

Site Details

Easting	436465	Northing	441062	Site area ha	5.8	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Office

Vacant building

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Outdoor sport facility

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat and undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Large brownfield site situated within the Green Belt. The site contains a 4 storey office building with significant areas of hardstanding. A vacant listed building is also situated within the site. Mature trees line the boundaries of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	Yes
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Large brownfield site within the Green Belt, which is well screened and seperated from the built up area of Scarcroft. However, the site could be developed for residential purposes and have no greater impact on the Green Belt and conservation area than the existing development which presently has a significant impact on openness of the countryside.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Unsuitable Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6618.36
Nearest bus stop	9867
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	252.26

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

For Development

Site is previously developed

The removal of large incongruous building in green belt will deliver significant improvements to the setting of the designated heritage assets.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Large brownfield site situated within the Green Belt and Scarcroft conservation area. The site is close to the built up area of the settlement and could be developed for residential development whilst not having a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and character and appearance of the conservation area than the existing significant development. Site to remain washed over with Green Belt.

Site Details

Easting	437847	Northing	448217	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East**70** **Linton Spring (office building), Sicklinghall Road, Wetherby****SHLAA conclusions****Availability:** Short (early)**Suitability:** Suitable**Achievability:** Short (=<5yrs)**Summary of infrastructure provider comments****Highways Agency**

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/04948/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 6, 10, 11 and 14 of Planning Application 10/05300/FU	A	98

Outer North East

70 Linton Spring (office building), Sicklinghall Road, Wetherby

13/04965/FU	Change of use of offices to form four houses and four flats, including extensions and alterations, erection of garage block, alterations to access and internal road layout	A	98
11/04198/FU	Change of use, alterations and extension of part of offices to form 4 dwellings, with detached double garage and store. (Amendment to previous approval 10/05300/FU)	A	98
11/04196/FU	Change of use, alterations and extension of offices to 1 house and erect detached double garage and store	A	98
10/05300/FU	Change of use of offices to 4 flats and 4 houses (Amendment to approval 07/04873/FU, 2 additional flats) including side extension	A	98
09/01578/FU	Change of use of offices to 4 flats and 4 town houses (Amendment to approval 07/04873/FU, 2 additional flats) including side extension	A	98

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations			
N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap	
N34 PAS	0.00		
RL1 Rural Land	0.00		
N1 Greenspace	0.00		
N1A Allotments	0.00		
N5 Open Space	0.00		
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00		
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00		
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00		
UDP City Centre	0.00		
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00		
Proposed Local Centre	0.00		
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00		
Core Strategy			
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap	
Major Settlement	0.00		
Minor Settlement	0.00		
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Regeneration Areas			
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap	
LB Corridor RA	0.00		
EASEL RA	0.00		
Aire Valley RA	0.00		
West Leeds Gateway	0.00		

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	13858.78
Nearest bus stop	8541
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	1313.14
Agricultural classification	Grade 2

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out site - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Site Details

Easting	443893	Northing	447147	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Other Rural Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Dwellings

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Core Strategy not fully met but some local services.	3
Access comments	
Adequate frontage	5
Local network comments	
Suitable network given the scale of the site	5
Mitigation measures	Total score
none	13
Highways site support	
yes	
Contingent on other sites	
no	
Contingent on other sites	
no	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
n/a			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

--

Outer North East

71 Thorp Arch Grange, Walton Road, Thorp Arch

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/03163/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 8, 11 and 14 of Planning Application 10/00492/FU	A	89
11/9/00161/MOD	Laying out of access road and erection of 14 houses - NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 10/00492/FU Canopies to front elevations and addition or alteration of brick chimneys to plots 1 - 12.	M01	89
11/03613/FU	Substitution of house type to plots 11 and 12 of approval 10/00492/FU (Laying out of access road and erection of 14 houses)	A	89
11/03871/CLP	Certificate of proposed lawful development for installation of rooflights and solar panels to Plots 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 and installation of solar panels to plots 35A & 35B of approved dwellings	A	72
10/00492/FU	Laying out of access road and erection of 14 houses	A	89
11/04776/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4 and 8 of Planning Application 11/03613/FU	A	89

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

71 Thorp Arch Grange, Walton Road, Thorp Arch

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00		Major Settlement	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00		Minor Settlement	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00		Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
N1A Allotments	0.00		Regeneration Areas		
N5 Open Space	0.00		Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
N6 Playing Pitch	0.94		LB Corridor RA	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00		EASEL RA	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00		Aire Valley RA	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00		West Leeds Gateway	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00				
Proposed Local Centre	0.00				
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00				

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	13908.76
Nearest bus stop	8855
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	182.98
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Residential development currently under construction on the site.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Against Development

Settlement Hierarchy
Deliverability

For Development

Statutory

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details

Easting	435035	Northing	442127	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Other
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Longterm (+11yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	7781.83
Nearest bus stop	5693
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	788.64

Agricultural classification	Grade 4
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Against Development

remote from the village core and is a considerable distance from other residential areas
This site is currently providing low cost accommodation (static caravans) for many Bardsey residents and any development will, at least in part, represent replacement by more expensive dwellings.
Problems for transport for those without cars as the site is some distance from the nearest bus route.

For Development

Statutory

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out site - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

90 Church Lane (27) - St Vincents School, Boston Spa

Site Details

Easting	442832	Northing	445436	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/02625/FU	Variation of condition 2 of permission 10/01180/FU to allow continued use of classroom	A	95

Outer North East

90 Church Lane (27) - St Vincents School, Boston Spa

14/00210/TR	Various pruning works.	NBJ	95
10/05599/FU	Laying out of hardstanding area and widening of access to school	A	95
11/01086/EXT	Extension of time for application 08/02322/FU Laying out of access road and erection of 13 houses	A	95
13/02635/FU	Single storey demountable classroom building/annexe and covered walkway	A	95
10/01180/FU	Detached single storey temporary classroom building to school	A	95
14/03309/FU	Demolition of existing buildings and laying out of access road and erection of 13No. dwellings	A	95
10/05598/CA	Retrospective Conservation Area Application to demolish entrance gate pier.	A	95

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	
N32 Greenbelt	0.00
N34 PAS	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.00
N1 Greenspace	0.00
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

% overlap

Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area	0.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	1.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

% overlap

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

% overlap

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12013.92
Nearest bus stop	4151
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	257.70
Agricultural classification	Grade 3

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary	

Site affects others?	

Sustainability summary	

Summary of reps	

Comments on phasing	

DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	

DPP Allocation Conclusion	
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted	

Outer North East

103 Moor End (7-14) - Boston Spa LS23 6ER

Site Details

Easting	441707	Northing	445687	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (later) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/01316/FU	Demolition of 8 houses, laying out of new access and erect 14 houses	W	98

10/04749/FU	Demolition of 8 houses, laying out of new access and erect 14 houses	98
-------------	--	----

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12111.91
Nearest bus stop	7740
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	157.92

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details

Easting	439751	Northing	448512	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mixed
On-site land uses	
Dwellings	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Outdoor amenity and open space	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Brownfield site in existing residential area, presently occupied by 3 dwellings and associated gardens. Tree Preservation Orders on Spofforth Hill street frontage and a band of trees east-west across the site.
-------------	---

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

361 Spofforth Hill (land at), Wetherby LS22 6SF

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unavailable

Suitability: Unsuitable

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Core Strategy target not fully met but some local services.

3

Access comments

Long frontage but mature trees might need to be lost for visibility splay. Footway provision maybe required along frontage and wider.

4

Local network comments

Spare capacity in the local network given the scale of development. Lack of footways on nearside and frontage

5

Mitigation measures

Possible footway works

Total score

12

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact

Network Status

No objection

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Wetherby

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

361 Spofforth Hill (land at), Wetherby LS22 6SF

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.05	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	4.32
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	14486.37
Nearest bus stop	8200
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	189.51

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site in existing residential area, presently occupied by 3 dwellings and associated gardens. Tree Preservation Orders on Spofforth Hill street frontage and a band of trees east-west across the site. Concerns regarding loss of established tree cover and local amenity issues.

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

minor negative for greenfield and landscape quality. Minor positive for education, health, culture, quality of housing, floodrisk and transport network.

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development

As freehold owners of the property we assume that any development of the site would give rise to a CPO of the property which we would strongly oppose.

Statutory

This site is not considered suitable for allocation for housing and falls outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site in current residential use. Allocation of the site is not supported by the owners.

Outer North East

757 Harewood Village Farm

Site Details

Easting	432345	Northing	445108	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Other Rural Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

Outer North East**757 Harewood Village Farm****SHLAA conclusions****Availability:** Short (=<5 yrs)**Suitability:** Suitable**Achievability:** Short (=<5yrs)**Summary of infrastructure provider comments****Highways Agency**

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/02342/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28 and 29 of Planning Application 10/00059/FU	A	75

Outer North East

757 Harewood Village Farm

13/03727/FU	Variation of condition 2 of previous approval 10/00059/FU for alterations to approved house type plot 1 bi-fold doors to the rear elevation and alteration from tarmac to gravel drives to plots 1 to 5	A	75
11/9/00116/MOD	Erection of 5 detached houses and 3 terrace houses NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 10/00059/FU Windows to second floor shower rooms	M01	75
12/05018/FU	Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of 10/00059/FU for MINOR MATERIAL AMENDMENT relating to alterations to house type to plot 5	A	75
11/9/00169/MOD	Erection of 5 detached houses and 3 terrace housesNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 10/00059/FU : Doors added in lieu of window within existing approved opening plot 5, kitchen, breakfast area, ground floor	M01	75
10/00059/FU	Erection of 5 detached houses and 3 terrace houses	A	75

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	
N32 Greenbelt	0.00
N34 PAS	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.00
N1 Greenspace	0.00
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

% overlap

Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area	0.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

% overlap

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

% overlap

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	9920.43
Nearest bus stop	4158
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	166.58

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details

Easting	442677	Northing	445931	Site area ha	8.6	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Dwellings

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=≤5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Partially meets primary education, health and secondary education (40%)	2

Access comments	
Agreed	

Local network comments	
Agreed	

Mitigation measures	Total score
Traffic calming	

Highways site support	
Already under construction, lost at appeal	

Contingent on other sites	

Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	
Under construction	

Environment Agency

Constraints	
FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation.	

LCC

Ecology support	Already Develop
Already Developed	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	

Outer North East

777 Churchfields, Boston Spa

Flood Risk

Mostly in Flood Zone 1, but NE boundary, running adjacent to the river Wharfe is in Flood Zone 2. More vulnerable uses, such as dwellings are appropriate for this location. A 9m easement will be required along NE bounday of the site, adjacent to the river Wharfe.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
12/9/00107/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erect 153 dwellings with garages, car parking and landscaping, with separate access road and 45 car parking spaces for adjacent church NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 09/04531/FU: Amendment to previously approved layout plan; amendment to plot 1 (replacement of proposed french door with bi-fold door); additional parking space to plot 50 and window alterations to Grampian house type	M01	93
12/00457/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 29, 36 and 37 of Planning Application 09/04531/FU	A	93
14/03024/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 19 of Planning Application 09/04531/FU	INT	93
12/00736/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 33 of Planning Application 09/04531/FU		93
14/9/00003/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erect 153 dwellings with garages, car parking and landscaping, with separate access road and 45 car parking spaces for adjacent church NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 09/04531/FU: We propose to raise the rear roof on plot 71 by 600mm to meet the main roof eaves level. Changes were discussed in principle with the planning officer and no issues were raised.	M01	93
12/00459/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 5 of Planning Application 09/04531/FU	A	93
12/9/00020/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erect 153 dwellings with garages, car parking and landscaping, with separate access road and 45 car parking spaces for adjacent church NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 09/04531/FU: Minor amendments to approved layout plan; amendments to approved plans on Condition 2	M01	93

777 Churchfields, Boston Spa

12/9/00111/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erect 153 dwellings with garages, car parking and landscaping, with separate access road and 45 car parking spaces for adjacent church NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 09/04531/FU: Amendment to previously approved layout plan; amendment to plot 1 (replacement of proposed french door with bi-fold door); provision of stone quions to Ashbury, Fairfield and Farrington house types		93
09/04531/FU	Laying out of access roads and erect 153 dwellings with garages, car parking and landscaping, with separate access road and 45 car parking spaces for adjacent church	R	93
11/04208/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 35 of Planning Application 09/04531/FU	A	93
09/02128/FU	Laying out of access roads and erection of 170 dwellings with garages, car parking and landscaping, with separate access road and 45 car parking spaces for adjacent church.	R	93
12/00821/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 19 and 27 of Planning Application 09/04531/FU	A	93

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.05
Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12475.24
Nearest bus stop	6007
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	247.27
Agricultural classification	Grade 3

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

778 **Bowcliffe Road - Bramham House, Bramham**

Site Details

Easting	442598	Northing	442692	Site area ha	2.1	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

Outer North East

778 Bowcliffe Road - Bramham House, Bramham

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Partial 70% primary education

1

Access comments

Access ok for development equivalent to existing use

3

Local network comments

No footways on Freely Lane, rural in nature

3

Mitigation measures

Total score

7

Highways site support

Yes to equivalent of existing use.

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------------------------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

All of site within SPZ 3. FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation.

LCC

Ecology support Not supported

Not supported (Red) - This site includes areas of semi-natural Lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP Priority Habitat. Remove areas of woodland from allocation.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/778. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent woodland habitat are addressed. Need a survey of the existing hall for bats - an old property such as this within a woodland setting is likely to be high risk for roosts.

Outer North East

778 Bowcliffe Road - Bramham House, Bramham

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	93.07
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	9277.40
Nearest bus stop	388
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	222.31

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

For Development

If development goes ahead all buildings should be constructed in stone and be of a size and design to reflect the existing character and style of the old village properties as the sites are all in or close to the village centre.

If development goes ahead protection must also be given to Bramham Beck. In recent years this area has been the focus of much environmental work by villagers and now is host to many species of flora and fauna, some relatively rare e.g. Kingfishers.

I believe this development was to include the widening of Freely Lane which I am in favour of I would prefer this to be developed in the short term.

Development is consistent with existing village environment

In the case of development, development of roads (Bowcliffe Road) required.

Suitability of site

we would suggest that there is scope for further land to come forward in the village for housing.

Against Development

Existing sites should be completed before any new ones are started.

Part of the yard was once used as a much needed car park. Further back in the past, old folks tell us, the site was used as a tip, for every form of rubbish imaginable (and before all houses had bathrooms!)

Statutory

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

780 First Avenue, Bardsey

Site Details

Easting	436957	Northing	444428	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

780 First Avenue, Bardsey

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Uncertain

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/02529/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 4 of Planning Application 13/02998/FU	A	95

Outer North East

780 First Avenue, Bardsey

14/01919/FU	Temporary detached single storey prefabricated sales unit to vacant land	A	98
14/02491/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 7, 8 and 13 of Planning Application 13/02998/FU		95
14/02184/TR	Remove G3 & G4 - 2 x & 4 x Willow trees, replanting scheme within buffer zone as per attached replanting schedule and plan	A	100
13/02998/FU	Residential development for 5 No. detached dwellings	A	95

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	10004.01
Nearest bus stop	12822
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	301.78

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

783 Bowcliffe Road Timber Yard, Bramham

Site Details

Easting	442479	Northing	442738	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Managed Forest

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

783 Bowcliffe Road Timber Yard, Bramham

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

3 buses per hour, 100% primary and health, some local services

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Access achievable to Bowcliffe Rd

4

Local network comments

small development - negligible impact on local network

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact

Network Status

No objection

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Thorp Arch

There is no capacity at Thorp Arch for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ2 and part FZ3. Source protection Zone 3. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but Bramham Beck and adjacent woodland are used by protected species Otters and Kingfisher. Any residential development along this linear site would have direct and indirect adverse impacts on the wildlife corridor function of this site, and use by Otters.	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1, although parts of site along Western boundary at risk of flooding from Bramham Beck	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
This site lies within the Bramham Conservation Area. When originally designated, it is presumed that this open area was considered to make an important contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore, one might assume that its loss and subsequent development would result in harm to that part of the designated area. In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this plot of land makes to the character of the Conservation Area. If this area does make an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, then the plan would need to explain why its loss and subsequent development is considered to be acceptable.	
Natural England	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/04203/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31 of Planning Application 31/51/03/FU	SPL	88
12/01231/FU	14 houses	W	93
09/05011/EXT	Extension of time for implementation of planning permission 31/51/03/FU (18 dwelling houses)	W	88
13/01248/FU	Erection of 14 dwellings and associated landscaping	A	93

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	9298.53
Nearest bus stop	388
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	143.88

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site. Principle of housing is already established as historic consents exist. A recent planning application for housing (12/01231/FU) was withdrawn, however the principle of housing on the site was not objected to. No highways issues raised.

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

major negative for biodiversity. Minor negative for floodrisk and pollution. Major positive for greenfield. Minor positive for health; housing quality and transport network.

Summary of reps

Pro
Improve appearance of site
Already accommodated within village environment and infrastructure. Consistent with existing village environment and are entirely sustainable
Support construction but, all buildings should be constructed in stone and be of a size and design to reflect the existing character and provide flood defence and reduce capacity from 18 to 15 dwellings
There is current planning permission
Suitable for elderly and affordable housing

Anti
If this area does make an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, then the plan would need to explain why its loss and subsequent development is considered to be acceptable.
There are biodiversity issues relating to the site which do not conform with Policy G8 in the draft core strategy or the National Planning Policy Framework.

Metro
Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
5695	5	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

785 Syke Lane/Moses Syke, Scarcroft

Site Details

Easting	436256	Northing	441814	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Other Rural Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=≤5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Fails to meet standards	1
Access comments	
Access off Syke Lane, no footway, narrow	3
Local network comments	
No footway on site side, A58 congestion	4
Mitigation measures	Total score
Footway and visibility splay, possible traffic management	8
Highways site support	
no	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints
FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation.

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Outer North East

785 Syke Lane/Moses Syke, Scarcroft

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/05551/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	R	99
11/04303/RM	Reserved Matters application to erect 11 houses	A	100
12/01315/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22 and 24 of Planning Application 11/04303/RM	A	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	7367.96
Nearest bus stop	5929
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	231.68

Agricultural classification	Grade 4
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

786 **Aberford Road - Bramham Lodge**

Site Details

Easting	442722	Northing	442539	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

Outer North East

786 Aberford Road - Bramham Lodge

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/9/00044/MOD	Change of use of house to 4 flats outbuildings to 3 houses and erection of 8 housesNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Walling up of window to approved gable	M01	99

11/02887/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 6, 20 and 25 of Planning Application 31/121/04/FU	A	99
---------------	--	---	----

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	1.10	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	9155.26
Nearest bus stop	388
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	418.75

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro
Improve appearance of site
Because they need developing, especially the Bramham House site, which Leeds City Council have disgracefully allowed to decay into an untidy ruin surrounded by six acres of unkempt grounds. The best answer now is to build houses, knock down Bramham House as it is now beyond repair and make the area look a little bit tidier

Already accommodated within village environment and infrastructure. Consistent with existing village environment and are entirely sustainable

Support construction but, all buildings should be constructed in stone and be of a size and design to reflect the existing character

There is current planning permission

Suitable for elderly housing

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details

Easting	437794	Northing	448218	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Other Rural Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency	
Impact	Network Status

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water
Treatment Works

Environment Agency
Constraints

LCC
Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities
Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other
English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	13854.39
Nearest bus stop	8541
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	1356.58

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details

Easting	442618	Northing	445647	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Dwellings	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Education	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description	
Site recently developed for residential development.	

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
n/a			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

This site includes a Grade II Listed Building (Four Gables and attached contemporary garden wall including that part within Woodside). There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that “special regard” should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset (including its setting) are not likely to be harmed.

This site lies within the Boston Spa and Thorpe Arch Conservation Area.

The NPPF makes it clear that the loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the significance of a Conservation Area should be regarded as resulting in substantial harm to that area. Consequently, if the buildings on the site make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, they should be retained.

If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the character of this part of the Conservation Area are not harmed.

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/04211/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 16, 19, 20, 21 and 22 of Planning Application 07/05690/FU	SPL	62
10/02504/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 6 and 7 of Planning Application 07/05690/FU	A	62

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.01
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12185.59
Nearest bus stop	14328
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	217.35

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site of existing large dwellings with generous curtilages. Accessible location within the urban area close to the local centre. However; site is situated within the conservation area which will impact upon design and density. Demolition of existing buildings if required will also require CAC (if building to be demolished). The setting of existing buildings also needs consideration. Oaks Lane is a single track. Potential alternative access through Whitham Close. Access through Whitham Close could be detrimental to the conservation area. Assimilation into the conservation area would have to be well managed. The site also contains significant trees which are protected due the the conservation area designation. Requires highways, trees and conservation area comments/mitigation

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro
Represent infill opportunities as the infrastructure (roads particularly) in these areas are more developed and could accomodate additional traffic flows

Anti
Traffic congestion, Pressure on local services
Conservation/ Heritage, Consequently, if the buildings on the site make a positive contribution to theConservation Area, they should be retained. If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the character of this part of the ConservationArea are not harmed.

Metro
Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network
Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
3251	5	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site not available. Previous consent for residential development fully built out.

Outer North East

793 **Linton Road - Raintree Lodge, Wetherby**

Site Details

Easting	439732	Northing	448279	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (= <5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/9/00227/MOD	Two 4 bedroom detached houses and a 3 storey block of 2 two bedroom apartments and 1 three bedroom apartmentNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: RAISED	M04	100

PATIO TO REAR

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	14256.03
Nearest bus stop	8200
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	45.04

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

797 East Leeds Extension

Site Details

Easting	436898	Northing	436873	Site area ha	204.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds, North Leeds, Outer North East				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Partially meets bus and employment(70%) meets primary health and education, partially meets secondary education(40%)

3

Access comments

Local network comments

Mitigation measures

Total score

Highways site support

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact Major impact

Network Status

Likely to require significant physical mitigation

Assessment of cumulative impact with other sites needed

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Appropriate stand off distance(s)/diversion(s) will be required for all infrastructure

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ3 small bit following river south west of site. See comments in our previous I&O consultation. Cock Beck (main river) runs along and within the site south of A64. FZ3 follows the course of the river. Grimes Dike (ordinary watercourse) runs along western boundary north of A64.

LCC

Ecology support

Not supported

Not supported (Red) - This proposed allocation includes a section of the Cock Beck and Grimes Dike which are both UK BAP priority habitat. They form an important corridor running north to south along the western boundary of the area. There are also lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP Priority Habitat which should be retained. Networks of hedgerows should be retained within public open space of developments where possible. Retain the beck and tributaries with a 20m biodiversity buffer stand-off from both sides to establish as a linear informal nature park area - and link into the disused railway to Scholes via an "Ecological Bridge with Cycle route" to connect to the East Leeds Country Park on the outside of the new ring road. Otter a European protected species has been recorded on the Cock Beck. The beck will also be important for bats another group of European protected species. Retain a 20m biodiversity buffer stand-off from the other beck towards the southern boundary that flows into the Cock Beck and Barnbow Common SEG1. Retain a minimum biodiversity buffer 10 metres on both sides of any other small becks or wet ditches. Remove woodland blocks and other features shown on the Leeds Habitat Network from the developable area.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawings RM/797 A to D. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed. Special ecologically designed linkages will be required where the new ring road crosses: 1 Wood Lane (and the nearby beck); 2 Disused railway; 3 Cock Beck; and 4 beck flowing into Cock Beck (see drawings) - these features all form part of the Leeds Habitat Network and must not be physically severed. These 4 crossing points will need to be factored into Highway design costings at an early stage - with design of ecological bridging features agreed. Bat activity surveys will need to focus on the 4 crossing points to identify levels of bat activity and influence design of Highway crossing features. Significant opportunity for positive biodiversity enhancements (or compensation/offsetting for unavoidable loss of habitats within the allocation) on outside of new ring road to increase the area and quality of Barnbow Common SEGI - so that it connects with the new East Leeds Country Park.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	99.98	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Sch. Ancient Mon.	1.00
-------------------	------

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	10.91
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2503.21
Nearest bus stop	14367
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	367.66

Agricultural classification	Grade 3b
-----------------------------	----------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

For Development

Our estimate of the capacity of the total residential land potential in the allocation as defined in the UDPR is circa 5,300 dwellings.

Appropriate adjustments to the boundaries to select the best ELOR alignment and meet environmental and infrastructure requirements will further increase the development capacity to circa 6,000 dwellings, subject to further work on a development framework and subsequent design considerations.

Taylor Wimpey intend to undertake further work following the publication of the City Council's feasibility study in order to examine in greater detail a preferred alignment which meets environmental and highway design criteria while allowing for a modest increase in the residential development capacity of land in the Central Quadrant of ELE.

The LLAF

- strongly urges that within the built development public paths should offer safe and pleasant environments through open landscaped areas rather than along narrow ginnels between fences or buildings;
- endorses the proposals made by Public Rights of Way (PROW) Department for a parallel bridleway route for walkers, horseriders and pedal cyclists, suitably distanced and screened from the proposed East Leeds Orbital Road (ELOR), and for additional multi-user linkages with the existing PROW network;
- stresses the need for cycleway linkages into the developed area;
- welcomes the intention to retain current levels of playing pitch provision;
- welcomes the provision of a country park to the west of Whinmoor Grange; and
- asks to be consulted on the Reserved Matters application expected in 2014.

The Forum asks that the first four points above, together with consideration of appropriate crossings of the ELOR by the existing PROW network, are also incorporated into the Development Brief now being prepared for the Southern Quadrant.

ELE should be completed prior to any other sites being developed in North East Leeds.

Against Development

Members wish to register strong concerns with site 797.

We strongly feel the ELOR will create major problems for our village (Barwick in Elmete).

Erosion of bungalows as a valuable housing stock. These could offer an alternative 'affordable' housing option. Choice of bungalows is limited. road infrastructure is not good enough to cope with this increase in traffic

Statutory

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details

Easting	437520	Northing	437011	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/01178/FU	Amendments to house types to plots 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 to approved application no. 08/03451/FU	A	99

Outer North East

798 Station Road (37-51), Scholes

10/00097/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 5, 10 and 15 of Planning Application 08/03451/FU	A	100
10/03555/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 3 of Planning Application 08/03451/FU	R	99
10/9/00022/MOD	Demolition of 2 semi detached houses, laying out of access road and erection of 10 detached housesNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Newbury House Type Plots 1 and 6 - bay windows to front, increased depth of landing window with metal balcony to rear with french door. Claremont House Type Plot 10 - bay window to front and french door with side lights to rear. Belmont House Type Plots 8 and 9 - Gable over garage door and introduced two french doors to rear in place of the door and side light and a window.	M04	100
11/9/00239/MOD	Demolition of 2 semi detached houses, laying out of access road and erection of 10 detached houses NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 08/03451/FU Plot 3: insertion of obscure glazed window to side, addition of ground floor window to side, re-arrangement of rear window/door openings; Plot 4: Insertion of obscure glazed window to side, re-arrangement of rear window/door openings	M01	99
11/00995/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 3 of Planning Application 08/03451/FU	A	99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2847.35
Nearest bus stop	7173
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	143.46

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps
Pro
Would be ideal for more community facilities and small shops in the village and an NHS dentist so support more people.
This site was removed from the SHLLA in the 2012 update, the site has been fully developed

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

830 Thorner Lane - Oaklands Manor, Scarcroft

Site Details							
Easting	437370	Northing	441210	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6850.26
Nearest bus stop	1692
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	857.44

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1001 Tarn Lane - Brandon Hall LS17

Site Details

Easting	433887	Northing	441001	Site area ha	3.8	SP7	Other
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown Suitability: Unsuitable Achievability: Uncertain

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6978.70
Nearest bus stop	12676
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	715.75

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1005 Wetherby Road, Scarcroft

Site Details

Easting	436143	Northing	440479	Site area ha	18.3	SP7	Other
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

1005 Wetherby Road, Scarcroft

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6034.26
Nearest bus stop	7314
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	207.52

Agricultural classification	Grade 3b
-----------------------------	----------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Anti
It will spoil the southernly aspect of Scarcroft and is a step towards the urbanisation of a semi-rural village. Also I object strongly to farmers who buy agricultural land at market prices including green belt then expect to fund their retirement by selling the land at development prices.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1008 Grove Road, Boston Spa

Site Details

Easting	443359	Northing	445027	Site area ha	3.9	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Flat greenfield site in agricultural use. Well defined boundaries. Road frontage along north and east borders. No visible constraints on site.
--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

1008 Grove Road, Boston Spa

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

No Public Transport but some local services

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Long frontages give options for access. Footways and visibility splays would need to be created.

4

Local network comments

Footways needed along the site frontage and possible road widening. Could be cumulative issues on High Street and J45 if other Boston Spa sites are taken forward. Visibility at some local junctions is not ideal, but no accident record to speak of.

3

Mitigation measures

Footways needed to site frontage and possible road widening. Possible traffic management works on High Street and works to J45 if all Boston Spa sites are taken forward

Total score

9

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Thorp Arch
-----------------	------------

There is no capacity at Thorp Arch for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
-----------------	-----------

Supported

Outer North East

1008 Grove Road, Boston Spa

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There is a combined public sewer along the North and Eastern boundaries of the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/03196/FU	Full planning application for the erection of 103 dwellings including associated car parking and garages, formation of new access, public open space, landscaping and parking facilities		100
13/03202/OT	Outline planning application for the erection of up to 104 dwellings including associated car parking and garages, means of access and parking facilities for Martin House Hospice. Matters relating to layout, appearance, scale and landscaping are reserved for approval later.	AP	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

N32 Greenbelt	0.02	% overlap
N34 PAS	99.95	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	11722.64
Nearest bus stop	11735
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	141.84

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Designated as PAS (protected area of search) on the existing UDP, not within the Green Belt. No physical constraints that would prevent development, topography is flat with a road frontage along two sides of the site available for access. Local network concerns, particularly cumulative impact

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield land. Minor negatives on greenspace; climate change and local needs. Minor positives education; health, housing quality; flood risk.

Summary of reps

Pro
Site 1008 Grove Road, Boston Spa should be identified as a “green” site and a housing allocation. Further detail on Grove Road, Boston Spa is provided in Section 4, which addresses the site’s availability, suitability and achievability. The site is deliverable now and accords with the NPPF and emerging Core Strategy. The site should therefore be allocated.

Anti
PAS land
Coalescence
Lack of consultation
Pressure on local services, Schools full, Dentist/GP full
Already built
New proposals devoid of open space
Flooding. We also get very heavy flooding at the hospice and, sometimes it is like driving through a river.

Traffic congestion.Grove Road invites up to 1000 two way trips per day using junctions not fit for purpose at each end of Grove Road and street parking. This will aggravate existing conditions.

Poor highway access, therefore should be colour coded red. The road on the Grove Estates both lead to blind exits and with the increase of traffic the chances of any accidents happening will increase

Poor Public transport. The site is outside the 15 minute walk time to regular public transport to a main transport hub and even when you reach that connection point, at Bridge Road, it is a 50-60 minute journey time to that transport hub. There is no connectivity in timetabling between the infrequent services passing the site and the more frequent 770 service to Leeds or Harrogate which has a 30 minute frequency during the day but only hourly at night and on Sundays.

The Boston Spa Conservation Area Management Plan identifies that the view across the site from Grove Road/Green Lane is a “key view” and should therefore be protected.

Metro
Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network
Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
4210	5	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Safeguarded land (PAS)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site allocated as PAS in the UDP and not situated within land defined as the Green Belt. Boston Spa is a smaller settlement within the CS settlement hierarchy and release of this site would not fit with CS priorities, there are local preferences for alternative sites/strategic options and therefore site should be retained as PAS.

Outer North East

1027 Wetherby Road (land to west), south of Bardsey

Site Details

Easting	436680	Northing	442765	Site area ha	25.1	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Managed Forest

Other land uses - None

Topography	Undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Large undulating greenfield site which separates Bardsey and Scarcroft. The site is bounded by residential dwellings to the north and south with agricultural land to the east and west. Site is situated on an elevated level from the A58.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	Coalescence/merging settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	Yes
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1027 Wetherby Road (land to west), south of Bardsey

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Development of this relatively large site would result in the merging of two settlements (Scarcroft and Bardsey).

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2 buses per hour, 30% primary

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

visibility onto Wetherby Road maybe difficult to achieve due to road alignment

2

Local network comments

possible spare capacity but cumulative issues

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

8

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ2 & FZ3 abuts north of site. Main river (Collingham Beck) to north of site. See comments in main text of our response

Outer North East

1027 Wetherby Road (land to west), south of Bardsey

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildlife corridor of Bardsey Beck to the north east. Retain a minimum 20 metres corridor to the beck. Otters,Water Voles and bats to consider.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Predominantly Flood Zone 1, There is a risk of flooding from Bardsey and Gill Becks to the North and NE corner of the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.97	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	8327.70
Nearest bus stop	7876
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	308.66

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Development of this relatively large site would result in the merging of two settlements (Scarcroft and Bardsey). Highways concerns regarding access onto Wetherby Road.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives greenfield land and landscape.Minor negatives health; greenspace; climate change; floodrisk; local needs and built environment. Minor positive housing quality.

Summary of reps

Pro

The North East corner of site 1027 would meet most of the criteria for GREEN and could accommodate around 40 houses

1027 coloured red look to be more suitable than CFSM009 as previously mentioned, due to flooding and site access.

I am the owner of a plot of land measuring approx.. 2,400 sq. yards situated on and adjacent to the A58 Trunk Road at Bardsey. My plot is surrounded on all three other sides by, and on your map included within, the SCHLAA site no. 1027. I am writing to advise you that I am amenable to my land being included in discussions for the granting of planning permission for housing development.
My email address is:- jenw@bethere.co.uk. Yours faithfully Jennifer M. Wormald (Mrs.)

It is considered that the plots being promoted within site 1027 could be delivered whilst maintaining a strong physical separation; this would be achieved by utilising existing site topography, maintaining the Green Belt designation and the National Policy protection this carries, alongside additional landscaping and screening between the two plots.

Anti

Lack of consultation

Traffic congestion

Access and safety. Exiting onto the A58 from Wayside Crescent can be time consuming in rush hour due to traffic flow and speed change (30mph - 50mph), so increasing traffic flow at this point would be dangerous

Green Belt. Will have a detrimental impact on Village life and in some cases create a ribbon effect on the A58 Wetherby Road. We must protect the existence of the green belt and Villages individuality.

Flooding and drainage. Development of this area could increase potential flood issues on the adjacent Drive and 1st Avenue residential areas. Likewise development up stream could put increased flood pressures on the beck

Conservation and Heritage. Wayside Gardens is a designated Conservation Area and this would greatly alter its nature and characteristics.

Visual impact. Building would break with the policy of hiding villages such as Bardsey, Keswick, Collingham... from the broader landscape

Coalescence, further applications/building which would mean the merger of Scarcroft and Bardsey and loss of important greenbelt.

The loss of good agricultural land

Wildlife/ biodiversity impact

Metro

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network.

Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
4135	4	Yes	Yes	

Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development of this relatively large site would result in the merging of two settlements (Scarcroft and Bardsey). Highways concerns regarding access onto Wetherby Road.

Outer North East

1028 Wetherby Road (land to west), north of Scarcroft

Site Details

Easting	436273	Northing	442111	Site area ha	12.8	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.94	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	1.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	7665.02
Nearest bus stop	14002
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	313.64

Agricultural classification	Grade 4
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Anti
This site is remote from Bardsey Village core 2 - It is a large site which is not sustainable within the context of a smaller settlement such as Bardsey, or a village such as Scarcroft.³ - There are concerns about addition traffic on the A58 and the need for access to it from the site. ⁴
The site is in the green belt

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1031 Sandhills (land to east), Thorner

Site Details

Easting	437292	Northing	439291	Site area ha	1.4	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/00388/FU	Engineering of land for the formation of wildlife habitat pond with associated landscaping	W	69

Outer North East

1031 Sandhills (land to east), Thorner

14/02254/FU	Demolition of dilapidated building and construction of new stables, tractor shed/feed store and implement store	W	69
11/01467/FU	Engineering of land for the formation of wildlife habitat pond with associated landscaping	W	69

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	4948.38
Nearest bus stop	13061
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	178.12

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Anti
Site sieved out. This is a decision I wholeheartedly support. This site is currently a house which would be knocked down and a long established meadow which is part of the green belt around Thorner and part of the Conservation area.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1040 Carr Lane, Thorner,LS14

Site Details

Easting	437747	Northing	440517	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Other Rural Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	20.36	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6244.84
Nearest bus stop	5614
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	212.14

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1041 Wetherby Road (land to east at Castle Mona Lodge), Scarcroft

Site Details

Easting	436469	Northing	441620	Site area ha	2.3	SP7	Other Rural Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency			
Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail			

Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works			

Environment Agency			
Constraints			

LCC			
Ecology support			

Ecology boundary			

Education comments			

Flood Risk			

Utilities			
Gas			

Electric			

Fire and Rescue			

Telecoms			

Other			
English Heritage			

Natural England			

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	54.21	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	7176.09
Nearest bus stop	7826
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	103.81

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details

Easting	439347	Northing	449023	Site area ha	15.4	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Agricultural field adacent to the north-west edge of Wetherby. A661 lies to the south of the site.
--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy targets not met 3 buses per hour on site frontage. Small parts of site with limited access to local services

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Large site should have two access points, which is questionable. Possible road widening required to accommodate ghost island and visibility splay or mini roundabout. Significant tree loss possible.

3

Local network comments

Works on site frontage could be required. Major development could have impact in Wetherby town centre and West Gate

4

Mitigation measures

Works at site frontage. Requirements in Wetherby difficult to determine

Total score

9

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact Minimal material impact

Network Status

No objection subject to satisfactory mitigation

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the Wetherby Railway Triangle LNA towards the north, Retain a minimum 10 metres corridor from the LNA boundary.

Ecology boundary

Outer North East

1046 Spofforth Hill, Wetherby LS22

Education comments

1046=420 houses generates 105 primary and 42 secondary children. New 1.5FE primary school or 2FE to include site 1046, or another 0.5FE required through expansion,

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing site 1046 is within 750m of Kirk Deighton SAC/SSSI. Sites 2158, 3125, 1233, 4074, 4075 and 4076 within 2km to this site, which is an internationally important site for Great Crested Newts. If these allocations are retained/promoted, the supporting HRA should assess the likely significant effects upon this species. The SA should examine potential significant effects upon the interest features of the SSSI (see citation below) www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation/citation_photo/1003837.pdf

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/03051/OT	Outline application for residential development of up to 325 dwellings, access and associated works including open space and structural landscaping, including addition of pelican crossing to Spofforth Hill		100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	
N32 Greenbelt	0.00
N34 PAS	95.02
RL1 Rural Land	0.00
N1 Greenspace	0.02
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

% overlap

Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area	0.00
Major Settlement	1.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

% overlap

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

% overlap

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	14895.11
Nearest bus stop	10614
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	204.58

Agricultural classification	Grade 3a
-----------------------------	----------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Designated as PAS (protected area of search) on the existing UDP, not within the Green Belt. Local Nature Area (LNA) 109 is present within part of the site, however West Yorkshire Ecology support development subject to appropriate mitigation. Development of the site would be well connected to the existing settlement.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield and natural resources. Minor negatives biodiversity; climate change; transport network and local needs. Minor positives culture; housing quality and floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Anti-development

- development would destroy the bridleway crossing the site by turning it into a kerbed tarmac footway (not in conformity with para 75 of the NPPF)
- the site assessment is wrong in that the site is not flat, but sloping. Will be visible for over half a mile
- question mark over whether mature trees would need to be felled to provide access
- should be planning in conjunction with North Yorkshire County Council - better sites to the north of Wetherby
- would need significant road calming measures
- adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours (overlooking, privacy, overshadowing)
- loss of open amenity space. Will mean residents will have to travel considerably further to find amenity space.
- no matter what traffic calming / management measures are employed the knock on effect to Wetherby town centre will make congestion far worse particularly at West Gate on at the mini roundabout at the river bridge and Crossley Street school crossing.
- will cause a rat run though the Lake District estate to the south and west.
- the installation of a mini-roundabout and or ghost island will slow traffic to a crawl in both directions.
- concern the developer Belway Homes is providing much needed affordable homes, identified for the LS22 area, in a separate development area in contained within LS9 Easel thus reducing the availability of affordable homes in the Wetherby area
- local sports and recreational facilities (in particular, the swimming pool) won't be able to cope
- allocations on the east side of town would have much less traffic impact with much easier and direct access to the motorway network
- in the earlier Leeds unitary development plan the Ministry of Agriculture objected to building on this site because of its very exceptional agricultural value.
- the area immediately to the north of Wetherby (at the top of Deighton Road) would be better suited to accommodate housing
- large piece of land which slopes away from the main road (A661) with natural drainage towards existing properties - will increase risk of flooding
- impossible to turn right from Linton Avenue onto Spofforth Hill at peak times.
- Crossley Street school full

Pro-development/neutral

- increasing housing supply in Wetherby should bring cheaper properties onto the market which will help first time buyers
- likely improve business activity in Wetherby and the surrounding area
- Permission should be limited to a maximum of 100 units. If housing development is approved, at least 50% should be affordable housing
- access to the site should be at the North Yorkshire boundary
- install some form of traffic light/pelican crossing to allow people to cross the road safely.
- no car access into the Glebefield estate. there needs to be an appropriate crossing at the Glebefield entrance

Statutory Comments

- Metro

Green Sites with poor accessibility

SHLAA Ref - 1046

AKA Name - Spofforth Hill, Wetherby LS22

RAG - G

Area (ha) - 15.41

Distance to core network (centre of site) - 1347

Buses per hour - 4

Access to primary schools - Yes

Access to secondary schools - Yes

Access to primary health - Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Allocated as PAS land in the UDP. Site is well related to Wetherby and not situated within land defined as Green Belt.

Outer North East

1048 Main Street (north of), Aberford LS25

Site Details

Easting	443331	Northing	438577	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	95.34	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	5632.96
Nearest bus stop	4882
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	104.98

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1055A

Site Details

Easting	444596	Northing	446522	Site area ha	96.1	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield/Brownfield mix
-----------	---------------------------

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale
Unmanaged Forest
Vacant land
Shops

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture
General
Manufacturing and Wholesale

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

The site forms approximatley two-thirds of the Thorp Arch Trading Estate and includes low density employment land, vacant land and retail units. Part of the site is heavily wooded and covered by a SEGI designation. Part of the site has historical significance relating to WWII.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency			
Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail	

Yorkshire Water	
Treatment Works	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	

LCC	
Ecology support	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Outer North East

1055A

Other
English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/03061/OT	Outline Planning Application for residential development with associated parking, landscaping, primary school, village centre, retail development, sports pavilion, play area, amenity space and associated off site highway works		100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.73	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	1.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.07
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	13494.06
Nearest bus stop	3979
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	326.69

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Outer North East

1055A

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Large brownfield site with current employment and retail uses. Local preference for the site to be allocated for employment uses rather than housing.

Outer North East

1055B

Site Details

Easting	445188	Northing	446342	Site area ha	64.6	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale
Agriculture
Shops

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	No

Description

The site forms approximatley one third of the Thorp Arch Trading Estate and is presently in employment uses. Part of the site has historical significance relating to WWII.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	
--------	--	----------------	--

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	
-----------------	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support	
-----------------	--

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas	
-----	--

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage	
------------------	--

Natural England

Outer North East

1055B

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	
N32 Greenbelt	0.00
N34 PAS	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.34
N1 Greenspace	0.00
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sch. Ancient Mon.	1.00

Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area	0.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.04
Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	13505.47
Nearest bus stop	364
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	236.24
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Large brownfield site with current employment and retail uses. Local preference for the site to remain in employment use.

Outer North East

1056 Main Street (off) - Cricket Field, Shadwell

Site Details

Easting	434139	Northing	440036	Site area ha	1.8	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	
Removed	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	92.07	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	89.76	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.01
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	5987.22
Nearest bus stop	8117
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	175.53

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1057 Scholes Lane, Scholes

Site Details

Easting	437603	Northing	437390	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	
Agriculture	
Transport tracks and ways	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description	
Triangular shaped site in agricultural use. Greenfield with no existing development. Contained by railway line to east and road to west.	

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	Yes
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1057 Scholes Lane, Scholes

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Well contained site, however, development would breach a disused railway line, currently a strong defensible boundary between the site and settlement.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy not fully met but some local services

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Long frontage but vegetation might need to be lost for visibility splay. Footway may need to be widened along frontage.

4

Local network comments

Spare capacity for this scale of development.

5

Mitigation measures

Footway widening along frontage

Total score

12

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knothrop
-----------------	----------

Knothrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1057 Scholes Lane, Scholes

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There is a drain running along the boundary to the North

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations			Core Strategy		
N32 Greenbelt	97.23	% overlap	Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00		Major Settlement	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00		Minor Settlement	1.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00		Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
N1A Allotments	0.00				
N5 Open Space	0.00				
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00				
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00				
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00				
UDP City Centre	0.00				
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00				
Proposed Local Centre	0.00				
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00				

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3225.29
Nearest bus stop	6568
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	190.11

Agricultural classification	Grade 3b
-----------------------------	----------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. There is no development beyond the railway line which is a strong defensible boundary to Scholes. Breaching the railway would set a precedent for further sprawl into a narrow gap between Scholes and the main urban area of Leeds. No Highways issues raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negative greenspace. Minor positives health; quality housing; floodrisk; transport network and natural resources.

Summary of reps

Neutral

We are not opposed to small developments provided it is in keeping with the village, no high rise flats etc.

Pro

This is a small compact site which related well to the developed form of the village and is well bounded with established hedges. I do not buy into the defending the railway line as this is not something that needs defending locally and to the north where development pressures can be restricted for other reasons.

The site may accessible from the East Leeds Orbital Road after it has been developed. Additionally the projected Penda's Green Way Cycle route may be a secondary beneficiary through planning gain or Community Infrastructure levy funding.

Against

This road well used now and A64 junction not easy. Where will exits from further housing go?

Non- essential.

This is outwith any realistic or necessary development.

Metro

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network.

Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.

We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
1187	16	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The development of the site would result in an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt. The development of the site would represent sprawl to the west of Scholes.

Outer North East

1061 Wood Lane (land off), and east of the former railway, Scholes, LS15

Site Details

Easting	437467	Northing	436810	Site area ha	1.9	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	East Leeds, Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Outdoor amenity and open space

Education

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	No

Description

Flat greenfield site. Well defined public right of way runs through centre of site. Mature trees line all the boundaries.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

1061 Wood Lane (land off), and east of the former railway, Scholes, LS15

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Core Strategy not fully met but some local services

3

Access comments

No frontage to adopted highway. Needs access via site 1094.

1

Local network comments

Spare capacity for this scale of development.

5

Mitigation measures

Needs access to adopted highway

Total score

9

Highways site support

yes subject to access

Contingent on other sites

yes, site 1094

Contingent on other sites

yes, site 1094

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrap
-----------------	----------

Knostrap High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1061 Wood Lane (land off), and east of the former railway, Scholes, LS15

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildlife corridor provided by the adjacent Scholes Brickworks Pond LNA and disused railway line.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Thre is a large open water body located SW of the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/00716/OT	Outline application for residential development, laying out of access road, car parking, landscaping and associated works.	R	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.01	% overlap
N34 PAS	99.99	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00
-------------------	------

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2643.46
Nearest bus stop	8060
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	189.74

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Designated as PAS (protected area of search) on the existing UDP, not within the Green Belt. Set behind a school, the site is connected to the settlement in terms of its location, and is bordered by trees which provide natural screening and containment. However, there is no road frontage and access to the site would require highways works, potentially involving part of site 1094.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives green field and natural resources. Minor negative biodiversity. Minor positives health; housing quality; floodrisk, transport network and natural resources.

Summary of reps

Pro

The Access Study concludes that access to this site can be achieved through the construction of a junction with Station Road at the current location of nos. 33 and 35 Station Road. This is illustrated on the appended plan.
The site is well connected to the settlement

neutral

if higher end detached properties are built and this is what the developers suggested due to the desirability, saleability, profitability of the area. We have enough four bed detached and We have enough four bed detached and need smaller houses to so younger people and the older residents can move to smaller houses and then free up the larger house in turn.

Against

Any further traffic through Scholes will be dangerous. Very Bad now! So where will extra cars from the new houses exit from this area?

Metro

We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered.
Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
701	8	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Safeguarded land (PAS)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site allocated as PAS in the UDP and not situated within land defined as the Green Belt. Scholes is a smaller settlement within the CS settlement hierarchy and release of this site would not fit with CS priorities, there are local preferences for alternative sites/strategic options and therefore site should be retained as PAS.

Outer North East

1070 Linton Lane - Cragg Hall Farm, Wetherby LS22

Site Details

Easting	439377	Northing	447993	Site area ha	1	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mixed
-----------	-------

On-site land uses

Agriculture
Dwellings

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings
Outdoor sport facility

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Former agricultural site to the south of Wetherby on which a large detached dwelling has recently been constructed.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Yes
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	Yes
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	Yes
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1070 Linton Lane - Cragg Hall Farm, Wetherby LS22

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The site is well related to the existing settlement and development would constitute 'rounding off' of the existing settlement.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

No Public Transport but some local services

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Visibility splay and footway works required. Access via site 1301 might be beneficial

4

Local network comments

No footway provision on the site frontage. New footway upto Avon Garth would be required.

4

Mitigation measures

Visibility splay and footway works

Total score

10

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

no but potential benefits

Contingent on other sites

no but potential benefits

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	no objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ2 small part to east of site. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1070 Linton Lane - Cragg Hall Farm, Wetherby LS22

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Predominantly Flood Zone 1. Part of site along Eastern boundary is in Flood Zone 2 - River Wharfe.	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/03409/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 7, 10, 11, 12, 16 and 19 of Planning Application 10/04438/FU	A	95
11/04020/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 8, 9 and 13 of Planning Application 10/04438/FU	A	95
11/05284/FU	Variation of condition No. 2 of planning approval 10/04438/FU for Solar Thermal and Photovoltaic panels to roof	W	95
11/04304/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 14 and 15 of Planning Application 10/04438/FU		95
10/04438/FU	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of detached 6 bedroom dwelling house, laying out of driveway to front and landscaping including creation of sunken garden and pond	A	95
12/9/00004/MOD	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of detached 6 bedroom dwelling house, laying out of driveway to front and landscaping including creation of sunken garden and pond NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 10/04438/FU: Amendment to Condition 2 (plans approved)	M01	95

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.90	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	13895.07
Nearest bus stop	12309
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	210.03

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is well related to the existing settlement and development would constitute 'rounding off' of the existing settlement. However, deliverability of the site is under significant doubt given that construction of a large single dwelling (approved under planning app:10/04438/FU) is currently underway and substantially completed. This planning consent supersedes the sites SHLAA submission. No Highways issues raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negatives greenspace; greenfield; climate change; floodrisk and local needs. Minor positives education; health; culture; housing quality.

Summary of reps

Metro				
We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
953	5	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is well related to the existing settlement and development would constitute 'rounding off' of the existing settlement. However, the site is not available for residential development given the recent planning permission and construction of a large single dwelling in the middle of the site.

Outer North East

1088 Whinmoor Lane, land to rear of Wainscott Cottage, Shadwell, LS17 8LS

Site Details

Easting	434385	Northing	438926	Site area ha	1.8	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	4865.57
Nearest bus stop	11618
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	329.98

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1089 York Road - Homecroft, Scholes LS15 4NF

Site Details

Easting	437929	Northing	438223	Site area ha	2.4	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Other

Dwellings

Vacant building

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Storage

Dwellings

Other land uses

Scrap Yard

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Brownfield site to the north of Scholes which is washed over by Green Belt. The site lies adjacent to the A64. A disused railway line and mature tree line lie to the rear which separate the site from the built up area of Scholes. The site forms part of a small cluster of industrial/storage uses on this part of York Road.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	Yes
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	Yes
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	Yes
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

Outer North East

1089 **York Road - Homecroft, Scholes LS15 4NF**

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Brownfield, however the site is physically separated from other residential development by the disused railway line and mature tree line which forms a strong barrier. As such residential development would jut out from the existing settlement form.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unavailable

Suitability: Unsuitable

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
No Public Transport and very limited services	2

Access comments	
Approved access for a B class development. Ghost Island required.	4

Local network comments	
Spare capacity for this scale of development, but ghost Island and footway improvements to A64 required.	4

Mitigation measures	Total score
Ghost Island and footway improvements to A64 required.	10

Highways site support
yes with mitigation, given the fall back position.

Contingent on other sites
no

Contingent on other sites
no

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
n/a			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knothrop
Knothrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.	

Outer North East

1089 York Road - Homecroft, Scholes LS15 4NF

Environment Agency	
Constraints	
FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.	
LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1. There is a drain running along the boundary to the East	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/00711/FU	Laying out of access road and erection of 4 buildings comprising of 1 single block of 12 start up units with 2 seminar areas and 6 workshop units in 3 blocks (all class B1(b and c)) with car parking	A	96
13/02466/EXT	Extension of time application for planning permission 10/00711/FU Laying out of access road and erection of 4 buildings comprising of 1 single block of 12 start up units with 2 seminar areas and 6 workshop units in 3 blocks (all class B1(b and c)) with car parking	A	96

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	4119.18
Nearest bus stop	9233
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	122.06

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Planning permission has recently being granted on the site for laying out of access road and erection of 4 buildings comprising of 1 single block of 12 start up units with 2 seminar areas and 6 workshop units in 3 blocks (all class B1(b and c)) with car parking. No Highways issues raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenspace. Minor negatives employment opportunities and economic growth; health; climate change and local needs. Major positive floodrisk. Minor positives qulaity of housing; greenfield; built enviroment.

Summary of reps

Anti

The proposal would be better sited in the vicinity of the former Yorkshire Elctricity Board Headquarters, in Seacroft which has the necessary infrastructure to accommodate such

on your way down York road there is large areas of land right the way down just past asda store at killingbeck with better access to infastucture ,transport ,shops etc with less impact and the loss of greenfields and typical rural farming land

Metro

We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
1833	6	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Not favoured for residential use as the site is isolated from the built up area of Scholes with barriers in between. The site has recent planning permission for employment uses.

Outer North East

1094A Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane (between)

Site Details

Easting	438359	Northing	435808	Site area ha	377.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Office

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Substantial greenfield site to the east of the main urban area of Leeds. Site abuts the East Leeds Extension housing allocation to the west and Scholes to the east.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	Yes
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	Coalescence/merging settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	Yes
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

Outer North East

1094A Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane (between)

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Large site which would merge Scholes with the urban area. Mid section of site is well connected to the settlement, however, peripheral sections in north and south could lead to further sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) is an extremely large site that has very limited coverage of Public Transport and local services

Rank (1-5)

1

Access comments

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) has long frontages with adopted highway however numerous access points would be required for a site so large. Access to large parts of the site does not appear possible. This site would be on the outside of the East Leeds Extension/East Leeds Orbital Road. The East Leeds Orbital Road is envisaged to provide the boundary to the edge of the City. This

2

Local network comments

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - The local network, even with the East Leeds Orbital Road in place is unlikely to be adequate. The size of the site and linkage with other allocations offers the potential for new public transport and other local services

1

Mitigation measures

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - Mitigation would be required but not achievable

Total score

4

Highways site support

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - No

Contingent on other sites

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - no, however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to improved local services and Public Transport. A reduced site boundary, but combined with adjacent but amended sites maybe acceptable.

Contingent on other sites

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - no, however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to improved local services and Public Transport. A reduced site boundary, but combined with adjacent but amended sites maybe acceptable.

Highways Agency

Impact	Network Status
Likely to require significant physical mitigation. Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.	

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1094A Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane (between)

LCC

Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Site is too large to make useful comments. Shape file is 377ha.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.99	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3591.15
Nearest bus stop	4987
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	305.11

Agricultural classification	Grade 3b
-----------------------------	----------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outer North East

1094A Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane (between)

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site 1094 has been split into two as part B is not connected to A. If site A is developed the site would link Scholes with the boundary of the allocated East Leeds extension effectively merging Scholes with the main urban area, contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belt, to prevent the coalescence of settlements. Significant highway concerns relating to access, impact on local network and relationship to the proposed East Leeds Orbital Route.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - Access to green space. greenfield site, ecology. Emissions and local needs met locally based on highways accessibility assessment. High grade agricultural land, ecology and pollution. Minor negatives - Access to education, health and leisure. Community participation and cohesion and transport network based on highways accessibility assessment. Landscape and local distinctiveness. Minor positive - flood risk.

Summary of reps

For Development

Housing supply deliverable within 5 years as land available now.

Some smaller parts of site suitable for residential development once the route of the East Leeds Orbital Road is fixed.

Part of the 1094A site (between Skeltons Lane and York Road and north of Bramley Grange Farm) does have potential for housing and should be colour coded amber.

The contribution which this site makes towards the housing requirement is significant.

It would seem inevitable that this site will be developed in its entirety following suitable highway infrastructure development and the construction of East Leeds Orbital Road.

the development of smaller parcels of this land would be wholly suitable as additional development which would adjoin the UDP East Leeds Extension area.

Against Development

EVERY EFFORT MUST BE MADE TO ENSURE THAT THERE IS A GREEN BELT SEPERATING VILLAGES OF THORNER AND SCHOLES

The village of Scholes and its identity would be lost.

Development of this site would join Scholes to the rest of the Leeds and remove its status as a separate village.

Significant encroachment on Green Belt.

Statutory

The site falls outside 400m of the current core bus network.

Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.

We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development. (Metro)

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Very large Green Belt site. Development of the site would not be acceptable in Green Belt terms as it would result in significant sprawl, coalescence of the urban conurbation of Leeds with Scholes and fail to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Significant highway concerns relating to access, impact on local network and relationship to the proposed East Leeds Orbital Route.

Outer North East

1106 First Avenue (land west of), Bardsey

Site Details

Easting	436875	Northing	444220	Site area ha	14	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	
Agriculture	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Large greenfield site situated between Bardsey and Bardsey Village which is surrounded by residential properties on three sides with a beck and mature tree line to west. Site is situated on a slightly lower level than the A58.
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	Yes
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	Significant effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1106 First Avenue (land west of), Bardsey

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Site would consolidate the existing settlement of Bardsey which is split into two halves (Bardsey & Bardsey Village). The beck also provides a strong natural barrier to the north-west which limits sprawl potential and possible coalescence issues with East Keswick.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2 buses per hour, 40% primary

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

site frontage should accommodate visibility onto Wetherby Road

5

Local network comments

possible spare capacity but cumulative issues

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

11

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ2 & FZ3 small part to north of site, Main river (Collinhambeck) runs along site boundary. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1106 First Avenue (land west of), Bardsey

LCC

Ecology supportSupported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildlife corridor of the Bardsey Beck. Retain a corridor of minimum 20 metres from the beck. Otters, bats and White-clawed Crayfish to consider

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Predominantly Flood Zone 1. Parts of site in Flood Zones 2 and 3 adjacent to Keswick Beck to the North and NW.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	9791.16
Nearest bus stop	3457
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	282.80

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site within special landscape area. The site is of substantial scale and development could affect the existing character of Bardsey. Flood zones 3b (washland), 3a (high risk) and 2 (medium risk) exist adjacent to the beck (northwestern part of site). Highways concerns regarding general accessibility of the site to facilities.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives greenfield and landscape. Minor negatives health; biodiversity and climate change and local needs. Minor positives quality of housing; floodrisk???

Summary of reps

For

there are no boundary issues and there are spaces available at the local school

see detailed assessment Branham park estates

against

should not have gone past the sieving stage including having public footpaths and elevation of the land.

It is also noted that one of the key determinants of whether a site in a settlement like Bardsey should be allocated for housing is the level of impact its development would have on the purposes of the Green Belt. Indeed Policy SP6 of the Core Strategy indicates that only sites with the 'least impact on the purposes of the green belt will be allocated for housing. It is this representation's case that when compared with other site options in Bardsey that can be delivered for housing, SHLAA site 1153 clearly has the least impact on the green belt.

Metro

We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
4463	4	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site which splits Bardsey from Bardsey Village. Surrounded by residential development on three sides. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

1107 Green Lane (land east of), Boston Spa LS23

Site Details

Easting	443767	Northing	444952	Site area ha	9.5	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Allotments

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Large flat site in agricultural use. Well defined boundaries on all sides. Slopes gently towards southern section as there is a beck along the boundary.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No

Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl
--------------------------------	---

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes

Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements
------------------------	---------------------------

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No

Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment
-------------------------	---

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	

Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features
----------------------	---

Outer North East

1107 Green Lane (land east of), Boston Spa LS23

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Site is well connected to the settlement and would be contained by a mature tree line. However, it is a large site that represents a significant encroachment into the green belt.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (<=5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

No Public Transport but some local services only on a small part of the site

Rank (1-5)

1

Access comments

Footways and vis splays would need to be created on Green Lane. Green Lane could accommodate a single point of access, vehicular access to High Street unfortunately does not appear possible. A second point of access for site of this size is desirable.

4

Local network comments

Footways needed along the site frontage and possible road widening. Could be cumulative issues on High Street and J45 if other Boston Spa sites are taken forward. Visibility at some local junctions is not ideal, but no accident record to speak of.

3

Mitigation measures

Footways needed to site frontage and possible road widening. Possible traffic management works on High Street and works to J45 if all Boston Spa sites are taken forward

Total score

8

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Thorp Arch

There is no capacity at Thorp Arch for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ2 & FZ3 along site boundary. Main River (Fir Green Beck) abuts site. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1107 Green Lane (land east of), Boston Spa LS23

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildlife corridor of the Fir Green Beck and associated woodland. Retain a corridor of minimum 20 metres from the beck. Otters, bats and White-clawed Crayfish to consider

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There is a small part of site in the Eastern corner which is in Flood Zone 2, associated with Firgreen Beck. There is a combined public sewer within the site boundary.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.97	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	11751.08
Nearest bus stop	1296
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	197.62

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site has no physical constraints and is related to the existing settlement however, this is a large site and represents a significant encroachment into the green belt. Highways concerns re general accessibility of the site to facilities.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives Greenfield; climate change and local needs. Minor negatives greenspace; biodiversity; transport network. Minor positives Quality of housing and floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Anti

8) The proposed developer (GMI) may proposed only 100 houses at this stage but will Undoubtedly change this to 200 plus if the development restriction was lifted.9) If this is granted it will set the precedent for adjoining landowners to develop their own land for profitable reasons.

Problems for vehicle access to a main road. Whatever route vehicles take in the morning they will encounter bottlenecks from schools and/or bad junctions and/or onstreet parking. Once on the High Street they will increase congestion at the A1 roundabout, an area in which we still do not know what the effect will be when the Church Fields development is fully occupied.

Distance from the village centre.

We are already without green spaces for the population we have, more large housing will increase the deficit.

Encroachment towards Clifford. At present it is possible to walk the boundary of the village with green belt on one side of the road. A development on this site would take away that amenity.

Pro

- Site 1107 in its modified form is capable of supporting a wholly sustainable low density residential scheme, with a much needed focus on housing for the older demographic;
- The site can support development whilst redefining and re-strengthening the southern boundary to the settlement of Boston Spa, that is Firgreen Beck;
- The site can deliver approximately 110 homes of 3933 units houses required in the Outer North-East Housing Market Characteristic Areas, in a high-quality and wholly inclusive manner;
- The site can directly connect to existing pedestrian, road and public transport corridors;
- The site will 'round off' the existing settlement boundary to the south;
- The site can protect and maintain significant green corridors;
- The site will protect more viable agricultural land from encroachment; and
- The site will not impact on the open character of the Boston Spa countryside.

Metro

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
4554	5	Yes		
Yes				Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The development of the site is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of sprawl to the south-east of Boston Spa and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Outer North East

1108 Willow Lane (land west of), Clifford LS23

Site Details

Easting	442577	Northing	444372	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: Unsuitable Achievability: Uncertain

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	
--------	--	----------------	--

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

LCC

Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	98.16	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	10921.88
Nearest bus stop	14069
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	158.82

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro
site is adjacent to other properties and should therefore be reconsidered

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1109 Cinder Lane (land west of), Clifford, LS23

Site Details

Easting	443120	Northing	444541	Site area ha	3.1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.71	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.19	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.01	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	11195.35
Nearest bus stop	3796
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	190.69

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1121 Trip Lane (land at), Linton

Site Details

Easting	438668	Northing	446711	Site area ha	2.1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Longterm (+11yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	12494.20
Nearest bus stop	6144
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	283.45

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1127 Woodacre Green and Bankfield (land to south), Bardsey

Site Details

Easting	436578	Northing	443763	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

Outer North East

1127 Woodacre Green and Bankfield (land to south), Bardsey

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Meets primary education only	1
Access comments	
Unless turning head on Bankfield can be extended it is unclear where access can be taken	3
Local network comments	
A58 congestion cumulative impact.	4
Mitigation measures	Total score
	8
Highways site support	
no	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	
Half site is in FZ2 to East, FZ3 clips site to East. On Active Landfill (woodacre land). Main river (Collingham Beck) runs through the site to East Boundary. See comments in our previous I&O consultation.	

LCC

Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (Red) - This site includes a wooded section of the Bardsey Beck and wet fen habitat - UK BAP Priority Habitats. Remove a minimum of 20m biodiversity buffer adjacent to the beck from the developable area to be managed by a specialist ecological management company. Avoid light spillage into this area and avoid any disturbance from people and dogs (i.e. no paths). The Bardsey Beck supports otter and bats European protected species - avoid any recreational use of this buffer to prevent disturbance to otters. Planning permission has been granted.	
Ecology boundary	
Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/1127. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent wetland habitat are addressed - i.e. no public access with positive wildlife management, and a layout which avoids back	

Outer North East

1127 Woodacre Green and Bankfield (land to south), Bardsey

gardens directly onto the biodiversity buffer.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Mostly in Flood Zone 1, but about 40% of the site is in Flood Zone 2. More vulnerable uses, such as dwellings are appropriate for this location. A 9m easement will be required along the Eastern bounday of the site, adjacent to Bardsey Beck.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/02658/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 28 of Planning Application 12/05259/FU	A	100
12/05259/FU	Erection of 14 houses, laying out of access road and associated landscaping to vacant land	A	100
13/9/00190/MOD	Erection of 14 houses, laying out of access road and associated landscaping to vacant land NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 12/05259/FU: Substitution of double garage for the approved single garage on Plot 1.	M04	100
14/03760/COND	Consent, agreement of approval required by condition 34 of Planning Application 12/05259/FU	R	100
13/05471/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 15, 17, 22, 24, 25, 32, 33 and 35 of Planning Application 12/05259/FU	INT	100
13/9/00158/MOD	Erection of 14 houses, laying out of access road and associated landscaping to vacant land NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 12/05259/FU: Amendment to layout	M01	100
14/00518/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 17 of Planning Application 12/05259/FU	A	100
13/9/00191/MOD	Erection of 14 houses, laying out of access road and associated landscaping to vacant land NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 12/05259/FU: Rear single storey extension added to plot 6.	M04	100
12/02392/FU	Erection of 14 houses, laying out of access road and associated landscaping to vacant land	W	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	1.39	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	9321.30
Nearest bus stop	11962
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	176.20

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

can be usefully developed to add to the social housing properties in the Village to help retain young people in the village. Alternatively, they could be used as small scale development for elderly residents who wish to downsize.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

1130 Parlington Lane (land off)

Site Details

Easting	443242	Northing	436701	Site area ha	1.7	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency	
Impact	Network Status

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water
Treatment Works

Environment Agency
Constraints

LCC
Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities
Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other
English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	95.87	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	East Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	4021.27
Nearest bus stop	3147
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	174.14

Agricultural classification	Grade 3a
-----------------------------	----------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro

1130 and 1132 should have been jointly allocated to allowing housing to be developed on site 1130 and an associated new Village Hall together with parking, MUGA and play area on site 1132.
Both sites are well related to the built form of the village.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1131 Field Lane (south of), Aberford

Site Details

Easting	443496	Northing	437587	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency			
Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail			

Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works			

Environment Agency			
Constraints			

LCC			
Ecology support			

Ecology boundary			

Education comments			

Flood Risk			

Utilities			
Gas			

Electric			

Fire and Rescue			

Telecoms			

Other			
English Heritage			

Natural England			

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.18	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	95.21	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	4879.52
Nearest bus stop	4779
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	135.11

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy and part SFRA floodzone 3b

Outer North East

1132 Lotherton Lane (land south of)

Site Details

Easting	443417	Northing	436820	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact Network Status

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

LCC

Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.39	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	East Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	4203.69
Nearest bus stop	8198
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	77.12

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

1130 and 1132 should have been jointly allocated to allowing housing to be developed on site 1130 and an associated new Village Hall together with parking, MUGA and play area on site 1132. Both sites lie outside the areas where there is flood risk in the village. Both sites are well related to the built form of the village

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1134 Aberford Road, Barwick LS15

Site Details

Easting	440326	Northing	437502	Site area ha	6.2	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Large flat greenfield site in agricultural use. Residential dwellings border the site on three sides. Agricultural fields lie beyond the northern boundary of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1134 Aberford Road, Barwick LS15

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Strong links to settlement. Fairly well contained on all sides except to the north where there is a high potential for further sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy not fully met. Some local services. Lack of nearside footways

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Long frontage onto Aberford Road

4

Local network comments

Spare capacity in the local network but some impact likely. Lack of footways towards village centre

4

Mitigation measures

Local traffic management measures maybe necessary and footway provision.

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Barwick in Elmet
-----------------	------------------

There is capacity at Barwick in Elmet for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1134 Aberford Road, Barwick LS15

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.88	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3894.70
Nearest bus stop	7355
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	267.50

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Despite its size the site links well with the settlement as it is partially contained on three sides. However, there is no defensible boundary to the north and this could lead to further sprawl. The site is flat with a long road frontage. No Highways issues raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives greenfield and landscape. Minor negative health. Minor positives quality of housing; floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Pro

Some small areas of development within the villages of Scholes and Barwick i.e 5-15 affordable houses may be acceptable in some places SHLAA 1134 (with reduced numbers of houses)

It is on the opposite side of the village to Scholes and would not become part of urban sprawl. The land is flat and not part of a well used amenity for walking and cycling.

excellent area with local amenities. If Barwick are taking not even a small amount of houses then a traveller site would be acceptable in the area.

If sympathetic development, and upgrading of services went hand in hand, Barwick would benefit.

if development other than infill has to take place in Barwick this is the only obvious site. But 139 houses is too large a number and would alter the character of the village.

the most appropriate for housing development in Barwick village. It is contained on three sides and naturally fills the area adjoining Aberford Road between Potterton Lane and Fieldhead Drive.

very southernmost part of 1134 could be appropriate for elderly housing accommodation, as single story accommodation would have the lowest impact on the Special Landscape Area due to its location at the low point of a valley

The site is not within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature. Development of this site would not effect the setting and special character of historic features.

Anti

the council assessment suggests the site is bounded on three sides by development, this is not really the case with the easternmost line of properties being some distance from the village, and the southernmost boundary being the road with only a scattering of properties

new and larger sewage system throughout the Village. This is already under pressure and not too pleasant when manhole covers rise and sewage spills onto the road

The inspector of the 2006 UDP refused the proposal to remove this site from the Greenbelt

There is a currently inadequate highway infrastructure in the village to support the proposed development and the site would have a disproportionate over massing effect on the existing settlement and neighbouring streets removing its existing "village" character, damaging the sense of community.

If this site goes ahead this will involve at least an additional 500 cars. At peak times this road is very busy and access is bad for many houses in Aberford Road, from the parish church. This is a blind corner both on A. R and Potterton Lane. If this goes ahead the school will not be large enough. Also the medical centre on Elmwood Lane.

The site is not flat as stated in the literature

Although described as 'flat' this field inclines considerably from south to north and from east to west which would make any housing very noticeable and out of keeping with the surrounding area.

This is a greenbelt site with inadequate local infrastructure to support the development postulated. Barwick in Elmet is a rural village and whilst some modest development would be acceptable development on the scale proposed would spoil the historic landscape and views in to the conservation area.

Barwick in Elmet and Scholes Parish Council do not believe SHLAA site 1134 should be designated as an amber site. It is our opinion that site is unsuitable for development as the site is in Greenbelt and the development sets a precedent for further encroachment into greenbelt beyond the curtilage of the proposed site as there is no defensible boundary to the north.

The site would have a disproportionate over massing effect on the existing settlement and neighbouring streets removing its existing "village" character, damaging the sense of community, creating a much more dormitory, modern sub-urban settlement, incongruous to the surrounding buildings and dwellings.

We also note that the inspector of the 2006 UDP refused the proposal to remove this site from the Greenbelt.

There is a currently inadequate highway infrastructure in the village to support the addition of a further 320+ cars, the primary school is near capacity, there is a relatively poor bus service, there are only a few shops, limited medical facilities, and there are no permanent recreational facilities for youths aged 11 to 18 years old.

The site has access issues; in that the Potterton Lane is narrow and inaccessible for large vehicles and indeed is inappropriate for a high number of additional resident vehicles that such a development would create.

The site also borders the existing conservation area in Barwick development would spoil the historic landscape and views of the 1000 year old church and Maypole on the village landscape. It is our view it would damage the aesthetic character of the village.

Finally according to a report by Yorkshire Water the existing sewerage system within the village only has capacity for a further 20+ houses, a development of this size and scale would require significant drainage works to make the site sustainable. Development would exacerbate fluvial flood risks in and around the local watercourses such as Rake Beck and Cock Beck.

The Parish Council would object to any proposed development of the site and recommend that the status of the site be amended to “RED.

fundamentally this site is in Green Belt and is protected under national policy in our view, along with reserved UDP policies. As mentioned above, there are no ‘Exceptional Circumstances’ that warrant the allocation of this Green Belt for housing and we object strongly

Metro

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
3521	8	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The development of the site is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of sprawl. The site would be a significant incursion into the Green Belt to the east of Barwick and could not be considered to round off the settlement.

Outer North East

1139 York Road, Morwick Hall (land adj to), Whinmoor, LS15

Site Details

Easting	437196	Northing	437488	Site area ha	13.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Office

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Greenfield site in agricultural use. Site wraps around an existing rural office development off the A64. Site abuts the East Leeds Extension UDP housing allocation to its west boundary.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

Outer North East

1139 York Road, Morwick Hall (land adj to), Whinmoor, LS15

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Site relates poorly to existing development. The site would adjoin the East Leeds Extension to its west boundary and would represent significant sprawl which is not well contained. The site would also significantly reduce the Green Belt gap between the urban conurbation of Leeds and Scholes.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy not fully met and limited local services. Extra footway needed on Scholes Lane.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Two points of access should be possible on Scholes Lane. Footway would need to be created along this frontage. No access from A64 unless it also involves removal of the existing Morwick Hall access. If Morwick Hall could also be served from Scholes Lane, and the existing A64 access removed, which would be a positive.

4

Local network comments

Extra footway required to Scholes Lane. Signalisation of Scholes Lane / A64

4

Mitigation measures

Extra footway required to Scholes Lane. Signalisation of Scholes Lane / A64

Total score

10

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

no - however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to improved local services and PT. A reduced site boundary, but combined with adjacent but amended sites maybe acceptable.

Contingent on other sites

no - however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to improved local services and PT. A reduced site boundary, but combined with adjacent but amended sites maybe acceptable.

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact

Network Status

No objection

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Knostrop

Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1139 York Road, Morwick Hall (land adj to), Whinmoor, LS15

LCC

Ecology support

Not supported

Not supported (RED). No designated sites but there is valuable parkland habitat south and west of Morwick Hall. Dead wood habitat and hedgerows also valuable.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/1139. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitat are addressed i.e. drain to east of Morwick Hall protected and enhanced using

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There is a minor watercourse within the site and a public foul sewer serving Morwick Hall.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	94.45	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	5.55	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3175.29
Nearest bus stop	2634
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	195.82

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site has no connections with the existing settlement, separated by a strip of Green Belt. Development would only be possible if SHLAA site 1094 was also developed. The two sites combined would result in a significant encroachment into the Green Belt. Highways concerns re access.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives greenfield and biodiversity. Minor negatives greenspace; climate change local needs. Minor positives quality of housing; floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Metro				
Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
1008	16	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site which relates poorly to existing development. The development of the site for residential use would be unacceptable in Green Belt terms as it would adjoin the East Leeds Extension to its west boundary and would represent significant sprawl which is not well contained. The site would also significantly reduce the Green Belt gap between the urban conurbation of Leeds and Scholes.

Outer North East

1153 Keswick Lane (land to north of), Bardsey - site of The Blessed Sacrament Church

Site Details

Easting	436469	Northing	443945	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Places of worship	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Outdoor sport facility	
Agriculture	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Former church site on the northern edge of the built up area of the settlement. The site is bounded by a sports ground to the north and residential dwelling to the south.
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	Yes
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1153 Keswick Lane (land to north of), Bardsey - site of The Blessed Sacrament Church

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The site would constitute a small extension into the Green Belt which is well related to the existing settlement. Greenspace to the north also contains the site and as such sprawl is unlikely to the north.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2buses per hour, 100% primary - very small site

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

site frontage should accommodate visibility onto Keswick Lane

5

Local network comments

spare capacity but cumulative issues

4

Mitigation measures

Yes

Total score

12

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1153 Keswick Lane (land to north of), Bardsey - site of The Blessed Sacrament Church

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.99	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.01	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	9499.91
Nearest bus stop	11962
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	35.36

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site would constitute a small extension into the Green Belt which is well related to the existing settlement. Greenspace to the north also contains the site and as such sprawl is unlikely to the north. The site lies adjacent to two low density dwellings which will help safeguard the open character of the Green Belt and prevent further sprawl.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative landscape. Minor negatives health; greenfield; climate change; local needs. Minor positives quality of housing; floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Anti

I wonder, when it was allocated a green colour, if those who made the decision were aware that, although perhaps suitable for housing for the community, it is not suitable for a gypsy/travellers site as it is in an enclosed quiet residential area next to sports fields.

Pro

Recommendation – reduce the overall capacity of the site to 2-3 dwellings.

LCC Capacity = 10

Barton Willmore Capacity = 2-3

Difference = -7

Metro

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
4012	4	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site would constitute a small extension into the Green Belt which is well related to the existing settlement and would have limited impact on openness..

Outer North East

1154 Church Street (land to east of), Boston Spa LS23

Site Details

Easting	442905	Northing	445429	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Vacant land	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Outdoor amenity and open space	
Education	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	No

Description	Vacant greenfield land situated within the urban area of Boston Spa close to local services. Access is reliant on site 3132 to the south. Mature trees line the east boundary of the site with the green space.
-------------	---

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

1154 Church Street (land to east of), Boston Spa LS23

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy not fully met but some local services. Not clear if there is pedestrian access to High Street?

Rank (1-5)

4

Access comments

No frontage to adopted highway. Needs access via site 3132.

1

Local network comments

Could be cumulative issues on High Street and J45 if other Boston Spa sites are taken forward. Needs access via site 3132

4

Mitigation measures

Possible traffic management works on High Street and works to J45 if all Boston Spa sites are taken forward

Total score

9

Highways site support

yes subject to access

Contingent on other sites

yes

Contingent on other sites

yes

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact

Network Status

No objection

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Thorp Arch

There is no capacity at Thorp Arch for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1154 Church Street (land to east of), Boston Spa LS23

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	
This site lies within the Boston Spa and Thorpe Arch Conservation Area. When originally designated, it is presumed that this open area was considered to make an important contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore, one might assume that its loss and subsequent development would result in harm to that part of the designated area. In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this plot of land makes to the character of the Conservation Area. If this area does make an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, then the plan would need to explain why its loss and subsequent development is considered to be acceptable.	

Natural England	

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site
------------------	---

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

1154 Church Street (land to east of), Boston Spa LS23

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	2.82	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12020.34
Nearest bus stop	13092
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	218.68

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is not within the Green Belt but situated within the heart of the settlement close to main services. However, the site has no direct road access. Access maybe possible through adjacent sites 3132 or 90, although the current approval on site 90 does not provide for this. The site is also situated within a conservation area with some existing trees, so this would need consideration at detailed design stage.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negatives transport network and historic character. Minor positives education; health; culture; quality of housing; floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Metro				
Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
3606	5	Yes		
Yes	Yes			
Anti				
This site lies within the Boston Spa and Thorpe Arch Conservation Area. When originally designated, it is presumed that this open area was considered to make an important contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore, one might assume that its loss and subsequent development would result in harm to that part of the designated area. In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this plot of land makes to the character of				
The road infrastructure is totally inadequate to accommodate increased volume of traffic, in fact roads in this area struggle to cope with present volume of traffic. These roads are DANGEROUS NOW, narrow village roads with on street parking, poor visibility at road junctions and heavy congestion at nearby school. Boston Spa has already a substantial building project underway at Church Fields which will impact on local amenities and facilities. The main street through Boston Spa is busy now, the completion of Church Fields and the proposed development at Newton Kyme will considerably increase the volume of traffic further. At present Clifford and Boston Spa are two separate villages that wish to retain their own identity. By developing this site the two villages will be linked creating one village / town. Boston Spa and Clifford have inadequate public transport so further development will only increase the volume of traffic on narrow village roads. If development is necessary, sites with access to better roads would surely be safer.				
But it looks like there are some infill sites in Boston Spa. These would be better used for amenity such as sports areas or open recreation areas. e 3232 1154				
The existing facilities for primary education, green space, recreational facilities, medical facilities and limited public transport, especially to the east of Bridge Road, are almost at breaking point even before the extant consents for 207 houses are delivered. Further pressure on these				

1154 Church Street (land to east of), Boston Spa LS23

relatively fragile facilities will come from Newton Kyme where 128 houses have planning consent. Whilst this is 'over the border' in Selby District the reality is that the development site is just one mile from Boston Spa centre yet four miles from the nearest Selby District town which is Tadcaster.

During and as part of the Neighbourhood planning process a village wide questionnaire resulted in a response rate of 37% which is a high return for this type of survey. The responses were also checked against the 2011 Census return to ensure that the responses were in line with the population mix. The overwhelming majority of residents would not support development of over 50 homes in total over all sites. Respondents also strongly opposed any significant development on any individual site. Furthermore the consensus view was that new development should be limited to sites within the existing settlement boundary. It would contrary to the aims of the Localism Act 2011 and the NPPF Guidance to ignore the views of the local stakeholders.

Whilst the housing numbers do not justify any additional burden on Boston Spa it is recognised that there will inevitably be demand for some additional development. However that must be carefully controlled to respect the wishes of the residents as expressed above and should not be permitted unless technical evidence is provided to identify sufficient capacity within the existing infrastructure. Where this is not available any shortfall identified must be provided as part of the proposed development. These infrastructure improvements must be directly related to, and in scale with, the proposed development. Other than in very exceptional circumstances where infrastructure gaps are identified and cannot be provided as part of the proposed development then such proposals should be refused permission.

The overall housing requirement for Leeds ONE in the next 15 years is understood although we consider it to be unduly optimistic (or pessimistic depending upon your point of view) and probably impossible to deliver. However in furtherance of meeting that objective we would give support to the development of sites 1055 and 3391. See below for site specific comments

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is situated within the urban area of Boston Spa, close to the local centre and local services. Site is reliant on access via site 3132 to the south. Development could preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Outer North East

1155 Bramham Road and North of Lyndon Road (land to west of), Bramham LS23

Site Details

Easting	442357	Northing	443564	Site area ha	12	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Transport tracks and ways

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Large greenfield site to the north of Bramham which is presently in agricultural use. The built up area of Bramham lies directly to the south of the site with the A1(M) to the west.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1155 Bramham Road and North of Lyndon Road (land to west of), Bramham LS23

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Set to north of Bramham, development would reduce separation between settlements and represent a significant incursion into the Green Belt. High potential for further sprawl to north as development would not be well contained.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Core Strategy not fully met. Some local services. Nearside footways may need to be widened.

3

Access comments

Long frontage onto Clifford Road can accommodate an access. Second access would be desirable given size of development, possible ghost island

4

Local network comments

spare capacity in the local network but some impact likely. Development large relative to existing settlement.

4

Mitigation measures

Possible traffic management measures required and ghost island

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Thorp Arch
-----------------	------------

There is no capacity at Thorp Arch for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1155 Bramham Road and North of Lyndon Road (land to west of), Bramham LS23

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There is a public surface water sewer in the SE corner of the site and a small section of culvert in the North of the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.23	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.03
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	10088.01
Nearest bus stop	8604
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	305.45

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Development of this site would represent a significant encroachment into the Green Belt reducing the gap between Clifford and Bramham. Originally a quarry the site is set above Bramham and development would be highly visible from the village. No Highways issued raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negatives greenspace; pollution. Minor positives

Summary of reps

Anti

history of the site as a quarry used for infill in fairly recent times could make the site unstable.

Travellers are a burden on society. They should NOT be encouraged to live in a manner which is "outside" of society. They have no regard for socially acceptable behaviour. This site is too close to a peaceful village and its school.This use of the land is not at all suitable for Bramham or its neighbouring villages.

Should be reconsidered, if there are technical concerns that could be overcome, if we are short of allocations.

The proximity of any development to the village school could put the safety of children and families at risk.

Metro

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
4884	5	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The development of the site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of sprawl to the north of Bramham and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Outer North East

1156 Bramham Road (land to east of), Clifford

Site Details

Easting	442808	Northing	444115	Site area ha	4	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--	--	--	--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	
-----------------	--

Ecology boundary

--	--	--	--

Education comments

--	--	--	--

Flood Risk

--	--	--	--

Utilities

Gas			

Electric

--	--	--	--

Fire and Rescue

--	--	--	--

Telecoms

--	--	--	--

Other

English Heritage			

Natural England

--	--	--	--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.63	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	10712.40
Nearest bus stop	8148
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	179.16

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1157 Old Mill Lane (land to south of), Clifford LS23

Site Details

Easting	443134	Northing	444092	Site area ha	1.3	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	10760.97
Nearest bus stop	9114
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	272.17

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1158 **Boston Road (land to west of), Clifford LS23**

Site Details

Easting	442816	Northing	444736	Site area ha	1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	11323.09
Nearest bus stop	13710
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	72.31

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro

6.2 The representation provides a summary of key elements of the Leeds Core Strategy, which sets out the framework for the Site Allocations Plan and explains why on this basis the current approach to housing site allocation is considered flawed. It argues why sites in Clifford should be assessed for potential housing land allocation and why SHLAA site 1158 provides a unique opportunity for the sustainable growth of the village.

6.3 The Leeds Core Strategy seeks to provide for the District's housing needs up to 2028 and to maintain the existing distinctive settlement pattern whilst providing for and supporting housing growth (part of the Core Strategy's spatial vision). It acknowledges the distinct role that each settlement plays within the overall make up of Leeds and crucially the opportunities for growth across the District will ensure that residents can stay within their communities as they progress through various stages of life and ensure that every area benefits from the development process (Paragraph 4.1.8 of the Core Strategy).

6.4 Clifford is a village in one of the four settlement types in the settlement hierarchy of the Core Strategy. These settlement types are -- the main urban area, major settlements, smaller settlements and villages/rural and Clifford is a village within the last settlement type.

The focus of the District's growth is to be in the main urban area and major settlements. Nevertheless in order to fulfil the above element of the spatial vision and the Plan's commitment to providing opportunities for growth across the District, housing is quite rightly proposed within the District's smaller settlements and villages. Policy SP7 of the Core Strategy provides an indicative figure of some 700 new dwellings to be provided for in villages like Clifford up to the year 2028, but the Issues and Options Consultation provides no sites for allocation to meet this figure.

6.5 Notwithstanding the Council's own commitment to some limited growth in these villages within the Core Strategy, the current consultation on the Site Allocations Plan has 'sieved out' from assessment all sites within the settlement type of 'villages/rural'. This approach fails therefore to consider all those site options that the Core Strategy housing target seek to plan for and is therefore 'unsound'.

6.6 This representation objects to this 'sieving out' process and requests that, prior to the publication draft of the Site Allocations Plan, the Council rectify this critical failure and also assess those sites within sustainable locations within the 'villages/rural' settlement type.

6.7 Virtually all these locations which involve greenfield land will be within the Green Belt. Nevertheless to achieve the spatial vision and objectives of the Core Strategy and plan for its housing distribution in a consistent manner, it is considered that such assessments must be made.

6.8 Furthermore, this representation notes that there appears to be some uncertainty over what should be the Core Strategy approach to site allocation within the Green Belt. Significant changes to the Publication Draft Plan Policy SP10: Green Belt have been made in the Council's Pre-Submission Changes. These changes will undoubtedly be the subject of discussion at the public examination into the soundness of the Core Strategy. One of these approaches clearly and quite rightly seeks to identify sites within rural settlements in the Green Belt, like Clifford, with potential for new housing. This again points to the necessity to assess site options within rural settlements like Clifford before housing land allocations are made in the Publication Draft Site Allocations Plan is prepared.

6.9 The subject site in Clifford is in sustainable locations within the context of a rural area, with good bus service to nearby villages, to Leeds and Wetherby, and onward to Harrogate and local schools and facilities within walking distance. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports the principle of looking at rural sustainability in terms of groups of settlements rather than individually.

6.10 Although this is a representation on the Site Allocations Plan and cannot in itself influence changes to the Core Strategy, it is argued that Policy SP10's wording that only 'exceptionally' will sites be allocated for housing in the Green Belt is inconsistent with Policy SP7 which positively seeks some limited growth. This is also likely to be the subject of discussion at the public examination.

6.11 SHLAA site 1158, land at Boston Road, Clifford provides a unique opportunity for sustainable growth in the District's rural area compatible with the spatial vision and objectives of the Core Strategy, as well as Policies SP6 and SP7. Against the Council's own Green Belt review methodology the site's development scores very highly in terms of site suitability. Its development for housing would;

- have minimal adverse impact on the Leeds Green Belt leading to no potential for urban sprawl beyond the site.
- be a small scale housing site appropriate to the size and role of the village and appropriate to the scale of housing envisaged for villages in the Leeds Core Strategy.
- provide much needed housing in a popular area in which to live and contribute to a more balanced housing distribution of housing in this part of the city.
- provide new housing within very close walking distance of local facilities and the local bus services giving access to both the nearby village facilities of Boston Spa and Leeds, Wetherby, Harrogate, Tadcaster and Otley.
- have no adverse impact on the landscape character of the wider area and represents a small scale rounding off of the existing built up area;
- have no adverse impact on designated areas of natural or heritage interest
- be designed to a high quality reflecting local distinctiveness as appropriate.

6.12 There are no other greenfield SHLAA site options in or adjacent to the village of Clifford that offer the appropriate scale of growth for the village, and have minimal harm on the Leeds Green Belt.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

Outer North East

1158 Boston Road (land to west of), Clifford LS23

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1161 Parlington Drive (west of), Aberford LS25

Site Details

Easting	442906	Northing	437146	Site area ha	2.7	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--	--	--	--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	
-----------------	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	
-----------------	--

Ecology boundary

--	--	--	--

Education comments

--	--	--	--

Flood Risk

--	--	--	--

Utilities

Gas			

Electric

--	--	--	--

Fire and Rescue

--	--	--	--

Telecoms

--	--	--	--

Other

English Heritage			

Natural England

--	--	--	--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	4183.34
Nearest bus stop	12845
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	247.82

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1162 Parlington Drive (east of), Aberford, LS25

Site Details

Easting	443108	Northing	436911	Site area ha	2.8	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--	--	--	--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	
-----------------	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	
-----------------	--

Ecology boundary

--	--	--	--

Education comments

--	--	--	--

Flood Risk

--	--	--	--

Utilities

Gas			

Electric

--	--	--	--

Fire and Rescue

--	--	--	--

Telecoms

--	--	--	--

Other

English Heritage			

Natural England

--	--	--	--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	4104.87
Nearest bus stop	3147
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	229.62

Agricultural classification	Grade 3a
-----------------------------	----------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Site Details

Easting	443220	Northing	436856	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	88.42	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	4129.72
Nearest bus stop	3147
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	110.07

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

There is concern that adopting such a carte blanche approach may result in some sites being overlooked which could otherwise significantly contribute to a small settlement. At present, the sieving out process appears to be limited to locational and scale factors, thus resulting in no further assessment being carried out of those sites. For example, our client's small sites in Aberford (ref. 1161, 1162 and 1163) and Barwick (ref : 1164) are available for development and indeed site ref : 1163 (Aberford Motors Site) is a brownfield site.

there is risk of a policy vacuum, resulting in those settlements becoming sterilised; meaning that the opportunities presented by available sites in supporting local sustainable measures will be foregone

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1164 Richmondfield Lane (land at) - Long Lane LS15

Site Details

Easting	440531	Northing	436705	Site area ha	7.2	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Poorly defined	Road front	No

Description

Greenfield site to the south-east edge of Barwick which is set over a series of agricultural fields with poorly defined boundaries. Longlane Beck runs across the middle of the site and splits it into two parcels. The site has no direct highway access. Agricultural fields lie to the east and south boundaries of the site with residential properties lying to the north and west.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1164 Richmondfield Lane (land at) - Long Lane LS15

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Relates poorly to settlement, particularly southern section which is separated by a beck and has no access. High potential for sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy not fully met. Some local services. Lack of nearside footways

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Access can be physically accommodated but no frontage with the public highway. Only one point of access for a fairly big development

1

Local network comments

Spare capacity in the local network but some impact likely.

4

Mitigation measures

possible mitigation required on Richmondfield Lane / Ave and Long Lane

Total score

7

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Barwick in Elmet
There is capacity at Barwick in Elmet for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.	

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1164 Richmondfield Lane (land at) - Long Lane LS15

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance Long Lane Beck and adjacent marsh/wet grassland/trees through providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to either side of the beck. Otters and Badgers to consider.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Parts of site may be at risk of flooding from Longlane Beck. There is a combined public sewer running across the NE limb.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3086.29
Nearest bus stop	4956
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	413.27

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is set on the edge of Barwick-in-Elmet and would result in a significant encroachment into the Green Belt, not well related to the existing settlement, having no road access and only one side that adjoins the village. Development could set a precedent for further sprawl into the Green Belt. The centre of the site contains a wooded area and beck which could result in the northern section of the site being disconnected from the south. Highways raise concerns as no road frontage.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield and landscape. Minor negatives health; Biodiversity; climate change, transport access and local needs. Minor positives Quality of housing and floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Anti

Whilst this proposal does not take up any of the present land associated with the cricket ground it would seriously affect the function of the club in as much as this potential development would sit right next door to this much used and loved social site, with all the health and safety issues associated with playing cricket directly next door to a private development of this nature. I fail to see how the cricket club would be able to continue if this development was undertaken. Generally the village has poor amenities and the present cricket club provides an area for children to learn the game and participate in the sport at an early age, whilst at the same time providing an important social function in the local community.

The infrastructure of Barwick simply would not cope with a development of this size and the soul of the village would be removed at a stroke. The influx of the associated use of private vehicles would again put a strain on the present highways and present an intolerable burden on existing village life, as we know it today.

The existing school and pre school locations simply would not cope with a potential increase of children looking for placements and would require substantial increase in size and possible re-siting as the existing land envelope would not be capable of accommodating such an increase in potential usage. Drainage in Barwick is already under heavy strain and this proposal would require substantial work to this area at a significant cost to the present village environment.

Metro

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
3139	7	No		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site relates poorly to the existing settlement. The development of the site for residential development would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of significant spawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The site also has poor access and a beck splits the site into two parcels.

Outer North East

1165 Barwick Road (land north of), Garforth

Site Details

Easting	440606	Northing	434293	Site area ha	9.7	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East, Outer South East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Transport tracks and ways

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	No

Description

Green Belt site set just north of Garforth. The site is part of a wider collection of sites between Garforth and the motorway to the north, which this section borders. Currently in agricultural use the site is flat, consisting of open fields and a small group of trees in the centre. A road abuts the western boundary but the site stops just short of this.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?		No
Would development result in an isolated development?		Yes
Is the site well connected to the built up area?		No
Would development round off the settlement?		Yes
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?		Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No	
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	Yes	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes	
Does the site contain buildings	No	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No	
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1165 Barwick Road (land north of), Garforth

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Relates poorly to settlement in isolation. The site could be considered to round off the settlement if developed with the other cluster of sites to the north of Garforth. Well contained by the motorway to the north reducing potential for further sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+ yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Fails Public Transport requirements and has a poor footway connection into Garforth Town Centre

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

No frontage onto highway, requires other site for access

2

Local network comments

Route into Garforth constrained by narrow railway bridge, capacity/congestion issues on wider network

3

Mitigation measures

The cumulative impact on capacity of local network with other large nearby sites needs to be considered, local physical constraints would also need to be addressed

Total score

8

Highways site support

No

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status no objection

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Owlwood/Garforth

There is capacity at Garforth for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1165 Barwick Road (land north of), Garforth

LCC

Ecology support

Not supported

Not supported (RED). Parts of the site recently assessed against Local Wildlife Site (Site of Ecological and Geological Importance, SEGI) criteria and sufficient to be designated, based on importance for Great Crested Newts.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas (Local Wildlife Site) are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/1165. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on Great Crested Newts are addressed. Parts of site have been designated as Local Wildlife Site in 2012.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Watercourse located to the North of the site and large area of land is shown to be highly susceptible to surface water flooding, adjacent to where the watercourse runs under the M1 in culvert, towards Cock Beck.

Utilities

Gas

Northern Gas Networks owns and operates a high pressure pipeline which crosses this site. The pipeline will be protected by means of a legal easement. The Institution of Gas Engineers and Managers document TD1 Edition 5 recommends a minimum building proximity distance of 27.39m to normally occupied properties.

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Within the Outer South East area there are eight nationally protected SSSIs, including significant wetland habitats adjacent to the River Aire. The effects of housing and employment allocations within this area should be assessed to determine their ecological impacts upon them. Recreational disturbance, loss of functional land (used by SSSI birds) and potential hydrological effects should be examined.

Planning History			
Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

1165 Barwick Road (land north of), Garforth

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	673.37
Nearest bus stop	4418
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	430.07

Agricultural classification	Grade 3b
-----------------------------	----------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The proposed HS2 rail route runs through the middle of the site, which would significantly reduce development potential for housing. The site is well contained by the motorway to the north consequently there is little potential for further sprawl into the Green Belt. Highways concerns re access - no site frontage and route to Garforth constrained by narrow railway bridge. These considerations will need to be taken into account in any detailed design and capacity may need to be reduced accordingly once more details of the proposed rail line are known.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives Greenfield and biodiversity. Minor negatives greenspace; climate change; transport access; local needs and pollution. Minor positives Quality of housing and floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Anti

Site ref. 1232 1. Site is sufficient to accommodate the required number of houses, with land remaining, which could be utilized for other purposes (see below);2. Road access to the site would be by Ridge Road, giving direct access to main road transport links, without the necessity of traffic moving through Garforth.3. Development conditions could include provision of healthcare and retail facilities, which would serve both the development and provide much-needed additional facilities for the nearby Micklefield.4. Development conditions, too, could include allocation of space to create a green corridor between it and Garforth, thus minimising impact on natural habitat and wildlife, and to provide much-needed recreational space, e.g. parkland, nature trails, woodland and sports areas.5. New sewage and drainage infrastructure would be incorporated in planning conditions, and would thus have no impact on existing facilities.

The boundary between the Outer North East and Outer South East areas to the north of Garforth is not considered to represent a characteristic or definitive boundary between the two areas. For example, in relation to our client's land at site 1165, the boundary appears to follow an arbitrary course following no apparent physical features. It is surmised that this boundary is an historic one and merely follows the established ward boundaries rather than defining two areas of different characteristics. As was highlighted in our response to the Community Infrastructure Levy consultation, it is suggested that the M1 and A1 might be more appropriate features to define the boundary between Outer North and Outer South East areas. It is highlighted that a large area of land located to the south of the M1 was proposed for exclusion from the Aberford and District Neighbourhood Area in the Council's recent consultation on Neighbourhood Area Designations. The reason behind this exclusion was because the land bares more relationship with Garforth than Aberford. This is a sensible and logical approach which is recommended should be followed for the Site Allocations Plan.

is noted that the Site Assessment for site 1165 make assumptions on the basis that the site is suitable in conjunction with other surrounding land. We strongly consider that site 1165 does not represent the best opportunity to meet development needs in a way which would be least damaging to the purposes of the Green Belt. The site is isolated from the settlement. The topography of the land to the south of the motorway results in open

all these areas would over populate the area with too many people

GY There are numerous pre-19th century mine workings here. These will have to be excavated, filled and compacte

There is a perceived blight on any development in the north of these sites due to HS2. Who will risk biulding, never mind buying, houses here?

The effective breach of the natural boundary of the village of Garforth provided by both Wakefield Road and Selby Road;Pushing further away from residents of Garforth, who are already ill-served for recreational space within the village, the green spaces surrounding it

Why cannot these houses be built on makins Farmland so traffic could use the A656 Ridge Road giving direct access to the motorway. New amenities i.e. drainage etc, Could be installed to eliminate flood impact on Garforth. This would also have an impact on an under privilege Macklefield and an over populated Garforth.

We have seen many changes and it has grown considerably and facilities are now fully in use, with already a huge increase in traffic. Your proposals are a step too far and will totally change this area

Have lived here 55 years and very little has changed regarding sport facilities.

The geology of the land I am led to believe is shifting so not suitable

There have been cases of subsidence (new housing off Selby Road/Ninelands Lane, new housing development near water tower).

Garforth has a natural boarder with large amounts of birds and other wildlife which older residents and school children appreciate and benefit from. Obviously if a new development were to go ahead al this would disappear.

There is also the problem if the HS2 passing through site 1165.

Why build more houses when the housing market in Garforth are not selling anyway.

We seem to have been the dumping ground for extended building including the industrial site at East Garforth plus the re-routing of the M1 which skirts three sides of Garforth. One of the original routes was between Scholes and Barwick which was the logical route to avoid traffic

through Cross gates. Now to rectify this bad error another bypass is to be built (crossing Swillington Common) to ease the Crossgates congestion.

What Garforth really needs is a natural parkland and the agricultural land bordering the Wakefield Road is ideal, currently we only have playing field areas – no specific park, and we were amazed when part of Gletelands was taken to extend the burial site.

NO council in this country seems to consider the complete environment, which is needed to improve a quality of life. Roofs over heads, needs to be developed in conjunction with social infrastructures', i.e. NOT just retail, we have a Main Street with empty shops dying, at least help rebuild the Main Street shopping experience , NOT ignore it !Communities require, places to visit, space to walk, space for activities and play, community centres, health centres, swimming / fun pools, halls/community centres to allow creative involvement, running, athletics, sports complexes to permit interaction at a social level, with these elements it creates neighbourly attitudes and ultimately a secure environment for all to live in. The local authority have a responsibility to provide these element, if not directly financed at least dealt with by the URBAN DEVELOPEMENT PLAN [which we live in hope will not be butchered by CENTRAL GOVERMENT and the Dept of the ENVIRONMENT on behalf of their friends in the city].

Since the 60s Garforth's population alone has increased by almost 80% without community facilities or Green open space been provided or proposed. We can only assume due to its supposed 'socio' economic groups B, C and now D mix in the minds of Leeds City Councillors, as the mantra is 'concentrate on the "Inner City problems rt". The inner city problems have been caused, again by infill mass house building without consideration to the life style of the resident's social, welfare, medical and other facilities.

Infill house building adds to existing problems, prevents the community bonding, no facilities leads to frustration, problems accessing transport links ,creates youth boredom and compounds already unsocial activities and further increases the problems with inadequate services such as drains flooding, public transport etc. and telecomm infrastructures'.

The proposed building of a retail unit will bring in further traffic from outlying areas adding to the existing congestion problems and would be of no benefit to Garforth at all in fact would prnhahly have the Opposite Affect and finish off Main St as A viable shopping centre. Main St has struggled at times, but currently there is a good selection of smaller shops, dentists, Doctors, opticians, plus the larger Factory Shop, Co Op and Pease's all of these providing a variety of services. The Councils recent investment in improved pavements & its plans for Main St shows a commitment to the traders. These traders already have to compete with Tesco's locally & Sainsbury's at nearby Colton, so to introduce a further supermarket would be the killer blow and all this investment would have been wasted, Garforth would end up with boarded up shops.

With all the Government assistance available now to buy new houses plus the incentives from the builders themselves there will be a knock on effect on the older houses that make up the majority of the housing in Garforth making it more difficult for them to sell.

Having grown up in Garforth and now living in Adel, I have always been within walking distance of open fields. Sadly however, looking at the proposed plans, I fear that this is all about to change. Whilst I appreciate that there is a need for new housing, I am disappointed that the solution appears to be for Leeds to grow outwards. Could we not perhaps think more imaginatively and radically about ways in which to redesign the urban centres to make them more amenable for family living. so, the trend for increasing numbers of students at the two Universities to live in purpose built residential blocks closer to the city centre, presumably means that more properties could become available in areas like Headingley. This would surely be the perfect opportunity to make Headingley more family-friendly and encourage the migration of families into this area.

Garforth as an area is already very full, with regular congestion on Aberford road. The trains are over congested on morning and evening rush hour. The schools are significantly oversubscribed and cannot cater for further children moving to / growing up in the area.

Garforth has a distinct identity, built on its geographical identity and its particular public services - the academy, the medical centre, the NPT and so forth. In turn this means Garforth has a thriving shopping centre.

These proposed developments threaten both of these characteristics as they break one of the natural boundaries of Garforth and through their size threaten the viability of the existing public services.

They would also put a significant stress on transport infrastructure. Wakefield Road/ Selby Road are already congested at peak times, and the Garforth Rail services are over crowded with inadequate parking at the railway station.

Therefore I would suggest that the land ref site 1232 will accommodate things in a better way.

1. Access can be from Ridge Road giving access to A63. A642 and A1/M1 link road without going through the heart of our village causing chaos.
2. No flooding impact as new infrastructure would need to be developed.
3. Space to accommodate green areas within development
4. Extra provision od dentists, doctors etc could also be provided in this area.

Garforth is in the Outer South East HMA and other urban extensions to Garforth are listed within that HMA. This site relates purely to Garforth, given the location of the M1 motorway, which acts as a barrier to the north of the site and the majority of this site is located in the Outer South East HMA. This site should therefore be listed in the Outer South East HMA.

1165 Barwick Road (land north of), Garforth

- the development of the sites on Wakefield Road and Selby Road would also breach the existing boundary of the village, which surely is leading to urban sprawl which seems to be the only reason given for some locations being coded as red/unsuitable for allocation of housing (eg 3106). Why does such a reason exclude housing development, when it clearly applies to another and yet this is coded green/greatest potential to be allocated for housing – there seems to be very different rules at play for various sites

Metro

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site) Primary Health	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to
735 Yes	7 Yes	Yes		

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site in isolation would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The site also lies within the proposed HS2 route which would have a significant impact on its deliverability. Major site 1232B to east of Garforth chosen on balance as a better site for development than the combined sites to the east/north of Garforth.

Outer North East

1167 Chapel Lane (land to the east of), Clifford LS23

Site Details

Easting	443018	Northing	444511	Site area ha	1.6	SP7	Other Rural Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Agriculture

Cemetery

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	No

Description

Linear greenfield site to the east edge of Clifford.. Agricultural land lies to the east and north. Residential dwellings are present to the west of the site with a cemetery to the south. A narrow access off Chapel Lane exists

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

1167 Chapel Lane (land to the east of), Clifford LS23

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=≤5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	
--------	--	----------------	--

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	
-----------------	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support	
-----------------	--

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Outer North East

1167 Chapel Lane (land to the east of), Clifford LS23

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	
N32 Greenbelt	6.01
N34 PAS	81.82
RL1 Rural Land	0.00
N1 Greenspace	1.20
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area	0.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	11144.27
Nearest bus stop	3796
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	96.23
Agricultural classification	Grade 2
Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Safeguarded land (PAS)

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site allocated as PAS in the UDP and not situated within land defined as the Green Belt. Clifford is a smaller settlement within the CS settlement hierarchy and release of this site would not fit with CS priorities, there are local preferences for alternative sites/strategic options and therefore site should be retained as PAS.

Outer North East

1182 Woodlands Farm (land at), Syke Lane, Scarcroft LS14

Site Details

Easting	436072	Northing	441769	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	91.98	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	12.11
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	7325.67
Nearest bus stop	3778
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	364.44

Agricultural classification	Grade 4
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1226 Nanny Goat Lane (land north of) and adjacent to M1, Garforth LS25

Site Details

Easting	440024	Northing	434005	Site area ha	17.4	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East, Outer South East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Transport tracks and ways

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Roughly triangular in shape the site has a current agricultural use consisting of open fields. The site is flat and bordered to the north and west by roads, though the motorway to the north is inaccessible. To the south are sporadic dwellings and beyond this the railway line.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	Yes
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1226 Nanny Goat Lane (land north of) and adjacent to M1, Garforth LS25

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

In isolation the site relates poorly to settlement. If the site was developed as part of a cluster of sites to the north of Garforth it may constitute rounding off of the settlement. Site is well contained by roads and a railway line reducing potential for further sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Poor footway connection into Garforth Town Centre with little scope for mitigation due to restriction under nearby railway bridge

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

The level of development would require multiple accesses to be provided, position of new junctions would need to be considered in conjunction with access requirement for sites on opposite side of Barwick Road

4

Local network comments

Route into Garforth constrained by narrow railway bridge, significant cumulative capacity/congestion issues on wider network

2

Mitigation measures

Unclear whether the physical constraints on Barwick Road can be mitigated. Significant cumulative impact on capacity of local network with other large nearby sites

Total score

9

Highways site support

No

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact Major Impact

Network Status

Likely to require significant physical mitigation

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.

Network Rail

Level crossing; asset protection issues. Contribution to Garforth station facilities Nanny Goat Lane in part Network Rail ownership

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Owlwood/Garforth

There is capacity at Garforth for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1226 Nanny Goat Lane (land north of) and adjacent to M1, Garforth LS25

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildlife corridor function alongside the south side of the motorway through native shrub planting and a network of wildlife ponds to benefit the locally important population of Great Crested Newts.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

3112+1100+1044+2156+2032+2091+3111(east area) + 1226 (outer NE area) = 2349 houses generates 587 primary and 235 secondary children. New 2FE primary school required, plus potentially land for expansion of existing schools.

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. However parts of site may be at risk of flooding from a number of minor watercourses / drains within the site.

Utilities

Gas

In the road on the east side of the site there is a high pressure pipeline owned by Northern Gas Networks. The Institution of Gas Engineers document TD1 Edition 5 recommends a minimum building proximity to normally occupied properties of 27.39m to this pipeline. As the pipeline is in public highway there will be no easement. In addition to the high pressure pipeline Northern Gas Networks operates a medium pressure main which runs in the verge of the same road. If the site access is to be taken from this road there is the possibility that this main be need lowering to accommodate the new road construction.

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Within the Outer South East area there are eight nationally protected SSSIs, including significant wetland habitats adjacent to the River Aire. The effects of housing and employment allocations within this area should be assessed to determine their ecological impacts upon them. Recreational disturbance, loss of functional land (used by SSSI birds) and potential hydrological effects should be examined.

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

1226 Nanny Goat Lane (land north of) and adjacent to M1, Garforth LS25

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	737.41
Nearest bus stop	4418
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	326.07
Agricultural classification	Grade 3b
Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The proposed HS2 rail route affects the northern part of the site. The site is well contained by the motorway to the north so little potential for further sprawl into the Green Belt. Flat site with road frontage. Highways concerns re access - route to Garforth constrained by narrow railway bridge. These considerations will need to be taken into account in any detailed design and capacity may need to be reduced accordingly once more details of the proposed rail line are known.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negatives biodiversity and pollution. Minor positives culture; quality of housing and floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Metro

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
573	4	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

Pro

It should be noted that whilst parts of the site (notably site reference 1226) are located within the neighbouring Outer North East Housing Market Area, such classifications are based of ward boundaries rather than the operation of housing market areas in practice or closely defined functional boundaries such as major highways as in this case. In reality, the M1 forms a natural barrier between the Outer South East and the Outer North East Housing Market Areas and it is considered that the entirety of the Barwick Road site (including site reference 1226) would contribute to the provision of housing within the Outer South East.

Anti

Site bounded by the motorway and to the south by a railway lin. A farm track (Nanny Goat Lane) runs adja cent to the south side of the site accessing whitehouse farm. Greenfield agricultural land and if allowed to be used for housing it will be lost forever. There is already enough brownfield lane within LeedsUDP area to use before greenfield sites and enough housing which only needs to be refurbished.

Garforth is bursting at the seams and its existing infrastructure as well as schools, GPs surgeries, dentists, policing and other public services (including drainage and the flooding risk) could not possibly absorb a large increase in population.

I believe that the corridor that will accommodate HS2 is unsuitable and that houses should not be built within 1 kilometre of the track. All the land identified above could be used for greenspace or industry but is not appropriate for housing

Garforth as an area is already very full, with regular congestion on Aberford road. The trains are over congested on morning and evening rush hour. The schools are significantly oversubscribed and cannot cater for further children moving to / growing up in the area.

Garforth has a distinct identity, built on its geographical identity and its particular public services - the academy, the medical centre, the NPT and so forth. In turn this means Garforth has a thriving shopping centre.

These proposed developments threaten both of these characteristics as they break one of the natural boundaries of Garforth and through their size threaten the viability of the existing public services.

They would also put a significant stress on transport infrastructure. Wakefield Road/ Selby Road are already congested at peak times, and the Garforth Rail services are over crowded with inadequate parking at the railway station.

Garforth is in the Outer South East HMA and other urban extensions to Garforth are listed within that HMA. This site relates purely to Garforth, given the location of the M1 motorway, which acts as a barrier to the north of the site and the majority of this site is located in the Outer South East HMA. This site should therefore be listed in the Outer South East HMA.

1226 Nanny Goat Lane (land north of) and adjacent to M1, Garforth LS25

these is already insufficient parks and sports facilities

A development of a new settlement on the land off Ridge Road (which is known as Makins farmland) and close to the Peckfield rounabout (site ref:1232) would allow a green belt corridor between Garforth and the new development.

What Garforth really needs is a natural parkland and the agricultural land bordering the Wakefield Road is ideal, currently we only have playing field areas – no specific park, and we were amazed when part of Gletelands was taken to extend the burial site.

Why was this only put through odd letterboxes and so very late?

Some areas it is not known what lies underneath, where old coalmine workings are, swampy ground.

1232 makins farm land seems much more suitable for several reasons.Accessability from m1 etc rather than through garforth.Drainage.Flooding is an issue in some areas of garforth already additional housing will worsen this.Local services.School,doctors and the police will face greater demands.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site in isolation would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The site also lies within the proposed HS2 route which would have a significant impact on its deliverability.Highways access concerns due to narrow bridge into Garforth. Major site 1232B to east of Garforth chosen on balance as a better site for development than the combined sites to the east/north of Garforth.

Outer North East

1233 York Road (land at)- Sandbeck Lane, Wetherby, LS22

Site Details

Easting	441669	Northing	449354	Site area ha	39.9	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture
Unmanaged Forest

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture
Residential institution
Outdoor sport facility

Other land uses - None

Topography	Undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Large greenfield site in agricultural use situated to the east of the A1(M) which splits the site from Wetherby. The site is situated within an area of rural land. The HMP College of Secure Learning and Wetherby Racecourse lie to the south of the site. The north boundary of the site adjoins the neighbouring Harrogate BC adminastrative area.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

1233 York Road (land at)- Sandbeck Lane, Wetherby, LS22

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

The site fails all the accessibility criteria but the size of this and the adjacent site give some potential for new Public Transport and local services. Severance issues to Wetherby cannot be resolved though.

Rank (1-5)

1

Access comments

Access points possible with Ghost Islands or signals

4

Local network comments

A site of this size will have implication in Wetherby town centre and the junction of York Road and Deighton Road.

3

Mitigation measures

Works at site 1233 frontage. Requirements in Wetherby difficult to determine

Total score

8

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact Major Impact

Network Status

Likely to require significant physical mitigation

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Wetherby

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ2 & FZ3 runs through middle of site & southern corner. See comments in main text of our response

Outer North East

1233 York Road (land at)- Sandbeck Lane, Wetherby, LS22

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	
2158+1233+3125+4074 = 1318 houses generates 329.5 primary and 132 secondary children. New 1.5FE primary school or 2FE to include site 1046.	

Flood Risk	
Predominantly Flood Zone 1. Parts of site in Flood Zones 2 and 3 adjacent to Sand Beck.	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	
Housing site 1046 is within 750m of Kirk Deighton SAC/SSSI. Sites 2158, 3125, 1233, 4074, 4075 and 4076 within 2km to this site, which is an internationally important site for Great Crested Newts. If these allocations are retained/promoted, the supporting HRA should assess the likely significant effects upon this species. The SA should examine potential significant effects upon the interest features of the SSSI (see citation below) www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation_phtot/200441.pdf	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	100.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		

☐

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00
-------------------	------

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	15766.01
Nearest bus stop	4879
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	405.69

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is not within the Green Belt, however it is open countryside which is currently safeguarded by rural land policy (RL1) within the UDP. Surrounding major roads would prevent unrestricted further sprawl. The site is also situated in close proximity to the Young Offenders Institution and Racecourse buildings which are already significant intrusions within the open countryside and reduce the site's potential impact. The site is quite isolated from the main urban area of Wetherby with only two access roads across the A1(M) which creates a significant barrier to the existing settlement of Wetherby. As such the site has high potential to create a car dominated development unless the site incorporates a range of services given that new pedestrian links will be difficult to achieve due to the A1(M). Potential noise issues due to the site's close proximity to the motorway. Any development should protect Cockshot Wood and an attractive avenue of trees which are present across the site. This site should be considered as a cluster of sites with 2158 and 3125.

Site affects others?

The development of the site alongside the adjacent sites (2158 & 3125) is preferential to create a more logical settlement extension

Sustainability summary

Major negatives greenspace; greenfield; climate change; floodrisk and local needs. Minor negatives transport access and pollution. Minor positives quality of housing.

Summary of reps

Metro

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
1784	4	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

we strongly question the deliverability of the 7 sites detailed and recommend the council either reclassify them or reassess their capacity. [see representation for full table]
LCC capacity sites 2158, 1233, 3125, 1291, 2067, 4079 = 1,575.
Barton Willmore capacity = 0 (Difference = -1,471)

The site has a strong likelihood of early delivery given that Taylor Wimpey have secured a formal legal agreement with the majority landowner as shown in the promotional document attached to this response. The site boundary in the Allocations Document extends beyond Taylor Wimpey's control. The site is available, achievable and developable in the short term (0-5 years). There would be a number of significant social, economic and environmental benefits to the local community and the wider Leeds district as a result of developing this site, these include:

- Delivery of new family housing including open market homes and affordable housing
- Direct and indirect construction jobs
- 106 monies in transport, education, public open space
- Increased expenditure in the local economy
- New Homes Bonus
- Provision of new public open space

The Outer North East housing market area has a housing requirement of 5,000 new dwellings over the plan period. This is a significant proportion and cannot be delivered just by the sites which are currently allocated or have planning permission, or those which are currently rated as Green in the Site Allocations Plan. A number of sites currently rated as Amber will therefore need to be allocated, to make up the housing requirement. We consider the site to be the most sustainable, non Green Belt release, urban extension in this housing market area. In the Outer North East housing market area there are 1,034 dwellings which have outstanding planning permission or are existing housing allocations, and 2,323 sites rated as Green. Of these sites rated as Green, 1,700 dwellings are coming from the redevelopment of the Thorpe Arch trading estate. Whilst we do not object to this redevelopment, it is important that Leeds City Council do not rely on this site to make up the housing numbers for this housing market areas, as a number of other options will be necessary. The Thorpe Arch scheme is unlikely to deliver greater than 100 units a year (based on 3 builders developing the site at a given time). Given that this would necessitate the comprehensive development of the Thorpe Arch estate, 1,700 dwellings may not all be delivered within the plan period, therefore other sites need to be considered and indeed will

1233 York Road (land at)- Sandbeck Lane, Wetherby, LS22

need to come forward in the short and medium term.

This site can and should be allocated for residential development, it is a sustainable site, capable of delivering circa 800 dwellings and contributing to the growth of the major settlement of Wetherby within the Outer North East Housing Market Characteristic Area. The site is clearly available for commencement of residential development now and achievable within 5 years given Taylor Wimpey's interest in developing the site.

It is not well connected to the settlement and connectivity cannot be improved given the physical barrier that is the A1/A168 road corridors;

There is an inconsistency with the summary reasons for colour coding of many of the sites. Sites Ref 1233 and 2158 have been colour coded amber for the reason 'the site is quite isolated from the main urban area of Wetherby with only two access roads'. Site Ref 1055 has access to only one road (Walton to Wighill road) which is the only road in the area with speed cameras because of the volume of accidents. The site is isolated even further from the main urban area of Wetherby and access to local shops in Boston Spa is via a single track bridge which has regular tailbacks of traffic in peak travelling times.

1233, 3125 and 2158These could be potential sites for development. However, given their relative size, if all three sites were developed, this would represent a significant increase in the size of the community in and around Wetherby and would likely have a significant impact on the environment/local services/transport network which would need to be addressed (or the proposed site reduced)

For example site 1233 & 3125 refer to poor access to Wetherby. It refers the single road bridge and the A1 as a barrier, whilst this is conveniently forgotten in the assessment for the TAE site 1055, which is sited 2 or so miles down the same road, which is considered so dangerous that it has 3 speed cameras on it. Why is this not mentioned in the assessment?

Pro

could be developed however if these go ahead the plan for an Asda store closer to these areas should be reconsidered.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is not within the Green Belt, however it is open countryside which is currently safeguarded by rural land policy (RL1) within the UDP. The site is isolated from the main urban area of Wetherby with limited access across the A1(M) which creates a significant barrier to the existing settlement of Wetherby. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

1239 Dowkell Lane (land south of), Thorp Arch LS22

Site Details

Easting	443701	Northing	446153	Site area ha	5.7	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	100.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12897.62
Nearest bus stop	10505
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	366.41

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1240 Church Causeway (land north of), Thorp Arch

Site Details

Easting	443528	Northing	446096	Site area ha	4.9	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency			
Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail			

Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works			

Environment Agency			
Constraints			

LCC			
Ecology support			

Ecology boundary			

Education comments			

Flood Risk			

Utilities			
Gas			

Electric			

Fire and Rescue			

Telecoms			

Other			
English Heritage			

Natural England			

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	99.97	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12801.53
Nearest bus stop	5069
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	218.08

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Mostly agreement that site should be sieved out, though some concede that it could be suitable for older people

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Site Details

Easting	443849	Northing	446815	Site area ha	8.9	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Outdoor sport facility

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses

Residential - residential institution

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

1241 Walton Road (land at), Thorp Arch LS22

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=≤5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Very limited site coverage for Core Strategy not fully met but some local services	2

Access comments	
Adequate frontages with adopted highway but mitigation likely	4

Local network comments	
The scale of development needs a comprehensive TA to assess the impacts. Issues exist towards Thorp Arch and Boston Spa and potentially on Walton Wetherby Road	2

Mitigation measures	Total score
Signals etc. TA is required to assess the impacts. Combining with site 1055 might help to fund public transport and highway mitigation.	8

Highways site support
?

Contingent on other sites
possible benefits if combined with site 1055.

Contingent on other sites
possible benefits if combined with site 1055.

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

LCC

Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildlife corridor provided by the adjacent disused railway (LNA). Badgers to consider.	

Outer North East

1241 Walton Road (land at), Thorp Arch LS22

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	100.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	13574.99
Nearest bus stop	5954
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	145.95

Agricultural classification	Grade 3a
-----------------------------	----------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site is 'Rural Land'

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Agreement that the site ought to be sieved out...landowner of opinion that the site is suitable for dev't

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1251 Leeds Road, Collingham LS22

Site Details

Easting	437852	Northing	445449	Site area ha	4.5	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	No

Description

Greenfield site in current agricultural use. Site lies to the south-west corner of Collingham. The site is adjacent to a UDP PAS site to the east and residential development to the north. Collingham Beck and a mature tree line are present to the south of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1251 Leeds Road, Collingham LS22

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

By itself development of the site would constitute isolated development unrelated to the existing settlement pattern. If the site was coupled with the adjacent site it could constitute rounding off of the settlement

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

40% primary & primary health

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Requires development of adjacent site for access

3

Local network comments

Spare capacity but cumulative issues

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

9

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Wetherby

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

Part of site is in functional flood plan (FZ3b), FZ3 and FZ2. Collingham Beck runs along the south of the site. See comments in main text of our response

Outer North East

1251 Leeds Road, Collingham LS22

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to retain a wildlife corridor alongside Collingham Beck and trees - minimum 20 metres from bank of the beck. Otters, White-clawed Crayfish and bats to consider.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Predominantly Flood Zone 1. Parts of site in Flood Zones 2 and 3 adjacent to Collingham Beck.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/00315/OT	Outline application for residential development up to 150 dwellings including means of access	R	58

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.56	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	11113.38
Nearest bus stop	12843
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	257.72

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. By itself development of the site would constitute isolated development unrelated to the existing settlement pattern. Development of the site would be contingent on the prior development of site 2135 for access. The southern part of the site is also within flood zone 3a (high risk), 3b (washland) and 2 (medium risk).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives greenspace; greenfield; floodrisk and landscaping. Minor negatives biodiversity, climate change and local needs. Minor positive quality of housing.

Summary of reps

METRO

R 4.47 3614 5 Yes Yes Yes

'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Anti

Traffic issue - Harewood Avenue, A58, since the wattle Syke/A1 link Collingham is frequently used as an alternative A1, there should be no development in Collingham full stop according to a survey of 180 people but no reason given why, field is known for slow worms, this development will enable site 1293 to be developed as well.

Pro

Site has only been colour coded red due to location to councillors homes while Wetherby has similar sites which have been given green, PAS sites like this should be developed before any green belt [site is not PAS - adjoining site is] this development will improve drainage issues and a general criticism of the councils housing figures/red classifications which are too low which this site could resolve.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. In isolation the site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt as it would form an isolated development and not round off the settlement. The southern part of the site is also within an area of high flood risk and the site requires the adjacent site to the east for access. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

1252 Northgate Lane, Linton LS22

Site Details

Easting	438597	Northing	447195	Site area ha	2.3	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.97	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	12956.38
Nearest bus stop	14309
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	606.50

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO

No comments as sieved out

Pro

Liar residential development that has taken place along Wetherby Road establishes a clear relationship between the settlement of Linton and the main urban area of Wetherby.

Whilst the site was eventually included within the greenbelt the UDP Inspector did conclude that the western boundary could be capable of acting as a satisfactory long term boundary to the greenbelt.

ite and its allocation could, in association with development of The Ridge to the east of Northgate Lane, deliver highway and access improvements if required at Northgate Lane and Tib Garth and provide a new village green setting and open space provision in this location to the benefit of the settlement together with a mix of house types including an element of affordable housing provision.

Anti

No comments

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1262 Roundhay Park Lane, Sandy Lodge (site of) LS17 8AS

Site Details

Easting	432897	Northing	439918	Site area ha	1	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Alwoodley	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mixed
-----------	-------

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Dwellings

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

The site contains an existing dwelling within a large plot. A cluster of listed buildings lie to the west of the site. The site is situated within an urban green corridor and a significant tree belt exists to the south and east boundaries of the site. Open fields lie to the south of the site with residential dwelling to the north, east and wet boundaries.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Yes
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	Yes
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	Yes
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

Outer North East

1262 Roundhay Park Lane, Sandy Lodge (site of) LS17 8AS

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The site is well connected to the urban area and would round off the settlement. Potential impact on the historic character of the area given the presence of a cluster of listed buildings adjacent to the site, however likely this could be mitigated.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

3 buses per hour, 50% primary education

3

Access comments

Limited frontages with highway

5

Local network comments

Spare capacity

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

12

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knothrop

Knothrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1262 Roundhay Park Lane, Sandy Lodge (site of) LS17 8AS

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There are public sewers within parts of the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	98.42	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	98.42	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	1.58	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	7.12
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6434.66
Nearest bus stop	2109
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	143.84

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site is within the urban area. Adjacent to a listed building. A mature tree belt covers part of the site.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negatives greenspace; climate change and local needs. Major positive floodrisk. Minor positives quality of housing and greenfield.

Summary of reps

METRO

Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

A 0.99 1237 6 Yes Yes Yes

ANTI

none

PRO

Infill site

NEUTRAL

This site is in ONE HMCA which is incorrect it should be in NORTH?

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Site is well related to the settlement and would round off the settlement. However, the site lies adjacent to a cluster of listed buildings and is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

1271 Rakehill Road (land off), Scholes, LS15

Site Details

Easting	438288	Northing	437439	Site area ha	112.3	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

A very large greenfield site currently in agricultural use. The site can be split into 3 main parcels of land, two to the east and one to the west of Scholes. The east parcels lie adjacent to the existing PAS site at Scholes and are split by Rakehill Road. The site to the west of Scholes adjoins existing residential properties to the east and a cluster of light industrial/storage uses to the north.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	Yes
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1271 Rakehill Road (land off), Scholes, LS15

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Large site out of scale with settlement. Relates poorly to the settlement, particularly the eastern section which would reduce the separation of Scholes and Barwick.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

A large site that has very limited coverage of Public Transport and local services

Rank (1-5)

1

Access comments

Site has long frontages with adopted highway however numerous access points would be required for a site of this size. Access to large parts of the site does not appear possible. Integrating the site with Scholes is likely to be dependant on site 2134 via Rakehill Road.

2

Local network comments

The local network is unlikely to be adequate.

1

Mitigation measures

Mitigation would be required but not achievable. The size of the site and linkage with other allocations offers the potential for new PT and other local services

Total score

4

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

no - however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to improved local services and PT. A reduced site boundary, but combined with adjacent but amended sites maybe acceptable.

Contingent on other sites

no - however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to improved local services and PT. A reduced site boundary, but combined with adjacent but amended sites maybe acceptable.

Highways Agency

Impact	Major impact	Network Status	Likely to require significant physical mitigation
--------	--------------	----------------	---

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1271 Rakehill Road (land off), Scholes, LS15

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to retain a wildlife corridor alongside Rake Beck - minimum 20 metres from each bank of the beck. Bats to consider.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There is a risk of flooding from Rake beck and another of other minor watercourses within the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.74	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.03	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	1.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3601.48
Nearest bus stop	5663
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	737.58

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is of significant scale wrapping around the northern part of the settlement. The north western part is set beyond a disused railway line which currently acts as a strong defensible Green Belt boundary for Scholes. Development beyond this point would contribute to reducing the Green Belt gap between Scholes and the main urban area. To the east of Scholes the remaining section of the site is separated from Scholes by SHLAA site 2134, a PAS (protected area of search) site. Development of this part of the site would significantly reduce the Green Belt gap between Scholes and Barwick-in-Elmet. Highway concerns re accessibility, access and local road network impact.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives community cohesion; greenfield; climate change; transport access and local needs. Minor negatives greenspace; biodiversity; built environment and historic environment. Minor positives quality of housing; floodrisk.

Summary of reps

METRO

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

R 112.30 1734 8 Yes Yes Yes

PRO

None

ANTI

Wrong type of housing will be built, traffic concerns - The current road access at the north end of the village onto the A64 York road causes problems during pk times, At the south end of the village going towards Leeds (via Leeds road and then Barwick road) the situation at the roundabout at St Theresa's is also bad.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Large Green Belt site which is out of scale with the existing settlement. The development of the site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Outer North East

1286 Colliers Lane (land off), Shadwell, LS17

Site Details

Easting	434181	Northing	439398	Site area ha	3.2	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	
--------	--	----------------	--

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	
-----------------	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support	
-----------------	--

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	5379.59
Nearest bus stop	13090
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	469.55

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO
Not assessed

ANTI
Support site being sived out.

PRO
None

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1287 Blind Lane (land at), Shadwell, LS17

Site Details

Easting	434248	Northing	439612	Site area ha	2.7	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	5552.15
Nearest bus stop	1386
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	258.36

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO
Not assessed

ANTI
Support site being sived out.

PRO
None

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1288 Manor Farm (land at), Shadwell, LS17

Site Details

Easting	434560	Northing	439483	Site area ha	13.1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	95.31	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.04	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	5323.91
Nearest bus stop	6981
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	189.46

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO
Not assessed

ANTI
Support site being sived out.

PRO
None

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1289 Dowkell Lane (land north of), Thorpe Arch, Boston Spa

Site Details

Easting	443481	Northing	446397	Site area ha	12.1	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

1289 Dowkell Lane (land north of), Thorpe Arch, Boston Spa

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	99.85	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	13085.13
Nearest bus stop	10505
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	216.85

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO
Not assessed

ANTI
Support site being sived out.

PRO
None

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Site Details

Easting	443416	Northing	445829	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency	
Impact	Network Status

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water
Treatment Works

Environment Agency
Constraints

LCC
Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities
Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other
English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	91.19	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12516.39
Nearest bus stop	5069
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	290.12

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO
Not assessed

ANTI
Support site being sived out.

PRO
None

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1291 Lilac Farm (land at), Lilac Farm, Collingham LS22

Site Details

Easting	439417	Northing	445943	Site area ha	8.1	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Large undulating greenfield site to the eastern edge of Collingham which abuts the A659 to its north-eastern boundary. Residential dwellings are present to the north and west boundaries, with open fields to the south and north. The site appears to have two access points, one to the east and one to the west.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?		No	
Would development result in an isolated development?		No	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?		Yes	
Would development round off the settlement?		Partial	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?		No	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No	
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes	
Does the site contain buildings	Yes	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	Yes	
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No	
Can development preserve this character?		
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features	

Outer North East

1291 Lilac Farm (land at), Lilac Farm, Collingham LS22

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The development of the site would lead to the partial rounding off of the settlement given that some linear development presently exists along Main Street (albeit half of which is washed over by Green Belt). No coalescence concerns, although no defensible boundary to the south to prevent further sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+ yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2 buses per hour, 50% primary & primary health

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Site frontage should provide visibility

4

Local network comments

Spare capacity but cumulative issues

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

10

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.	

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1291 Lilac Farm (land at), Lilac Farm, Collingham LS22

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	
1291+1293=286 houses generates 71.5 primary and 29 secondary children. Collingham has a small village school, land required for expansion by 0.5FE. Secondary capacity at the moment, however, extra children generated by combined sites in Thorp Arch/Wetherby/Boston Spa/Collingham would require expansion by approx. 3FE. Land would be required.	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	
Housing site 1293 and 1291 are within 2km of Linton Common SSSI. Site 1293 is also 2km from East Keswick Fitts SSSI. The Council must be satisfied that these allocations do not significantly affect their interest features (see citations below) www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation/citation_photo/1004167.pdf and www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation_photo/1005548.pdf	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

1291 Lilac Farm (land at), Lilac Farm, Collingham LS22

N32 Greenbelt	97.46	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	11916.35
Nearest bus stop	12216
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	194.81

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The development of the site would lead to the partial rounding off of the settlement given that some linear development presently exists along Main Street (albeit half of which is washed over by Green Belt) and existing residential development is also present to the west. Any development would also be well contained by the road (Wattle Syke) along its eastern boundary. However, no strong defensive boundary would exist to the long south side boundary of the site. In addition no coalescence would occur as the surrounding settlements would remain well separated from Collingham. Highway concerns regarding poor accessibility of the site.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives greenfield and landscape. Minor negatives climate change, floodrisk; local needs. Minor positive quality of housing.

Summary of reps

METRO

'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

A 8.15 2318 5 Yes Yes Yes

ANTI

Traffic - Wetherby Road, Harewood Avenue/ A58/ Syke Junction/ site is also too steep for housing.

PRO

Should be developed and has only been colour coded amber as 'highly paid' Council officials live there, Close to doctors and medical facilities, Land owner and current farmer are in support of this site being developed, site would be excellent for elderly, not viable as a farm.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The development of the site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Outer North East

1292 Jewitt Lane (paddock at), Collingham, LS22

Site Details

Easting	439127	Northing	445733	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mixed
-----------	-------

On-site land uses

Dwellings

Other

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Agriculture

Other land uses

Paddock

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Small sloping greenfield site which lies within the defined urban area. The site is surrounded by residential properties to the north and east, with open fields to the south. Significant tree cover exists to the south boundary of the site. Jewitt Lane is a narrow country road with no footways.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

1292 Jewitt Lane (paddock at), Collingham, LS22

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2 buses per hour, 100% primary & primary health

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Site frontage may provide visibility

2

Local network comments

Unsuitable network

1

Mitigation measures

Total score

5

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact

Network Status

No objection

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Wetherby

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1292 Jewitt Lane (paddock at), Collingham, LS22

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the species-rich hedgerows.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/03881/FU	Four detached houses to paddock	R	68

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	1.05	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	11639.38
Nearest bus stop	6148
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	317.94

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is within the existing settlement of Collingham, not within the Green Belt. However, Highways concerns regarding access to the site and the existing highway network. The site slopes significantly and mature trees surround the narrow entrance to the existing dwelling on site which reduces development potential.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative transport access. Minor negatives greenfield, biodiversity climate change; local needs and landscape. Minor positive quality of housing and floodrisk.

Summary of reps

METRO

'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

R 1.14 2634 5 Yes Yes Yes

ANTI

Wrong type of housing will be built, Colingham SADP consultation Executive summary Development in Collingham Village is a topic that incites passion and opinion amongst residents and from the output of the first consultation activity held in September 2012, over 70% of residents are against any development in the village. - No reasons given.

PRO

Would prefer to see flats developed here, Would prefer as a long term site.

We do not consider that housing sites should be phased over particular periods of the Core Strategy as this is a matter for the market to determine.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is within the existing settlement of Collingham, not within the Green Belt. However, Highways concerns regarding access to the site and the existing highway network. The site slopes significantly and mature trees surround the narrow entrance to the existing dwelling on site which reduces development potential.

Outer North East

1293 Harewood Road (land at), Collingham LS22

Site Details

Easting	437581	Northing	445512	Site area ha	4.6	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Greenfield site to the western edge of Collingham which is currently in agricultural use. The site slopes steeply towards the south. Residential dwellings lie to the north and east boundaries, with open fields to the west and south.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1293 Harewood Road (land at), Collingham LS22

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Existing residential development is present to the north and east of the site. As such development of the site would partially round off the settlement. A significant Green Belt gap would remain to Bardsey.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2 buses per hour 50% primary & primary health

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Site frontage should provide visibility

4

Local network comments

Spare capacity but cumulative issues

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

10

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1293 Harewood Road (land at), Collingham LS22

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	
1291+1293=286 houses generates 71.5 primary and 29 secondary children. Collingham has a small village school, land required for expansion by 0.5FE. Secondary capacity at the moment, however, extra children generated by combined sites in Thorp Arch/Wetherby/Boston Spa/Collingham would require expansion by approx. 3FE. Land would be required.	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	

Utilities	
Gas	
Northern Gas Networks owns a 4" CI low pressure main which runs in the verge on the north east corner of the site. If the access to the site is to cross this main then a mains diversion may be required. The site is crossed by a high pressure pipeline owned and operated by National Grid. Therefore, National grid should also be consulted with regard to the development potential of this site.	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	
Housing site 1293 and 1291 are within 2km of Linton Common SSSI. Site 1293 is also 2km from East Keswick Fitts SSSI. The Council must be satisfied that these allocations do not significantly affect their interest features (see citations below) www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation/citation_photo/1004167.pdf and www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation_photo/1005548.pdf	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

1293 Harewood Road (land at), Collingham LS22

N32 Greenbelt	98.73	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	1.01
Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	11141.41
Nearest bus stop	10673
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	100.14
Agricultural classification	Grade 3b
Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Existing residential development is present to the north and east of the site. As such development of the site would partially round off the settlement. A significant Green Belt gap would remain with Bardsey to the south-west with the disused railway and tree line providing a defensible boundary to prevent further sprawl to the south of the site. Highway concerns regarding poor accessibility of the site.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives greenspace; greenfield and landscape. Minor negatives climate change and local needs. Major positive floodrisk. Minor positive quality of housing.

Summary of reps

METRO

sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

A 4.59 3761 5 Yes Yes Yes

PRO

Only site in this area so should be developed and has support from local Neighbourhood Plan.

ANTI

Traffic - Crabtree Lane/Main Street A58/Harewood traffic lights/A659, development wont be in keeping with design statement, wrong type of housing will be built, the defensible boundary the council has referred to hasn't existed for 5 years, East Keswick will receive the CIL money for this but it is in reality in Collingham.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt Site. Site is steeply sloping. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

1294 Leeds Road (land at), Collingham LS22

Site Details

Easting	438547	Northing	445335	Site area ha	5.4	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Greenfield site to the south-western edge of Collingham which is currently in agricultural use. Residential dwellings lie to the north of the site with open fields to the other boundaries. A mature tree line is present to the south-west boundary of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1294 Leeds Road (land at), Collingham LS22

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The southern part of site juts out from the existing settlement form and has no defensible boundary containing it, which could set a precedent for further sprawl into Green Belt. The SW part of the site would be well contained by a mature tree belt.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2 buses per hour, 40% primary & primary health

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Limited site frontage with Leeds Road

2

Local network comments

Spare capacity but cumulative issues

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

8

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

Corner of site in Functional Flood Plain (FZ3b). See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1294 Leeds Road (land at), Collingham LS22

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Predominantly Flood Zone 1. Part of site to the Northern corner is in Flood Zone 3 attributed to Collingham Beck

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	11121.65
Nearest bus stop	3353
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	261.85

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The southern part of the site juts out from the existing settlement form and has no defensible boundary containing it, which could set a precedent for further sprawl into Green Belt. Highways concerns raised due to the narrow road frontage and poor accessibility to services.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield and landscape. Minor negatives climate change and local needs. Minor positives quality of housing and floodrisk

Summary of reps

METRO

'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

R 5.37 3271 5 Yes Yes Yes

ANTI

Wrong type of housing will be built, Colingham SADP consultation received 70% objection to any development including this site - reasons not stated. Traffic issues at Harewood Avenue, Jewitt Lane and A58.

PRO

Site should be combined with 3334 which would then solve many problems if developed as one large site. Site should be green as similar sites in Wetherby are green but Councilors don't live behind those sites.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The southern part of the site juts out from the existing settlement form and has no defensible boundary containing it, which could set a precedent for further sprawl into Green Belt. Highways concerns raised due to the narrow road frontage and poor accessibility to services.

Outer North East

1300 Linton Lane - land opposite the Ridge, Linton LS22

Site Details

Easting	439184	Northing	447244	Site area ha	1.7	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

1300 Linton Lane - land opposite the Ridge, Linton LS22

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.99	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	13122.18
Nearest bus stop	14309
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	146.36

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO
Not assessed

ANTI
Support site being sived out.

PRO
None

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Site Details

Easting	439358	Northing	447935	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield/Brownfield mix
-----------	---------------------------

On-site land uses

Outdoor sport facility

General

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Agriculture

Outdoor sport facility

Other land uses

Car Park

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

The site forms the existing clubhouse and car park for Wetherby Golf Club, which is situated to the south of Wetherby. The golf course lies to the east and south of the site with low density linear residential properties to the west. A single detached dwelling within a large plot lies to the north with the urban area of Wetherby further beyond.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1301 Linton Lane - Wetherby Golf Course house and car park, Wetherby LS22

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The site is not related to the existing settlement given that site 1070 is situated between the site and the existing built up area. No defensible boundary present to the south side boundary

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Longterm (+11yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

No Public Transport but some local services

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Established access to golf club exists. Visibility splay and footway works required

4

Local network comments

No footway provision on the site frontage. New footway upto Avon Garth would be required past site 1070.

4

Mitigation measures

Visibility splay and footway works

Total score

10

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

no but potential benefits

Contingent on other sites

no but potential benefits

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
n/a			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.	

Environment Agency

Constraints

Rear boundary of site in FZ2. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1301 Linton Lane - Wetherby Golf Course house and car park, Wetherby LS22

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Predominantly Flood Zone 1. Part of site in the East is in Flood Zone 2 attributed to the River Wharfe. Part of site is susceptible to surface water flooding.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/04586/ADV	2 non illuminated freestanding signs to entrance	A	74

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.89	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	13834.04
Nearest bus stop	14197
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	199.09

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is not related to the existing settlement given that site 1070 is situated between the site and the existing built up area. (It is noted that site 1070 presently contains one detached dwelling, however this was deemed to be appropriate within the Green Belt.) No defensible boundary is present to the south side of the site which could lead to further unrestricted sprawl into Green Belt. The site currently contains a golf clubhouse and car park, which is acceptable, appropriate development in the Green Belt. Development of the site would therefore also result in the loss of a community facility given that the clubhouse would have to be demolished. No highways concerns.

Site affects others?

The prior development of 1070 is essential to create a sustainable and well connected pattern of development

Sustainability summary

Minor negatives culture; community cohesion; greenspace; climate change and local needs. Minor positives education; health; quality of housing and greenfield.

Summary of reps

METRO

Not assessed

ANTI

Traffic - Spofforth Hill

PRO

None

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is not related to the existing settlement given that site 1070 is situated between the site and the existing built up area. (It is noted that site 1070 presently contains one detached dwelling, however this was deemed to be appropriate within the Green Belt.) No defensible boundary is present to the south side of the site which could lead to further unrestricted sprawl into Green Belt. The site currently contains a golf clubhouse and car park, which is acceptable, appropriate development in the Green Belt. Development of the site would therefore also result in the loss of a community facility given that the clubhouse would have to be demolished.

Outer North East

1304 **Larumrise (land to the west of), off Willow Lane, Clifford LS23**

Site Details

Easting	442428	Northing	444444	Site area ha	2.1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.27	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	10967.45
Nearest bus stop	244
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	180.05

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO
Not assessed

ANTI
Support site being sived out.

PRO
None

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1309 Linton Lane (land to the rear of) LS22

Site Details

Easting	439065	Northing	447577	Site area ha	3.5	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency	
Impact	Network Status

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water
Treatment Works

Environment Agency
Constraints

LCC
Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities
Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other
English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.98	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	13421.68
Nearest bus stop	14309
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	214.48

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO
Not assessed

ANTI
Support site being sived out.

PRO
None

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1315 Holywell Lane / Bridle Path Road (land to east of), Shadwell LS17

Site Details

Easting	434033	Northing	440213	Site area ha	2.2	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.68	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6190.82
Nearest bus stop	8608
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	224.90

Agricultural classification	Grade 4
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1316 **Bridle Path Road (land to north of), Shadwell, LS17**

Site Details

Easting	434068	Northing	440436	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

Outer North East

1316 Bridle Path Road (land to north of), Shadwell, LS17

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6386.58
Nearest bus stop	8608
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	439.31

Agricultural classification	Grade 4
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1324 Ling Lane - Stonecroft LS17 9JN

Site Details

Easting	435054	Northing	441296	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency	
Impact	Network Status

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water
Treatment Works

Environment Agency
Constraints

LCC
Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities
Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other
English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.65	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6958.83
Nearest bus stop	5693
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	182.55

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Metro				
Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
2903	4	No		
No	No			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1329 Blackmoor Lane (land to north of), Bardsey, Leeds

Site Details

Easting	435835	Northing	442716	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

1329 Blackmoor Lane (land to north of), Bardsey, Leeds

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/05587/FU	Detached dwelling	R	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	8281.30
Nearest bus stop	1399
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	63.69

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

1367 Rakehill Road (land north of), Barwick in Elmet

Site Details

Easting	439666	Northing	437624	Site area ha	1.3	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

A greenfield site to the northern edge of Barwick which is presently in agricultural use. A small cluster of semi detached dwellings lie to the north-east of the site adjacent to Rakehill Road, with open fields beyond the other boundaries. Rake Beck and a mature tree line lie to the north of the site. The site lies adjacent to the Barwick conservation area and close-by to an ancient monument

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

1367 Rakehill Road (land north of), Barwick in Elmet

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Relates poorly to settlement. Could lead to further sprawl to the west.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+ yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy not fully met. Some local services. Lack of nearside footways or narrow footways

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Access can be physically accommodated but no frontage with the public highway. Local roads very narrow.

1

Local network comments

Local roads very narrow. Mitigation may not be possible

2

Mitigation measures

site visit required

Total score

6

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Barwick in Elmet
-----------------	------------------

There is capacity at Barwick in Elmet for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

Watercourse to northern boundary of site and fz3 - see comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1367 Rakehill Road (land north of), Barwick in Elmet

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildlife corridor function of the Rake Beck. Retain a 20 metre corridor adjacent to the beck.Otters to consider.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Predominantly Flood Zone 1. Small part of site adjacent to Rake Beck, in the North at risk of flooding from the beck.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.47	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	4123.36
Nearest bus stop	3371
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	352.82

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Development of this site alone would not relate well to the existing settlement form. However, if site 1368 was to be developed, the site would not be so isolated. The beck to the north provides a defensible boundary. Highway concerns regarding poor access and narrow local roads.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negatives biodiversity; floodrisk and transport access. Minor positive quality of housing.

Summary of reps

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network.
Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.
We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
2986	8	No		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development of this site alone would not relate well to the existing settlement form and would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt

Outer North East

1368 Rakehill Road (land south of), Barwick in Elmet

Site Details

Easting	439689	Northing	437456	Site area ha	3.1	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other

Other land uses

Ancient Monument

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Sloping agricultural field containing a storage/agricultural building in the northern corner. Bounded by hedgerows, with residential to the south and fields on the other extents including the scheduled ancient monument to the east.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	Yes
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	Yes
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	Yes
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

Outer North East

1368 Rakehill Road (land south of), Barwick in Elmet

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Relates poorly to settlement. Site adjoins ancient monument to the east and conservation area, development would have an effect on the character of area and countryside. Potential for further sprawl to the west.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy not fully met. Some local services. Lack of nearside footways or narrow footways

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Access can be physically accommodated but no frontage with the public highway. Local roads very narrow.

1

Local network comments

local roads very narrow. Mitigation may not be possible

2

Mitigation measures

site visit required

Total score

6

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Barwick in Elmet
-----------------	------------------

There is capacity at Barwick in Elmet for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

1368 Rakehill Road (land south of), Barwick in Elmet

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations			Core Strategy		
N32 Greenbelt	96.09	% overlap	Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00		Major Settlement	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00		Minor Settlement	1.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00		Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
N1A Allotments	0.00				
N5 Open Space	0.00				
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00				
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00				
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00				
UDP City Centre	0.00				
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00				
Proposed Local Centre	0.00				
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00				

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3954.47
Nearest bus stop	3371
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	271.96

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site, adjoining the existing settlement on two sides. However, concerns regarding potential harm to the setting of the scheduled ancient monument and the conservation area. Highway concerns regarding poor access and narrow local roads.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives greenfield and natural resources. Minor negatives transport access and historic environment. Minor positives health; quality of housing; greenspace; floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network.
Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.
We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
2926	8	Yes		
Yes		Yes		

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site, adjoining the existing settlement on two sides. However, concerns regarding potential harm to the setting of the scheduled ancient monument and the conservation area. Highway concerns regarding poor access and narrow local roads. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

5162 Land at Whinmoor Lane Redhall

Site Details

Easting	434368	Northing	438883	Site area ha	19.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture
Unmanaged Forest

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture
Dwellings
Outdoor sport facility (golf course)
Horticultural nursery

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

A large site consisting of a number of agricultural fields, including an area of woodland. It is bounded by hedges or earth bunds, and Whinmoor Lane to the north, the Ring Road to the south, and the Red Hall nursery complex to the east.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	Yes
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	Yes
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Some potential to link up to development on the adjacent Red Hall site, but would be separated by the ELOR and woodland and therefore would be isolated development with a large impact on the Green Belt and potential for unrestricted sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Suitability: Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact	Minimal material impact	Network Status	No objection subject to satisfactory mitigation

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	Not Supported
Not supported - RED - The central southern section of this site is included within the updated 2014 Leeds Habitat Network because it is Lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP priority habitat. Remove the woodland from the proposed allocation and provide a Biodiversity Buffer adjacent to the woodland and connecting lines of mature trees - to include locally native tree and shrub planting, and provide bat and bird boxes within the remaining site.	

Ecology boundary

Amber - Supported with mitigation - if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/5162.

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

Fluvial Flood Risk = Low (FZ1). Surface water flood risk = Low.

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.86	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.14	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.30
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	4833.22
Nearest bus stop	11618
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	293.04

Agricultural classification	Grade 3a
-----------------------------	----------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The development of the site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Outer North East

5163 Land at Wike Ridge Lane Slaid Hill

Site Details

Easting	432876	Northing	440624	Site area ha	4.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Alwoodley	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor sport facility (golf course)

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Scrubland site with significant tree cover on boundaries, bordering gold course to the north and residential to the south, with fields to the east beyond Wike Ridge Lane.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

A well contained site, however it would jut out from the existing urban area. The development of the site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of sprawl. The existing drain and tree line provide a strong existing barrier.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Suitability: Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency			
Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection

Network Rail	

Yorkshire Water	
Treatment Works	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	

LCC	
Ecology support	Not Supported
Not supported - RED - whole site is in the updated 2014 Leeds Habitat Network. This site is all lowland acid grassland UK BAP priority habitat and forms part of a larger network of acid grassland/heathland sites which span this part of Leeds.	
Ecology boundary	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	
There is a minor watercourse running along the Southern boundary of the site. It should be assumed that there will be no development within 9m of the beck. Surface water flood risk = Low.	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.98	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.02	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	7055.38
Nearest bus stop	3579
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	336.07

Agricultural classification	Grade 4
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The development of the site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Outer North East

5166 Land at Sandbeck Lane Wetherby

Site Details

Easting	440938	Northing	449465	Site area ha	6.3	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Agricultural fields with few development constraints lying directly to the north of the built up area of Wetherby. No comments from infrastructure providers as yet due to been a new site. Comments provided in due course.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	
--------	--	----------------	--

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	
-----------------	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support	
-----------------	--

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Outer North East

5166 Land at Sandbeck Lane Wetherby

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/00279/OT	Outline Planning Application to layout access and erect business and industrial park development, with offices, research and development units, light industrial units, warehouses with car parking and attenuation pond.	A	68

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	15723.48
Nearest bus stop	2951
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	354.85

Agricultural classification	Grade 3a
-----------------------------	----------

5166 Land at Sandbeck Lane Wetherby

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is a previously undeveloped employment allocation within the UDP and not situated within land defined as Green Belt, as such the principle of development is acceptable. The site is well related to the major settlement of Wetherby and is bounded by the A1(M) to the east and Harrogate BC land to the north.

Outer North East

2059 Oakhill Cottage Farm, Shadwell LS17

Site Details

Easting	433156	Northing	439418	Site area ha	13.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Flat sloping site consisting of a number of fields including hedgerows and tree boundaries, with some small agricultural buildings in the middle. Site bounded by a tree band to the east, the Ring Road and further trees to the south, a road and fields to the west, and one field and then residential properties to the north.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	Yes
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	Yes
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	Yes
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

2059 Oakhill Cottage Farm, Shadwell LS17

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The site is an important gateway into the countryside from the ring road, with views from the ring road giving the edge of the main urban area a 'rural feel'. Site does not relate well to the existing settlement form.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

30% primary health

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Two site frontages which should provide access options

2

Local network comments

Local congestion issues

3

Mitigation measures

Total score

7

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knothrop
-----------------	----------

There is capacity for significant development at Knothrop High and Low level. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

2059 Oakhill Cottage Farm, Shadwell LS17

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There are a number of public sewer within the site boundary

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.82
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	5873.60
Nearest bus stop	3101
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	237.65

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is an important gateway into the countryside from the ring road, with views from the ring road giving the edge of the main urban area a 'rural feel'. The northern boundary is connected to the existing settlement but the west and eastern boundaries are open, so the site does not relate well to the existing settlement form. Highway concerns regarding poor accessibility.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negatives Education; community cohesion; climate change; trnapsort access; local needs and built environment. Minor positive quality of housing; greenspace;floodrisk.

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development
Support for red status of site
This site presents intrinsic spatial planning problems.

Statutory
This site is not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network.
Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.
We agree that this site would not be suitable for housing development. - METRO

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is an important gateway into the countryside from the ring road, with views from the ring road giving the edge of the main urban area a 'rural feel'. The northern boundary is connected to the existing settlement but the west and eastern boundaries are open, so the site does not relate well to the existing settlement form and is unacceptable in terms of Green Belt impact. Highway concerns regarding poor accessibility.

Outer North East

2067 Thorp Arch Grange, Wetherby LS23

Site Details

Easting	443996	Northing	447056	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield						
On-site land uses							
Outdoor amenity and open space							
Neighbouring land uses							
Agriculture							
Dwellings							
Outdoor sport facility							
Other land uses							
Outdoor Amenity and Open Space, residential institution							
Topography	Flat			Landscape	Limited Tree Cover		
Boundaries	Existing well defined			Road front	Yes		

Description							
Flat grassed site containing a few trees and on boundary.							

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

2067 Thorp Arch Grange, Wetherby LS23

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Core Strategy not fully met but some local services.

3

Access comments

Adequate frontage

5

Local network comments

Suitable network given the scale of the site

5

Mitigation measures

none

Total score

13

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact

Network Status

No objection

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Thorp Arch

There is capacity at Thorp Arch for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

2067 Thorp Arch Grange, Wetherby LS23

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There appears to be a highway drain in the SE corner of the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	85.98	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.45
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	13844.38
Nearest bus stop	8855
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	177.99

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is designated as N6 protected playing pitch on the existing UDP and currently provides an open setting for Thorp Arch Grange and the Leeds United training ground. The site is flat and has a road frontage. See also greenspace section, page 33, question G7.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenspace and greenfield. Minor negatives health; greenspace. Minor positive quality of housing; floodrisk and transport access.

Summary of reps

For Development

Release for housing

Any development must include sufficient greenspace and playing pitches are provided elsewhere but within accessible distance.

Against Development

Retain as Greenspace

Access to greenspace with children's play facilities from this area is already in excess of the 720m acceptable distance.

Remove from the allocations process as not within settlement Hierarchy.

The site should not be released for housing in view of the potential for site 1055

If planning is granted for residential development on the Thorp Arch Trading Estate, no other development should be permitted within the TA Parish

Statutory

This is a current development plan protected pitch N6 allocation. We would object to this change unless one or more of our policy exceptions are met, as set out above, exceptions E1 – E5. Land no longer in use for sport is not an argument for its disposal to other uses. In Sport England's experience it is more likely this is down to the site owner closing the site off rather than lack of demand to make use of the playing field.

This site falls outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

2068 Thorp Arch Estate Waste Tip, Wetherby LS23

Site Details

Easting	445346	Northing	446042	Site area ha	10.1	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Water Storage and Treatment

Other land uses

Unmanaged forest

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Sloping site, former tip, grassed with some trees/scrub. No clear boundary to the south.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

2068 Thorp Arch Estate Waste Tip, Wetherby LS23

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

No public transport or local services

Rank (1-5)

1

Access comments

No frontage to adopted highway. Site owner may have ability to connect to highway though.

1

Local network comments

Footways possibly needed within the estate and junction improvement with Wetherby Road

2

Mitigation measures

Footways possibly needed within the estate and junction improvement with Wetherby Road

Total score

4

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

yes. If whole estate is redeveloped, comprehensive measures may be possible

Contingent on other sites

yes. If whole estate is redeveloped, comprehensive measures may be possible

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

--

Environment Agency

Constraints

--

LCC

Ecology support	Not supported
-----------------	---------------

Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but calcareous grassland in west of site.

Outer North East

2068 Thorp Arch Estate Waste Tip, Wetherby LS23

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/2068. Mitigation will still be required to ensure adjacent habitats are protected and enhanced. Remaining grassland should have a botanical survey to

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	100.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.71
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	13277.82
Nearest bus stop	3608
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	177.80

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site lies within a 'Rural Land' designation which aims to protect the attractive open countryside for its own sake as well as a recreation resource. Green Belt considerations can be applied. Development of the site would not constitute ribbon development nor join to settlements but would not round off an existing settlement and may set a precedent for further sprawl. Existing features do not provide clear barriers to contain development. No access to the countryside across this land and no protected habitats. Two ancient monuments (Schedule 1 and 2) to the east of the site. It is anticipated that development of the site would not impact on these. Poor vehicular access. Overall, site not considered suitable for housing development.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Site Details

Easting	438104	Northing	437090	Site area ha	32.1	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Large greenfield site presently in agricultural use to the east of Scholes. Rakehill Road splits the site into two parcels of land (north and south)
--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

Outer North East

2134 Scholes (east of)

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

A large site that has very limited coverage of Public Transport and local services

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Site has limited frontages with adopted highway however numerous access points would be required for a site of this size. Access to large parts of the site is questionable. It is not clear whether the site has access to the adopted sections of Rakehill Road or The Avenue, but given the capacity additional access points may be required.

2

Local network comments

The local network is unlikely to be adequate without mitigation. A Traffic Assessment or further work is required to determine what mitigation might be required.

2

Mitigation measures

Total score

6

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

no - however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to improved local services and public transport. A reduced site boundary, but combined with adjacent but amended sites maybe acceptable.

Contingent on other sites

no - however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to improved local services and public transport. A reduced site boundary, but combined with adjacent but amended sites maybe acceptable.

Highways Agency

Impact Major Impact

Network Status

Likely to require significant physical mitigation

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

There is capacity for significant development at Knostrop High and Low level. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support Not supported

Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but the southern area of the site has species-rich grassland - which needs further botanical survey to confirm its value.

Outer North East

2134 Scholes (east of)

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/2134. Mitigation will still be required to ensure adjacent habitats are protected and enhanced. Further botanical surveys are required to confirm the

Education comments

2134=843 houses generates 211 primary or 84 secondary children. New 1FE school required (Scholes).

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There is a drain / minor watercourse adjacent to the site in the SE corner and there is a small watercourses as well as Rake Beck, which cross the site towards the North of the site. There are also a number of public sewers in the vicinity of Rake Beck.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/01211/OT	Outline application for mixed use development comprising residential development (C3) of up to 700 houses, including Extra Care residential accommodation (C2); retail and community uses (A1 to A5); health care (D1); and education uses (D1); car parking; means of access; infrastructure; open space; landscaping; and other associated works including demolition of existing house and agricultural building	R	94

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	100.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00
-------------------	------

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3209.62
Nearest bus stop	4490
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	421.10

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Designated as PAS (protected area of search) on the existing UDP, not within the Green Belt. Development would represent a significant and disproportionate addition to the settlement. Highway concerns re access, accessibility and local network.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives greenfield and biodiversity. Minor negatives climate change; transport access; local needs; landscape and built environment. Minor positives quality of housing and floodrisk.

Summary of reps

For Development

Some development on a small scale providing sheltered housing may be acceptable.

Long term development prospect 10-15 years recommended.

"There is no reason why any further new housing development should change its essential character.

Phasing through to 2028.

It is evident there are no physical problems or limitations, other potential impacts or environmental conditions which would preclude the development of the site for housing, both in the next five years and longer term.

Against Development

Unrealistic.

No safe walking or cycle provision.

Local Schools and Doctors' services too small.

Loss of allotments.

This land is a well used and valued area of the original typology. (SA Vol.2 p.31)

Lack of play facilities for children.

Loss of amenity and degrade (from a user viewpoint) existing rights of way, including a section of the Leeds Country Way.

Loss of leisure areas for walking/cycling etc.

The Council should not be afraid to reclassify it as a red site on its merits as performing a green belt function.

What about links with the local network?

There should be no presumption that land identified as PAS as a whole or part should be developed.

Development will affect the existing social facilities eg cricket/football ground.

Impact assessment?

There should be no presumption that land identified as PAS as a whole or part should be developed.

Development will affect the existing social facilities eg cricket/football ground.

Highway concerns

Statutory

The site falls outside 400m of the current corebus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Safeguarded land (PAS)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site allocated as PAS in the UDP and not situated within land defined as the Green Belt. Scholes is a smaller settlement within the CS settlement hierarchy and release of this site would not fit with CS priorities, inc. accessibility and highways infrastructure, there are local preferences for alternative sites/strategic options and therefore site should be retained as PAS.

Outer North East

2135 Leeds Road Collingham

Site Details							
Easting	438069	Northing	445518	Site area ha	6.5	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	Agriculture
Neighbouring land uses	Agriculture
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	No

Description	Greenfield site with residential dwelling to the north and east boundaries. Collingham Beck and a mature tree line present a constraint to access from the A58. Approximately 30% of the site is situated within an area of high flood risk.
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

2135 Leeds Road Collingham

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2 buses per hour, 70% primary & primary health

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

visibility should be possible onto Leeds Road

5

Local network comments

spare capacity but cumulative issues

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

11

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

Part of site is in functional flood plan (FZ3b), FZ3 and FZ2. Collingham Beck runs along the south of the site. See comments in main text of our response

Outer North East

2135 Leeds Road Collingham

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to retain a wildlife corridor alongside Collingham Beck and trees - minimum 20 metres from bank of the beck. Otters, White-clawed Crayfish and bats to consider.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Large part of the site is in Flood Zone 3B - Functional Floodplain. Remainder of site is in Flood Zone 1. There is a culvert and public sewer running N to S through the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/00315/OT	Outline application for residential development up to 150 dwellings including means of access	R	96

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.25	% overlap
N34 PAS	99.75	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00
-------------------	------

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	11214.73
Nearest bus stop	6174
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	244.61

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Designated as PAS (protected area of search) on the existing UDP, not within the Green Belt. However, access to the site appears to be difficult to achieve as Collingham Beck runs adjacent to Leeds Road. As such a bridge would be required across the beck to allow access to the site from Leeds Road. Furthermore, a significant part of the site (30%+ is situated in floodzones 3b (washland) and 3a (high risk), which reduces the developable area of the site. Therefore, whilst the site is not within the Green Belt, access and flooding provide significant constraints.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield and flood risk. Minor negatives greenspace; biodiversity; climate change; local needs. Minor positive quality of housing.

Summary of reps

For Development

Short term Phasing. Asda Site.

The flood protection measures proposed for this plot makes it by far the most favoured plot on this side of Collingham but they need extremely careful consideration and testing.

If the environment agency approve the landowners plans for flood prevention then as PAS land development here could work, but only if the flood plans were assured.

This site (along with 1251, 3334 and 1294) offers opportunity to develop purpose built settlement and infrastructure.

Proposals to manage flooding. Any development should contains runoff, which currently impacts on some houses.

Trees will minimise perception of sprawl.

The development of this site offers betterment in the form of reducing flood risk for the wider area.

The land is wholly suitable for residential development and can deliver additional benefits, and as such, together these sites have the greatest potential to be allocated and should be colour coded green.

Against Development

Land not suitable for development and should be removed entirely from the Site Allocation process.

Privacy

Previous Planning Applications have been refused because of the flood risk.

Any development of this site will affect the water table, impacting existing properties.

Statutory

The site is not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network.

Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.

We agree that this site would not be suitable for housing development.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Safeguarded land (PAS)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site allocated as PAS in the UDP and not situated within land defined as the Green Belt. Collingham is a smaller settlement within the CS settlement hierarchy and release of this site would not fit with CS priorities, there are local preferences for alternative sites/strategic options, flood risk issues and therefore site should be retained as PAS.

Site Details

Easting	438848	Northing	447327	Site area ha	4.1	SP7	Other Rural Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Greenfield site surrounded by residential dwellings to the west, south and east. Narrow sloping access to the south of the site

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

Outer North East

2136 The Ridge, Linton

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/04340/OT	Outline application for residential development including means of access		99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	100.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	13133.34
Nearest bus stop	14309
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	329.32

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development

This site should be redesignated as Greenbelt which will provide the necessary protection for the future

Statutory

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Safeguarded land (PAS)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site allocated as PAS (safeguarded land) in the UDP and not situated within land defined as the Green Belt. Site is well related to the existing settlement, however Linton is not within the settlement heirarchy. Access to the site is difficult to achieve. Site not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option and should therefore be retained as PAS

Outer North East

2137 West Park, Boston Spa

Site Details

Easting	442247	Northing	446196	Site area ha	4.1	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Linear greenfield site to the north of Boston Spa. Residential dwellings exist to the east of the site with the River Wharfe directly to the north. An attractive mature tree exists within the middle of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

2137 West Park, Boston Spa

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy not fully met but some local services. Footways needed that are beyond the developers control

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Any access would require significant tree loss. Wider route to High Street would also need widening with possible 3rd party land required - site 3128.

2

Local network comments

Deepdale Lane is unsuitable, narrow with no footways. This site is reliant on site 3128 for improvements to Deepdale Lane. Could be cumulative issues on High Street and J45 if other Boston Spa sites are taken forward

2

Mitigation measures

It is not clear whether the developer could deliver the required improvements to Deepdale Lane. Possible traffic management works on High Street and works to J45 if all Boston Spa sites are taken forward

Total score

6

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

yes, site 3128

Contingent on other sites

yes, site 3128

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Thorp Arch
-----------------	------------

There is no capacity at Thorp Arch for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

2137 West Park, Boston Spa

LCC

Ecology supportSupported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the boundary area to Deepdale/Jackdaw Crag SEGI, Boston Spa Riverside Woods RIGS and River Wharfe SEGI - to involve provision of a suitable buffer zone of at least 20 metres.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. NE boundary just in Flood Zone 2: source is the river Wharfe.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing site 2137 adjacent to Deepdale / Jackdaw Crag local site. The plan should avoid/mitigate potential adverse effects

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations			Core Strategy		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	100.00		Major Settlement	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00		Minor Settlement	1.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00		Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
N1A Allotments	0.00				
N5 Open Space	0.00				% overlap
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00				
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00				
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00				
UDP City Centre	0.00				
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00				
Proposed Local Centre	0.00				
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00				

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12675.59
Nearest bus stop	12899
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	364.03

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Designated as a PAS (protected area of search) site, not within the Green Belt. Protected trees line the boundary of the site, providing a strong boundary. The site is within a conservation area so design and layout of any scheme would need to be carefully considered. Highway concerns regarding suitability of Deepdale Lane – adjacent site 3128 required for improvements. Any access would require significant tree loss.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield and landscape. Minor negatives biodiversity; climate change; flood risk; transport access; local needs and historic environment. Minor positive quality of housing.

Summary of reps

For Development

Within settlement limit of Boston Spa
Long term protection of green belt.

Against Development

Eventually the houses would reach right to the A1.
Infrastructure insufficient.
Along with 3132, 1008 and 3128, less suitable than other sites.
Extends the village boundary.

Statutory

This site falls outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.
We recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Safeguarded land (PAS)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site allocated as PAS (safeguarded land) in the UDP and not situated within land defined as the Green Belt. Site is well related to the existing settlement, however site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option and should therefore be retained as PAS.

Outer North East

2158 Sandbeck wood (south of), Wetherby

Site Details

Easting	441289	Northing	449462	Site area ha	5.4	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Unmanaged Forest

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	No

Description

Flat agricultural field bounded by hedges. Sandbeck Wood to the north, M1 to the west, fields to south and east.
--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

2158 Sandbeck wood (south of), Wetherby

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

the site fails all the accessibility criteria but the size of this and the adjacent site give some potential for new Public Transport and local services. Severance issues to Wetherby cannot be resolved though.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

no frontage onto highway, requires other site for access

1

Local network comments

When combined with site 1233 will have implication in Wetherby town centre and the junction of York Road and Deighton Road.

3

Mitigation measures

Works at site 1233 frontage. Requirements in Wetherby difficult to determine

Total score

6

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

yes

Contingent on other sites

yes

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ3 Clips & sbuts against east of site . See comments in main text of our response

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
-----------------	-----------

Supported

Outer North East

2158 Sandbeck wood (south of), Wetherby

Ecology boundary

Education comments

2158+1233+3125+4074 = 1318 houses generates 329.5 primary and 132 secondary children. New 1.5FE primary school or 2FE to include site 1046.

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Site boundary adjacent to Sand Beck at risk of flooding.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing site 1046 is within 750m of Kirk Deighton SAC/SSSI. Sites 2158, 3125, 1233, 4074, 4075 and 4076 within 2km to this site, which is an internationally important site for Great Crested Newts. If these allocations are retained/promoted, the supporting HRA should assess the likely significant effects upon this species. The SA should examine potential significant effects upon the interest features of the SSSI (see citation below) www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation_phtot/200441.pdf

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	100.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	15828.26
Nearest bus stop	14188
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	584.06

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is not situated within the Green Belt, however it is open countryside which is currently safeguarded by rural land policy (RL1) within the UDP. Development of the site in isolation would represent an island site unrelated to the existing settlement. The development of the site is reliant on the prior development of 1233 in particular. Surrounding major roads would prevent unrestricted further sprawl. The site is also situated in close proximity to the Young Offenders Institution and Racecourse buildings which are already significant intrusions within the open countryside and reduce the site's potential impact. The site is quite isolated from the main urban area of Wetherby with only two access roads across the A1(M) which creates a significant access barrier to the existing settlement (if developed with 1233). As such the site has high potential to create a car dominated development unless the site(s) incorporate a range of services given that new pedestrian links will be difficult to achieve due to the A1(M). Potential noise issues given the close proximity to the motorway. The site should be considered as a cluster with 1233 and 3125. Highway concerns regarding accessibility, severance issues, access and cumulative impact.

Site affects others?

Contingent on 1233 for access.

Sustainability summary

Major negatives greenspace; greenfield; climate change and local needs. Minor negatives health; floodrisk; transport access and pollution. Minor positive quality of housing.

Summary of reps

For Development

The site will impact less on the town centre.

Housing targets

Medium term phasing

If development were to take place it would likely have a significant impact on the environment/local services/transport network which would need to be addressed (or the proposed site reduced).

These sites would also provide sufficient space for additional supermarkets/services in locations where they can serve the local residents directly.

if development goes ahead the plan for an Asda store closer to these areas should be reconsidered.

Site has a lower amenity value for existing Wetherby residents.

Reduce congestion in Wetherby itself.

Easier access to schools.

Against Development

Environmental damage.

Highway capacity problems.

Site isolated visually and physically from Wetherby

The site is not well connected to the settlement and connectivity cannot be improved given the physical barrier that is the A1/A168 road corridor

Remote from services.

Development would represent a significant incursion into the open countryside.

Statutory

The site falls outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.

We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is not within the Green Belt, however it is open countryside which is currently safeguarded by rural land policy (RL1) within the UDP. The site is isolated from the main urban area of Wetherby with limited access across the A1(M) which creates a significant barrier to the existing settlement of Wetherby. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Site Details

Easting	434321	Northing	439220	Site area ha	4.1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Flat agricultural field bounded by hedges/trees, and rear gardens of a few houses to the north west.
--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+ yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	5161.47
Nearest bus stop	11618
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	518.92

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development

We strongly support the 'sieved out' purple status of the site 3019 within our village area.

Statutory

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

3020 Land at Elmete Lane Shadwell

Site Details

Easting	434113	Northing	439126	Site area ha	2.2	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency	
Impact	Network Status

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water
Treatment Works

Environment Agency
Constraints

LCC
Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities
Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other
English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.02
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	5159.00
Nearest bus stop	11618
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	379.76

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development

We strongly support the 'sieved out' purple status of the site 3020 within our village area

Statutory

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

3114 Barwick Road, Garforth

Site Details

Easting	440095	Northing	433864	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East, Outer South East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Transport tracks and ways

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Flat field, site boundary cuts across field without physical boundaries apart from hedgerows on north and east. Houses to the west, railway to south, and fields to north and east.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

3114 Barwick Road, Garforth

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Small site, relates poorly to Garforth as it is set to the north of the railway line. Potential for further sprawl, however, if developed with adjacent site 1226 the motorway to the north would contain the site.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Landlocked site, Public Transport standards not fully met

3

Access comments

Requires development of adjacent site for access

3

Local network comments

Local congestion/capacity issues and potential for significant cumulative impact with other nearby sites

2

Mitigation measures

The potential for mitigation and capacity improvements needs to be considered with in conjunction with other nearby sites

Total score

8

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

yes

Contingent on other sites

yes

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Network Rail

Level crossing; asset protection issues. Contribution to Garforth station facilities. Nanny Goat Lane in part NR ownership

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Owlwood/Garforth
-----------------	------------------

There is capacity at Garforth for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

3114 Barwick Road, Garforth

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
-----------------	-----------

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Proposal	Decision	% of site
----------	----------	-----------

Decision	% of site
----------	-----------

% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00
N34 PAS	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.00
N1 Greenspace	0.00
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	609.40
Nearest bus stop	4418
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	265.35

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Proposed HS2 rail route runs to the north of the site. Highways concerns re access - route to Garforth constrained by narrow railway bridge and access to the site itself is down a narrow unadopted road. Development would be contingent on SHLAA site 1226 coming forward so that access could be shared. The motorway would form a strong defensible boundary preventing further sprawl of Garforth if this and adjacent sites were to be released.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negative pollution. Minor positives education; health; culture; quality of housing; greenspace; floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Pro

Some plots should be made available for self build

Not visible

Site is available in the short term and should be moved to phase 1

Site would bring regeneration benefits

HS2 can be accomodated without sterilising the site (masterplan inc)

Anti

The single-carriageway road under the railway bridge make this site totally unsuitable

No more room

Future food shortages as a result of the loss of agricultural land

Strain on police and Fire Service

HS2 - Unsuitable for housing so close to line. Land should be used for Greenspace or Industry instead

Presedent for more Green Belt land to be lost

Natural boundary of Garforth needs to remain intact

Not supporting the current residents

No regard for the history of Garforth

HS2 - cumultative impact

Disrupt views, noise/dust from construction works, loss of a safe place to walk dogs

loss of public bridleway

Prefer housing to be built on Makings farmland 1232

Land lost forever

Geology - land stability is shifting and not suitable

Smell from drains already bad

Build elsewhere, not necessary in Garforth

Needs to be some GB left for future generations

Site identified on the map but not listed

Cottingley Springs extension should be suffient

No requirement for travellers. The extension to Cottingley Springs should be adequate and travellers & would not fit into the cultural area of Garforth

3114 Barwick Road, Garforth

Detrimental impact on the existing Garforth Housing Framework

1224, 3110 and 1232 are a better alternative option

Cottingley springs expansion is a better solution

HS2/M1 cumulative impact

Metro

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these sites were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible sites have been considered.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless. Distance to core network 417m buses an hour 4 primary school Yes secondary Yes healthcare Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Proposed HS2 rail route runs to the north of the site. The site is very isolated from the main settlement. The development of the site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of sprawl and protecting the countryside from encroachment. Highways concerns re access - route to Garforth constrained by narrow railway bridge and access to the site itself is down a narrow unadopted road. Major site 1232B to east of Garforth chosen on balance as a better site for development than the combined sites to the west/north of Garforth.

Outer North East

3125 Carr Lane, Wetherby

Site Details

Easting	441278	Northing	449095	Site area ha	2.3	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Vacant land	
Neighbouring land uses	
Agriculture	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Scrubland field containing a line of trees in the middle and trees on the boundaries. M1 to the west, residential and a pond to the south, fields to north and east.
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

3125 Carr Lane, Wetherby

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

The site fails all the accessibility criteria but the size of this and the adjacent site give some potential for new Public Transport and local services. Severance issues to Wetherby cannot be resolved though.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

no frontage onto highway, requires other site for access

1

Local network comments

When combined with site 1233 will have implication in Wetherby town centre and the junction of York Road and Deighton Road.

3

Mitigation measures

Works at site 1233 frontage. Requirements in Wetherby difficult to determine

Total score

6

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

yes

Contingent on other sites

yes

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ2 abuts southern end of site. See comments in main text of our response

Outer North East

3125 Carr Lane, Wetherby

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	
2158+1233+3125+4074 = 1318 houses generates 329.5 primary and 132 secondary children. New 1.5FE primary school or 2FE to include site 1046.	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1. Parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding. Pond directly adjacent to site. There is a public surface water sewer running across the site.	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	
Housing site 1046 is within 750m of Kirk Deighton SAC/SSSI. Sites 2158, 3125, 1233, 4074, 4075 and 4076 within 2km to this site, which is an internationally important site for Great Crested Newts. If these allocations are retained/promoted, the supporting HRA should assess the likely significant effects upon this species. The SA should examine potential significant effects upon the interest features of the SSSI (see citation below) www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation_phtot/200441.pdf	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	100.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	15476.54
Nearest bus stop	14188
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	397.57

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is not situated within Green Belt, however it is open countryside which is safeguarded presently by rural land policy (RL1) within the UDP. The development of the site is reliant on the development of site 1233 in particular. Surrounding major roads (around 1233 partially) would prevent further unrestricted sprawl. The site is also situated in close proximity to the Young Offenders Institution and Racecourse buildings which are already significant intrusions within the open countryside and reduce its potential impact. The site and adj sites are quite isolated from the main urban area of Wetherby with only two access roads across the A1(M) which creates a significant access barrier to the existing settlement (if developed with 1233). As such the site has high potential to create a car dominated development unless the site(s) incorporate a range of services given that new pedestrian links will be difficult to achieve due to the A1(M). Potential noise issues given the close proximity to the motorway. The site should be considered in conjunction with 1233 and 2158. Highway concerns regarding accessibility, severance issues, access and cumulative impact..

Site affects others?

The development of the site is reliant on the development of 1233 to create a critical mass of development to the east of the A1. Development of this site alone would create a very isolated residential development.

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negatives greenspace; climate change; transport access; local needs and pollution. Minor positives quality of housing.

Summary of reps

Pro

Anti

It is incumbent upon all of us to save energy, Environmental damage

Site would be physically isolated from Wetherby. Not well connected to the settlement and connectivity cannot be improved given the physical barrier that is the A1/A168 road corridors

The site is also disconnected from the existing settlement by the A1

Not integral to the town

Poor pedestrian accessibility

Housing should be located within the inner city, close to shops/restaurants to make inner cities vibrant again.

Deliverability is questioned

Sites in Collingham are more preferable than ones in Wetherby

Open Countryside

Incursion into open countryside, Would break a strong defensible boundary (A1), Isolated from the main urban area

Metro

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless. Distance to core network 1324, buses per hour 4, Access to primary schools Yes, Access to Secondary Schools yes, Access to primary health yes,

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is not within the Green Belt, however it is open countryside which is currently safeguarded by rural land policy (RL1) within the UDP. The site is isolated from the main urban area of Wetherby with limited access across the A1(M) which creates a significant barrier to the existing settlement of Wetherby. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

3126 Syke Lane, Scarcroft

Site Details

Easting	436066	Northing	441854	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.96	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	7410.38
Nearest bus stop	5929
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	415.84

Agricultural classification	Grade 4
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro

Anti

It would need to complement, and have the support of, Scarcroft's Neighbourhood Plan as a pre- condition for inclusion as one of Bardsey's preferred sites

Site is remote from Bardsey and would bring little benefit to the village

Metro

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

3127 Wetherby Road, Scarcroft

Site Details

Easting	436386	Northing	441208	Site area ha	5.1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

3127 Wetherby Road, Scarcroft

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
2 buses per hour, 80% primary health and secondary education	2
Access comments	
Access ok from Wetherby Road	5
Local network comments	
spare capacity	4
Mitigation measures	Total score
	11
Highways site support	
yes	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Outer North East

3127 Wetherby Road, Scarcroft

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.66	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.01	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6762.65
Nearest bus stop	9867
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	132.94

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro

Anti

Scarcroft Lodge site is the best option

Metro

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Site Details

Easting	442126	Northing	445949	Site area ha	2.2	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Agricultural field bounded by hedgerows. Fields to the west and north, residential and a school to the south and east.
--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Site is within the conservation area so development will affect the character of the area. Potential for further sprawl to the west.
--

Outer North East

3128 Land west of Deepdale Lane, Boston Spa

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy not fully met but some local services.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Route to High Street would need widening and footway provision

4

Local network comments

Potential widening and footway needed to Deepdale Lane. Could be cumulative issues on High Street and J45 if other Boston Spa sites are taken forward

4

Mitigation measures

Widening of Deepdale Lane and provision of footway. Possible traffic management works on High Street and works to J45 if all Boston Spa sites are taken forward

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Thorp Arch
-----------------	------------

There is no capacity at Thorp Arch for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
-----------------	-----------

Supported

Outer North East

3128 Land west of Deepdale Lane, Boston Spa

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There are a couple of public surface water sewers within the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

This site adjoins the boundary of the Boston Spa and Thorp Arch Conservation Area.

In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas including their setting, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this area makes to the landscape setting of the Conservation Area. If this area does make an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, then the plan would need to explain why its loss and subsequent development is considered to be acceptable.

If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the character of that part of the adjacent Conservation Area are not harmed.

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		Core Strategy	
N32 Greenbelt	99.88 % overlap	Main Urban Area	0.00 % overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	Major Settlement	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	Minor Settlement	1.00
N1 Greenspace	0.00	Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
N1A Allotments	0.00		
N5 Open Space	0.00		
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00		
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00		
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00		
UDP City Centre	0.00		
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00		
Proposed Local Centre	0.00		
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00		
		Regeneration Areas	
		Inner South RA	0.00 % overlap
		LB Corridor RA	0.00
		EASEL RA	0.00
		Aire Valley RA	0.00
		West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12415.74
Nearest bus stop	12899
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	263.29

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. No defensible boundary to the west of the site which could set a precedent for further sprawl.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives greenfield and landscaping. Minor negatives historic environment. Minor positives education, health; quality of housing; floodrisk transport access.

Summary of reps

Pro

Site should be coupled with 2137 to make a comprehensive development

Anti

Other villages should take their fair share

Would it not make sense to enlarge smaller hamlets and villages with new housing opportunities so that they can then become communities able to support their own schools, doctors, shops and other basics

Development will cause loss of separation and identity of the villages

The sites contribution to the adjacent Conservation area needs to be taken into consideration. If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the character of that part of the adjacent Conservation Area are not harmed

Forms an integral part of the riverside walk experience

would negatively impact the appeal of the village for visitors and residents resulting in a decline in local trading

Impact of building works - would infringe on Childrens play park facilities and access to community building. Would also impact on safety

Metro

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these sites were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible sites have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless. Distance to core network 2701, buses per hour 5, Access to primary schools No, Access to Secondary Schools yes, Access to primary health yes,

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. No defensible boundary to the west of the site which could set a precedent for further sprawl. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Site Details

Easting	441799	Northing	445231	Site area ha	2.5	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Field bounded by trees to the south and west, and residential to the north and east. Further fields to the west, and school playing field to the south.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Yes
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	Yes
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Relates well to settlement. Development would round off this area of Boston Spa. Low potential for sprawl.
--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy not fully met but some local services. Off site footway needed to Clifford Moor Road.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Long frontages give options for access. Footways and visibility splays would need to be created and possibly road widening which could result in significant tree loss. Footway would need to be created to Clifford Moor Road. Important that extent of public highway is established to understand if the work can be done without third party land.

3

Local network comments

Could be cumulative issues on High Street and J45 if other Boston Spa sites are taken forward. Winnow Lane is not suitable at present and would need to be upgraded with at least one continuous footway and possible road widening.

2

Mitigation measures

It is not clear whether the developer could deliver the required improvements to Winnow Lane. Possible traffic management works on High Street and works to J45 if all Boston Spa sites are taken forward

Total score

8

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Outer North East

3129 Moor End, Boston Spa

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	
----------	--

Fire and Rescue	
-----------------	--

Telecoms	
----------	--

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	
-----------------	--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship		
LCC ownership %	0.00	
Nearest train station	Garforth	
Nearest train station distance (m)	11666.86	
Nearest bus stop	10594	
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	272.74	
Agricultural classification	Grade 2	

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is well contained and related to the existing settlement and development would constitute rounding off of the settlement. Highways support development with appropriate mitigation.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negatives health; greenspace. Minor positives education; quality of housing; floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Pro

Phasing: Medium term

Anti

Other Villages should take their fair share

Would it not make sense to enlarge smaller hamlets and villages with new housing opportunities so that they can then become communities able to support their own schools, doctors, shops and other basics

Incorrect description, not on Leys Lane & High Street

Should only be considered as a last resort

Metro

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these sites were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible sites have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless. Distance to core network 3135, buses per hour 5, Access to primary schools Yes, Access to Secondary Schools yes, Access to primary health yes,

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

3130 Primrose Lane (west), Boston Spa

Site Details

Easting	442368	Northing	445207	Site area ha	3.7	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Flat field bounded by hedgerows. Residential to north, school to west, fields to south and east.
--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Good connections to settlement, however, development would breach existing road which currently acts a defensible boundary. Development could lead to further sprawl.

Outer North East

3130 Primrose Lane (west), Boston Spa

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy not fully met but some local services.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Long frontages give options for access. Footways and visibility splays would need to be created.

4

Local network comments

Could be cumulative issues on High Street and J45 if other Boston Spa sites are taken forward. Junction visibility at Church Street and Clifford Moor Road may be substandard and should be checked.

4

Mitigation measures

Possible traffic management works on High Street and works to J45 if all Boston Spa sites are taken forward

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact

Network Status

No objection

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Wetherby

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support Supported

Supported

Outer North East

3130 Primrose Lane (west), Boston Spa

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Parts of site highly susceptible to surface water flooding. There are a couple of public (foul) sewers within the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.01	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %0.00

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	11711.93
Nearest bus stop	4874
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	238.81

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Development would result in the crossing of Primrose Lane which is currently a strong defensible boundary, which could set a precedent for further sprawl which would reduce the Green Belt gap between Boston Spa and Clifford.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor positives education; health; quality of housing; floodrisk

Summary of reps

Pro

There will be services available

Anti

Other villages should take their fair share

In planning terms would it not make sense to enlarge smaller hamlets and villages with new housing opportunities so that they can then become communities able to support their own schools, doctors, shops and other basics. The opposite seems to apply whereas the burden of new development is placed on those towns with existing facilities resulting in saturation levels being reached on their infrastructure and facilities.

Would reduce the gap to Clifford

Would create a less defensible Green Belt boundary

Metro

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development. Distance to core network 3443, buses per hour 5, Access to primary schools Yes, Access to Secondary Schools yes, Access to primary health yes,

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development would result in the crossing of Primrose Lane which is currently a strong defensible boundary, which could set a precedent for further sprawl which would reduce the Green Belt gap between Boston Spa and Clifford.

Outer North East

3131 Primrose Lane (east), Boston Spa

Site Details

Easting	442686	Northing	445260	Site area ha	1.6	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Flat field bounded by hedgerows. Stables building adjacent to the site in the south west. Surrounded variously by fields, residential, and school fields.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes

Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl
--------------------------------	--

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	Yes
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No

Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements
------------------------	---------------------------

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No

Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment
-------------------------	---

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	

Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features
----------------------	---

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Strong defensible boundary between the site and settlement. Well contained site reducing potential for further sprawl.
--

Outer North East

3131 Primrose Lane (east), Boston Spa

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

No Public Transport but some local services

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Long frontages give options for access. Footways and vis splays would need to be created.

4

Local network comments

Could be cumulative issues on High Street and J45 if other Boston Spa sites are taken forward. Junction visibility at Church Street and Clifford Moor Road may be substandard and should be checked.

4

Mitigation measures

Possible traffic management on Clifford Moor Road and Church Street. Creation of footway to site frontage. Possible traffic management works on High Street and works to J45 if all Boston Spa sites are taken forward

Total score

10

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
-----------------	-----------

Supported

Outer North East

3131 Primrose Lane (east), Boston Spa

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Parts of site highly susceptible to surface water flooding. There are a couple of public (foul) sewers within the site. We have a record of flooding within the field.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.89	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	11814.78
Nearest bus stop	8145
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	330.17

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Development would result in the crossing of Primrose Lane which is currently a strong defensible boundary, which could set a precedent for further sprawl which would reduce the Green Belt gap between Boston Spa and Clifford.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negatives climate change and local needs. Minor positives education; health; quality of housing and floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Pro

Services will be available

Anti

Will lessen the gap between Clifford and Boston Spa

Would result in a less defensible Green Belt boundary

Other villages should take their fair share

In planning terms would it not make sense to enlarge smaller hamlets and villages with new housing opportunities so that they can then become communities able to support their own schools, doctors, shops and other basics. The opposite seems to apply whereas the burden of new development is placed on those towns with existing facilities resulting in saturation levels being reached on their infrastructure and facilities.

Inadequate roads

Rural vista along Primrose Lane would be lost

Clifford PC will receive the precept but access and egress will be through Boston Spa.

Metro

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development. Distance to core network 3590, buses per hour 5, Access to primary schools Yes, Access to Secondary Schools yes, Access to primary health yes,

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development would result in the crossing of Primrose Lane which is currently a strong defensible boundary, which could set a precedent for further sprawl which would reduce the Green Belt gap between Boston Spa and Clifford.

Outer North East

3132 Church Street

Site Details

Easting	442857	Northing	445271	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Vacant land	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Vacant land	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Greenfield site within the urban area of Boston Spa. Site is situated within a conservation and contains several mature trees on its boundaries.
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

3132 Church Street

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy not fully met but some local services. Possible footway required on Church Street.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Access possible from Lonsdale Meadows. Could be difficult from Church Street due to junction spacing. Possible direct access. Footway to Church Street required.

4

Local network comments

Could be cumulative issues on High Street and J45 if other Boston Spa sites are taken forward

4

Mitigation measures

Possible traffic management on Clifford Moor Road and Church Street. Creation of footway to site frontage. Possible traffic management works on High Street and works to J45 if all Boston Spa sites are taken forward

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Thorp Arch
-----------------	------------

There is no capacity at Thorp Arch for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
-----------------	-----------

Supported

Outer North East

3132 Church Street

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Public (foul) sewer within the site. Possible surface water flood risk along Southern boundary.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.37	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	1.91	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.12
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	11856.79
Nearest bus stop	13732
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	268.66

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site within the settlement of Boston Spa. Within the conservation area. Development would need to respect the character of the area and the trees on site. This would be dealt with at detailed design stage.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield and natural resources. Minor negatives historic environment. Minor positives education; health; quality of housing; floodrisk; transport access

Summary of reps

Pro

Anti

Ideally any development should try to aim for refurbishment of the existing building to preserve the environmental character of the locality.

Other villages should take their fair share

Would it not make sense to enlarge smaller hamlets and villages with new housing opportunities so that they can then become communities able to support their own schools, doctors, shops and other basics

The colour coding is conditionally acceptable but development of this site should only be allowed as a last resort in the event of a major shortage of housing in the village

Less suitable than other sites

It would be better as open space or even as an extension to the playing field or as amenity green space with a footpath/cycleway link to the playing field and to St Mary's School.

Extend the village boundary

Would be better left as open space

These two areas would benefit Boston Spa residents by being converted into public park or other green space.

This area is already overcrowded

Metro

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless. Distance to core network 3691, buses per hour 5, Access to primary schools Yes, Access to Secondary Schools yes, Access to primary health yes,

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is situated within the urban area of Boston Spa, adjacent to existing residential development. Development could preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area

Outer North East

3133 Woodacre Lane (north), Bardsey

Site Details

Easting	436452	Northing	443737	Site area ha	1.7	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Greenfield site. The site slopes steeply down towards the east. Residential dwellings lie to the north of the site, with open fields to the south and west. To the east of the site lies a previous UDP housing allocation. Significant tree belts are situated on the west and south boundaries of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Yes
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	Yes
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

3133 Woodacre Lane (north), Bardsey

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

An existing UDP housing allocation is present to the east of the site, as such the site would be well connected to the existing urban area, with residential development to the north and east. Therefore the site would partially round off the settlement

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2 buses per hour, 100% primary, no other local services

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Site frontage offers no options for access

2

Local network comments

Spare capacity but likely cumulative issues

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

8

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. Authorised Landfill (Licensed Site) on site. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

3133 Woodacre Lane (north), Bardsey

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the hedgerow along Woodacre Lane, and restrict any access to the east to Bardsey Beck and adjacent wet fen area through native shrub planting and fencing - to avoid disturbance to Otters and wet fen habitat

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.95	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.03
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	9292.47
Nearest bus stop	11711
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	169.50

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is situated on a very steep slope which could restrict the development of the site. Highways raise concerns due to lack of access options and poor accessibility.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negatives health; biodiversity; climate change; local needs. Minor positives quality of housing; greenspace; floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Pro

Engineering solutions can overcome concerns with the slope of the site, as shown on the adjacent site.

Access could be taken from land to the west which is also with their ownership

Anti

Opens up the opportunity for further development

Don't support overall or hmca numbers. Question the deliver of some extant permissions and previous allocations. Should not be using planning permission data which is over a year old

Insufficient open spaces

Already have a travellers site

Massive change in road layout

Site should have been seived out

Distance to village core#

It is a steeply sloping site

Metro

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development. Distance to core network 3962, buses per hour 4, Access to primary schools Yes, Access to Secondary Schools yes, Access to primary health yes,

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is situated on a very steep slope. Highways raise concerns due to lack of access options and poor accessibility. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

3134 Woodacre Lane, Bardsey

Site Details

Easting	436579	Northing	443560	Site area ha	9.1	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Education

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

A large greenfield site currently in agricultural use. The site slopes significantly down towards the beck and mature tree line to the east. A primary school lies to the west of the site with the Motte and Bailey, Castle Hill Ancient Monument to the south. A small UDP housing allocation lies to the north of the site alongside an open field. The surrounding road network is narrow.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	Yes
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	Yes
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

Outer North East

3134 Woodacre Lane, Bardsey

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The beck/trees create a strong boundary with the urban area to the east, however built up land also lies to the north and south of the site. As such the site will partially round off the existing settlement.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
2 buses per hour, 100% primary, no other local services	2

Access comments	
Footway required along site frontage and forward visibility works required	4

Local network comments	
spare capacity but likely cumulative issues	4

Mitigation measures	Total score
	10

Highways site support
no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints
Part of site in FZ2 & FZ3 Main River runs through site (Collingham Beck). See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the Bardsey Beck wildlife corridor through native shrub planting and fencing - to avoid disturbance to Otters and scrub/grassland habitat from recreation.	

Outer North East

3134 Woodacre Lane, Bardsey

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Part in Flood Zone 1. Land adjacent to Bardsey Beck is in Flood Zone 3B (Functional Flood Plain). There are a number of public sewers within the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.77	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	9118.73
Nearest bus stop	8864
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	282.81

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The beck and mature tree line create a strong boundary to the east between the built up area and the site. The site is mostly surrounded by built up land, except to the north where a short gap occurs to residential properties. As such development would partially round off the existing settlement. The site is also situated opposite Bardsey Junior and Infant school. However, the surrounding road network is narrow and there are significant Highways concerns. The site also lies adjacent to a conservation area and Motte and Bailey, Castle Hill Ancient Monuments. As such mitigation measures would be required to prevent any harm to these historical assets. In addition the site is situated on a significant slope which could impact on potential housing density and would result in any development being very prominent within the landscape. A protected mature tree belt and beck (with flooding concerns) lies to the east of the site which would prevent the development of this section of the site.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negatives health; biodiversity; climate change; floodrisk; local needs and historic environment. Minor positives quality of housing; greenspace.

Summary of reps

Generally comments are against development due to the site being greenbelt and fears that it would create ribbon development along the A58.

ANTI-DEVELOPMENT

Development of three of these sites would create horrendous linear development along the A58 with all of the attendant traffic and access problems.

Contiguous development of this sort would mean that Scarcroft, Bardsey and perhaps Collingham would lose their village identities, creating massive urban sprawl

It would devastate the Green Belt and run counter to recent promises by the P.W.

The site is close to Hetchell Woods which is a nature reserve.

METRO: We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

PRO-DEVELOPMENT

The site will 'round off the existing settlement'. The urban area and these natural features provide defensible boundaries which will prevent unrestricted sprawl of future development. The site is therefore well contained and will relate well to the existing urban area of Bardsey and the natural features of the site provide clear defensible boundaries which will prevent unrestricted sprawl.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The beck and mature tree line create a strong boundary to the east between the built up area and the site. The surrounding road network is narrow and there are significant Highways concerns. The site also lies adjacent to a conservation area and Motte and Bailey, Castle Hill Ancient Monuments. In addition the site is situated on a significant slope and as a consequence any development would be very prominent within the landscape. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

3135 Land south of Wetherby Race Course (adj to Race Course)

Site Details

Easting	441926	Northing	448431	Site area ha	17.2	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Outdoor sport facility

Other land uses - None

Topography	Undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	No

Description

Greenfield site currently in agricultural use. The site is seperated from the main urban area of Wetherby by the A1(M). The site is well contained by Wetherby Racecourse and associated buildings to the north and the former railway line (now a bridleway), and mature tree line to the south of the site. Open fields lie to the south and east of the site. Spring Lane is a narrow single track..

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

3135 Land south of Wetherby Race Course (adj to Race Course)

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

The site fails all the accessibility criteria but the size of this and the adjacent site give some potential for new Public Transport and local services

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Access can only be gained via site 3136

3

Local network comments

Spare capacity in the local network but some impact likely

4

Mitigation measures

None identified to overcome site deficiencies

Total score

9

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

need to combine with 3136

Contingent on other sites

need to combine with 3136

Highways Agency

Impact Major Impact

Network Status

Likely to require significant physical mitigation

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Wetherby

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. Source Protection Zone 1 - small part to North of site. See comments in main text of our response

Outer North East

3135 Land south of Wetherby Race Course (adj to Race Course)

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the Thorp Arch Disused Railway LNA and adjacent trees, woodland and wetland areas - provide a 20 metre buffer to the disused railway and adjacent habitats.	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1. There a number of small drainage channels within the site. Part of site may be at risk of surface water flooding.	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		Core Strategy	
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	Main Urban Area	0.00
N34 PAS	0.00	Major Settlement	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	100.00	Minor Settlement	0.00
N1 Greenspace	0.00	Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
N1A Allotments	0.00	Regeneration Areas	
N5 Open Space	0.00	Inner South RA	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	LB Corridor RA	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	EASEL RA	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	Aire Valley RA	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00	West Leeds Gateway	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00		
Proposed Local Centre	0.00		
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00		

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.97
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	14864.36
Nearest bus stop	9781
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	539.32

Agricultural classification	Non-agricultural
-----------------------------	------------------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is not within Green Belt, however it is open countryside which is currently safeguarded by rural land policy (RL1) within the UDP. The development of the site is reliant on the development of 3136 for access. Development of the site would be unrelated to the existing settlement and represent a significant incursion into open countryside extending to the southeast of Wetherby. Presently the A1(M) forms a strong defensible boundary between the urban area and the countryside. The site would be isolated from the main urban area of Wetherby with only one access road across the A1(M) which creates a significant access barrier to the existing settlement.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negatives greenspace and greenfield. Minor negatives education; health; biodiversity; climate change; local needs; pollution; landscape. Minor positives quality of housing and floodrisk.

Summary of reps

There is general support for residential development on the site 3135 due to its location close to the A1 (M) which would provide easy access and also the fact that it would not significantly impact existing residents in the area.

PRO-DEVELOPMENT

Close to the existing Wetherby community and can therefore benefit from it - is likely to be far more favourable than the outcome of an anthropological assessment of site 1055.

Ideal site with close and excellent transport links. Adjacent to A1(M).

Site would not be overlooked or look out of place.

Would not represent any significant impact to surrounding existing villages, and most importantly it is not classified as green field.

To develop the site would be significantly easier than other highlighted as green and in doing so would have very little impact on local residents or the road network.

Facilitate resident quick and easy access to the main road network - particularly as the sites allow for major works to provide effective and safe access, with little disruption to existing residents.

Housing supply : Along with the development of site 3136, the site capacity would be 1348 dwellings which aid in housing provision.

ANTI-DEVELOPMENT

It is not well connected to the settlement and connectivity cannot be improved given the physical barrier that is the A1/A168 road corridors.

METRO: We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is not within Green Belt, however it is open countryside which is currently safeguarded by rural land policy (RL1) within the UDP. The development of the site is reliant on the development of 3136 for access. Development of the site would be unrelated to the existing settlement and represent a significant incursion into open countryside extending to the southeast of Wetherby. Presently the A1(M) forms a strong defensible boundary between the urban area and the countryside. The site would be isolated from the main urban area of Wetherby with very limited access across the A1(M) which creates a significant access barrier to the existing settlement.

Outer North East

3136 Land south of Wetherby Race Course, Walton Road

Site Details

Easting	441678	Northing	448168	Site area ha	34.2	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Managed Forest

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Greenfield site currently in agricultural use. The site is seperated from the main urban area of Wetherby by the A1(M). Open fields surround the site to the north, east and south, with Wetherby Racecourse and associated buildings further beyond to the north. A former railway line (now a bridleway), and mature tree line runs along the north boundary of the site. Spring Lane is a narrow single track..

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

3136 Land south of Wetherby Race Course, Walton Road

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

The site fails all the accessibility criteria but the size of this and the adjacent site give some potential for new Public Transport and local services

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Access could be achieved by way of a new junction onto Walton Road

4

Local network comments

Spare capacity in the local network but some impact likely

4

Mitigation measures

None identified to overcome site deficiencies

Total score

10

Highways site support

Yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact Major Impact

Network Status

Likely to require significant physical mitigation

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Wetherby

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

3136 Land south of Wetherby Race Course, Walton Road

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the Thorp Arch Disused Railway LNA and adjacent trees, woodland and wetland areas - provide a 20 metre buffer to the disused railway and adjacent habitats.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There a number of small drainage channels within the site. Part of site may be at risk of surface water flooding. There is a short section of highway drain in the West of the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	100.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.22
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	14582.90
Nearest bus stop	9781
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	512.42

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is not within Green Belt, however it is open countryside which is currently safeguarded by rural land policy (RL1) within the UDP. Development of the site would be unrelated to the existing settlement and represent a significant incursion into open countryside extending to the southeast of Wetherby. Presently the A1(M) forms a strong defensible boundary between the urban area and the countryside. The site would be isolated from the main urban area of Wetherby with only one access road across the A1(M) which creates a significant access barrier to the existing settlement. No Highways concerns raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield and natural resources. Minor negatives greenspace; biodiversity; climate change; local needs and pollution. Minor positives quality of housing; greenspace; floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Generally comments are pro-development due to the site's close proximity to the road network (A1) and limited impact on existing villages.

PRO-DEVELOPMENT

Quick and easy access to the main road network.

Would not represent any significant impact to surrounding existing villages, and most importantly it is not classified as green field.

Close to the existing Wetherby community and can therefore benefit from it

ANTI-DEVELOPMENT

It is not well connected to the settlement and connectivity cannot be improved given the physical barrier that is the A1/A168 road corridors.

The site is isolated visually and physically from Wetherby.

METRO: We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is not within Green Belt, however it is open countryside which is currently safeguarded by rural land policy (RL1) within the UDP. Development of the site would be unrelated to the existing settlement and represent a significant incursion into open countryside extending to the southeast of Wetherby. Presently the A1(M) forms a strong defensible boundary between the urban area and the countryside. The site would be isolated from the main urban area of Wetherby with very limited access across the A1(M) which creates a significant access barrier to the existing settlement.

Outer North East

3152 Spen Common Lane, Bramham

Site Details

Easting	444493	Northing	441515	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Other Rural Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage

The barn on north side of farmyard adjacent to west side of Headley Hall and former aircraft hangar approximately 200 metres south east of Headley Hall Farm are Grade II Listed Buildings.
There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that “special regard” should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset (including its setting) are not likely to be harmed.

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Outer North East

3152 Spen Common Lane, Bramham

14/00132/FU	Variation of condition 2 (Plans schedule) of approval 11/04642/EXT for MINOR MATERIAL AMENDMENT - revised access details	A	90
11/04642/EXT	Extension of time for planning application 08/05954/FU for Change of use involving demolitions, alterations, extensions, recladding and new pitched roofs to existing farm buildings to form 3 two bed, 4 three bed and 2 four bed dwellings with associated garages	A	90
11/04640/EXT	Extension of time for Listed Building application 08/05953/LI for demolitions, alterations, extensions, recladding and new pitched roofs to existing farm buildings to form 3 two bed, 4 three bed and 2 four bed dwellings with associated garages	A	93

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	8777.87
Nearest bus stop	388
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	2431.76

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outer North East

3152 Spen Common Lane, Bramham

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

There is general support for short-term to medium term development of site 3152 as a new settlement which would also bring new facilities to the area.

PRO-DEVELOPMENT

The site is large and flexible enough for storage, with minimum disruption and good access and commercial viability. It would provide a new settlement means that amenities like schools, doctors, play areas church will be able to cope with the number of residents as it is all planned as a new settlement.

Site offer opportunity to develop purpose built settlement and infrastructure

Would seem to put less pressure on the environment and infrastructure development seems straightforward

ANTI-DEVELOPMENT

The plot is Green Belt and could only be developed following a Green Belt review.

Collingham Neighbourhood Planning Committee And Collingham With Linton Parish Council highlighted the following points:

- The plot is Green Belt and could only be developed following a Green Belt review.
- The land is agricultural and we should not support losing valuable agricultural land. It is likely however that by good design in this purpose built settlement the overall density of housing achieved will be greater than elsewhere in Outer North East Leeds, thus potentially taking less farmland.
- Pepper potting new development around existing villages will have too great an impact on infrastructure. Much better to design a large scheme with its own infrastructure, for example transport, schools, childcare, GP surgery, access to roads, drainage, green space, community halls, post office, pub and village shops.
- Creating a new village in its own right will allow a brand new integrated community to be developed.
- Comments generally suggest access to the A1 is seen as a positive from this site as it does not mean an increase in traffic through existing villages. Access to A64 is also beneficial for access to Leeds and York.
- The site would effectively create a new town which might compete with Wetherby. This could be looked upon as beneficial as Wetherby struggles to support its role as a major urban settlement, or damaging if it leads to the decline of Wetherby.
- Would appear to be little impact on existing villages and communities.
- Large site would benefit from economies of scale and resulting house prices would be more affordable than many of the villages in Outer North East Leeds.
- Profits through sale of the land would be retained by the University of Leeds and may therefore support the improvement and growth of the University, bringing benefits to the whole of Leeds. There were 38 comments in total, 26 supportive and 12 opposing development. There are several positive points from a planning perspective. The comments recognised that the proposals represent a good use of land and it is much more likely that infrastructure will be appropriate for the 21st century than piecemeal development in existing communities.
- The opposing comments were generally seeking investment in the villages of Leeds to support a demand for housing for both young and elderly.
- This site should be considered further through feasibility assessment and master planning.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

3186 **Wetherby Health Centre**

Site Details

Easting	440316	Northing	448365	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

Outer North East

3186 Wetherby Health Centre

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--	--	--	--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--	--	--	--

Education comments

--	--	--	--

Flood Risk

--	--	--	--

Utilities

Gas			

Electric

--	--	--	--

Fire and Rescue

--	--	--	--

Telecoms

--	--	--	--

Other

English Heritage			

Natural England

--	--	--	--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/01594/CA	Conservation Area Application to demolish health centre	A	93

Outer North East

3186 Wetherby Health Centre

10/01593/FU	Part 2 storey part 3 storey residential care home with 58 bedrooms and 2 storey block of 8 extra care flats, with car parking and landscaping	A	100
12/01254/FU	Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of approval 10/01593/FU for MINOR MATERIAL AMENDMENT relating to part 2 storey part 3 storey residential care home with 58 bedrooms and 2 storey block of 8 extra care flats, with car parking and landscaping	A	98
12/9/00176/MOD	Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of approval 10/01593/FU for MINOR MATERIAL AMENDMENT relating to part 2 storey part 3 storey residential care home with 58 bedrooms and 2 storey block of 8 extra care flats, with car parking and landscaping NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 12/01254/FU: Vertical alignment of six windows on the West Elevation, incorporation of additional sash to two window components on the West Elevation	M01	98
11/02344/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18 and 22 of Planning Application 10/01593/FU	INT	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	1.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	1.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	14490.91
Nearest bus stop	9617
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	175.52
Agricultural classification	Urban

3186 Wetherby Health Centre

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

One comment in support of development on the site due to its location near the town center and easy access to public transport.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

3223 Elmhurst, Elmwood Lane, Barwick In Elmet

Site Details

Easting	439863	Northing	437113	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

3223 Elmhurst, Elmwood Lane, Barwick In Elmet

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/9/00198/MOD	8 four bedroom detached houses (Substitution of house types from previous approval)NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Removal of bin store annotation to front of	M01	94

Outer North East

3223 Elmhurst, Elmwood Lane, Barwick In Elmet

	Plot 6 and replacement of hardstanding with soft landscaping; land to fall within curtilage of Plot 6		
10/00734/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3 and 4 of Planning Application 09/05007/FU	A	94
09/05007/FU	8 four bedroom detached houses (Substitution of house types from previous approval)	A	94
09/05221/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3 and 4 of Planning Application 08/01837/FU	A	94

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.10
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3580.17
Nearest bus stop	377
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	100.69

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

One comment supporting housing development on the site as it would be infilling.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

3309 Scarcroft Cottage, Wetherby Road, Scarcroft, Leeds, LS14 3HJ

Site Details

Easting	436200	Northing	440886	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mixed
-----------	-------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

3309 **Scarcroft Cottage, Wetherby Road, Scarcroft, Leeds, LS14 3HJ**

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/03010/FU	Removal of condition 7 (stable block is restricted to the personal use of residents of Ashfield House) of application 06/02614/FU	A	55

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6440.38
Nearest bus stop	11714
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	56.55

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Only one comment highlighting that the plot of Ashfield House, Wetherby Road, Scarcroft which has been offered as a potential development site by the previous owner is no longer available for consideration and should be removed.

"I understand that the plot of Ashfield House, Wetherby Road, Scarcroft has been offered as a potential development site by the previous owner. As the current winter I can confirm that this pot is no longer available for consideration and I would be grateful if you could remove this option going forward.Kind reg"

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

3310 Land Boston Road, Wetherby

Site Details

Easting	440538	Northing	447810	Site area ha	1.5	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Other

Dwellings

Other land uses

Police Station

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Greenfield site within the urban area of Wetherby. The site is currently in green space use. The site slope significantly toward the river which wraps around the north and east boundaries of the site. The site has a very narrow access off Boston Road which is bounded by mature trees. The site is situated within a conservation area

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

3310 Land Boston Road, Wetherby

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

4 buses per hour, 100% employment, primary health & secondary education, 50% primary education

Rank (1-5)

4

Access comments

Limited frontage with Boston Road

4

Local network comments

congestion / cumulative issues

3

Mitigation measures

Junction improvement (width / visibility)

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes with junction improvements

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Wetherby

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ2 & FZ3b (Functional flood plain) as shown in LCC SFRA - development will not be appropriate in this part of the site. Main River (river Wharfe) to east of site. See comments made in main text of our response.

Outer North East

3310 Land Boston Road, Wetherby

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the River Wharfe SEGI. An undeveloped buffer of a minimum 20 metres is required that does not have public access, and is managed positively to enhance features for bats and Otters. Protected species surveys	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	
Site almost entirely in Flood Zones 3A, 3B and 2. Source is River Wharfe.	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		Core Strategy	
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	Main Urban Area	0.00
N34 PAS	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	Minor Settlement	0.00
N1 Greenspace	86.72	Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
N1A Allotments	0.00		
N5 Open Space	0.00		
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00		
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00		
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00		
UDP City Centre	0.00		
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00		
Proposed Local Centre	0.00		
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00		
		Regeneration Areas	
		Inner South RA	0.00
		LB Corridor RA	0.00
		EASEL RA	0.00
		Aire Valley RA	0.00
		West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	14023.92
Nearest bus stop	5587
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	97.82

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is presently designated as N1 greenspace on the existing UDP. Any development of the site would therefore be reliant on the site being deemed surplus for greenspace use. (See greenspace section, page 32-34). The site slopes significantly down towards the river which may impact on possible development. Flooding issues as the majority of the site lies within flood zones 3b (washland) and 3a (high risk). In addition the site only appears to have one very narrow access point, off Boston Road which is surrounded by high stone walls and mature trees. The site lies within a conservation area where careful consideration of these aspects would be needed.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative culture, greenspace and greenfield and natural resources.. Minor negatives biodiversity; climate change; pollution; landscape and historic environment. Minor positive health; quality of housing; climate change; local needs.

Summary of reps

There is support for development of site 3310 into residential accommodation, particularly elderly accommodation.

PRO-DEVELOPMENT

Building elderly residential accommodation within weatherby centre allowing for better access to health and social care services.

The site falls within the settlement limits of Wetherby and is within easy walking distance of the town centre.

METRO: From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Piece of open land adjacent to the river with adds to the character of the conservation area. The site slopes significantly down towards the river. Flooding issues as the majority of the site lies within flood zones 3b (washland) and 3a (high risk). The site also has very poor access.

Outer North East

3317 railway sidings at scholes

Site Details

Easting	437935	Northing	438259	Site area ha	3.3	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield/Brownfield mix
-----------	---------------------------

On-site land uses

Transport tracks and ways

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other

Other land uses

Garden Centre

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	No

Description

A very narrow linear site which follows a disused railway line and extends beyond the north of Scholes. Some areas of the site are full of mature trees. The majority of the site is surrounded by open fields.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	Yes
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

3317 railway sidings at scholes

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Part of disused railway line. Relates poorly to settlement and would constitute ribbon development. High potential for further sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: Unsuitable

Achievability: Uncertain

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Poor accessibility

1

Access comments

limited frontage with The Avenue / The Approach

2

Local network comments

congestion / cumulative issues

3

Mitigation measures

Total score

6

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Barwick in Elmet
-----------------	------------------

There is capacity at Barwick in Elmet for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support

Not supported

Not supported (RED). No site-based designations but this land is a linear lowland mixed deciduous woodland along a disused railway line. It is a very important wildlife corridor which cuts across intensive arable farmland. The tree cover would be seriously affected by development due to the constrained nature of the site. Will form part of the Leeds Habitat Network. The site is likely to provide bat feeding and potentially roosting habitat. Badger and harvest mice are also likely to use the corridor. The full extent of the biodiversity value has not been assessed.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	98.34	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00
-------------------	------

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	4155.05
Nearest bus stop	9233
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	134.55

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is a disused railway track and is therefore linear and extends out into the Green Belt, totally unrelated to the existing settlement form. Development would create a linear island site not considered acceptable development in the Green Belt. Highways concerns re access.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield; biodiversity; climate change and local needs. Minor negatives Education; health; greenspace; transport access; landscape and built environment. Minor positive quality of housing; floodrisk.

Summary of reps

Comments, along with the Scholes Parish Council agree with LCC's designation of site 3317 as RED.

METRO: We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is a disused railway track and is therefore linear and extends out into the Green Belt, totally unrelated to the existing settlement form. Development would create a linear island site not considered acceptable development in the Green Belt. Highways concerns regarding access.

Outer North East

3319 Main Street, Aberford

Site Details

Easting	443415	Northing	437008	Site area ha	1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture
Vacant land
General

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture
Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=≤5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	
--------	--	----------------	--

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	
-----------------	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support	
-----------------	--

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Outer North East

3319 Main Street, Aberford

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
12/05434/FU	Alterations and extension to Aberford Village Hall to form mixed use development (use classes A1, A3, B1 and D2) and erect 5 detached houses with associated car parking and landscaping	R	99
12/00885/FU	Alterations and extensions to Aberford Village Hall to form mixed use development (A1, A3, B1(a) and D1), fourteen houses and associated car parking and landscaping	R	99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	88.71	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	4369.73
Nearest bus stop	8198
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	176.59

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site was initially sieved out as Aberford does not fall within the settlement hierachy. On the recommendation of members the site has been put back in. The main issues with the site is access and it might be contingent on the partial or complete demolition of Aberford Village Hall.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

3322 Winnow Lane

Site Details							
Easting	441569	Northing	445458	Site area ha	14.6	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Dwellings	
Neighbouring land uses	
Agriculture	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Large greenfield site currently in agricultural use to the western edge of Boston Spa. Residential properties lie to the east of the site with open fields to the north, west and south. The A1(M) lies further beyond to the west of the site.
-------------	---

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	Yes
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

3322 Winnow Lane

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Large site that would significantly reduce green belt buffer around the settlement. Out of scale and could lead to further sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

3 buses per hour, 40% primary education, 60% secondary education & primary health

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Long frontage with Moor End should provide access

5

Local network comments

spare capacity

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

12

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact Major Impact

Network Status

Likely to require significant physical mitigation

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Wetherby

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

3322 Winnow Lane

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations			Core Strategy		
N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00		Major Settlement	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00		Minor Settlement	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00		Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
N1A Allotments	0.00				
N5 Open Space	0.00				
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00				
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00				
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00				
UDP City Centre	0.00				
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00				
Proposed Local Centre	0.00				
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00				

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	11872.70
Nearest bus stop	9559
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	307.23

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is set to the west of Boston Spa and although it is connected to the urban area along the eastern side it would result in a significant expansion to the settlement, reducing the gap between the town and motorway. No Highways issues.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield and natural resources. Minor negatives greenspace; pollution. Minor positives quality of housing; floodrisk and transport access.

Summary of reps

Comments agree that site 3322 is not suitable for development and any development would consitute over development in the area.

One comment that supports development outlines that Site 3322 (withdrawn by the owner) would have been the best site, infilling only towards the A1M, with good access to the High Street and minimal effect on through traffic in the village centre.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The development of the site would be unacceptable in Green Belt terms as it would result in unrestricted sprawl and fail to protect the countryside from encroachment. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

3323 Land at Brandon Golf Course, Shadwell

Site Details

Easting	433738	Northing	440259	Site area ha	4.5	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6346.10
Nearest bus stop	14403
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	230.67

Agricultural classification	Grade 4
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps
Comments agree with LCC's decision to sieve out the site.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

3325 Land at Thorner Lane Leeds

Site Details							
Easting	437152	Northing	438431	Site area ha	6.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	Agriculture
Neighbouring land uses	Agriculture Office

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Rectangular greenfield site currently in agricultural use. The site is not connected to any settlement and is wholly surrounded by open fields. Some mature trees exist to the west boundary of the site.
-------------	---

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	Yes
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

3325 Land at Thorner Lane Leeds

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Isolated site that is not connected to the settlement. Relates poorly and would set a precedent for development in this area that could lead to further sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2 buses per hour, 100% primary & secondary education, 100% primary health

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Thorner Lane ok for access

5

Local network comments

congestion / cumulative issues

3

Mitigation measures

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Barwick in Elmet

There is capacity at Barwick in Elmet for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

3325 Land at Thorner Lane Leeds

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	4077.57
Nearest bus stop	4987
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	241.16

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is set in an isolated position and does not relate to any of the nearby settlements. As such development would represent an island site within the Green Belt, contrary to the purposes of Green Belt. The site itself has a road frontage. No Highways issues raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negatives greenspace. Minor positives education; health; quality of housing; flood risk; transport access.

Summary of reps

Comments agree with site 3325's RED designation.

ANTI-DEVELOPMENT

Barwick in Elmet and Scholes Parish Council agree that the sites designated Red have been given the correct coding within the consultation documents.

Flood risk Houses in Scholes are at significant flood risk as the land is made of blue clay and therefore has very poor drainage. Significant evidence has been gathered by community groups to show the evidence of this; further housing in this area, specially to the North and East of the village, would put many properties in serious danger of flooding.

METRO: We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

OTHER COMMENTS

Suggest land use consistent with Green Belt Policies – Amenity Space.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is set in an isolated position and does not relate to any of the nearby settlements. The site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and encroachment of the countryside

Outer North East

3332 High Trees School, Boston Spa

Site Details

Easting	443230	Northing	444925	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Outdoor sport facility

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Education

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Greenfield site situated to the south of Boston Spa. Part of the site is in green space use. Mature trees bound the site. High Trees nursery is situated to the north of the site with Martin House Hospice further beyond. Open fields lie to the west and south of the site with a UDP PAS allocation to the east.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

3332 High Trees School, Boston Spa

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Relates poorly to settlement. Defensible boundary to south reduces potential for further sprawl, however, development would reduce separation between Boston Spa and Clifford.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+ yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

No Public Transport, 100% primary & secondary education, 100% primary health

2

Access comments

Frontage to Cinder Lane may provide access

4

Local network comments

Spare capacity

4

Mitigation measures

Footway on Cinder Lane

Total score

10

Highways site support

Yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Thorp Arch
-----------------	------------

There is no capacity at Thorp Arch for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

3332 High Trees School, Boston Spa

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations			Core Strategy		
N32 Greenbelt	98.44	% overlap	Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	1.56		Major Settlement	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00		Minor Settlement	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00		Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
N1A Allotments	0.00				
N5 Open Space	0.00				
N6 Playing Pitch	67.61				
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00				% overlap
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00				
UDP City Centre	0.00				
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00				
Proposed Local Centre	0.00				
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00				

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	11593.54
Nearest bus stop	6271
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	213.36

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is separated from the main settlement area. Development would represent isolated development and contribute to narrowing the gap between Boston Spa and Clifford. The site is also designated as N6 (protected playing pitch) in the current UDP. Any development of the site would therefore be reliant on the site being deemed surplus for greenspace use. (See greenspace section, page 32, question G8).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenspace and greenfield. Minor negatives climate change and local needs. Minor positives education; health; quality of housing.

Summary of reps

General support to retain the site as a greenbelt.

Other Comments:

If this is public space it should be retained, if this is privately owned and not accessible for all, then it should be considered for an alternative use.

The school should use it for sports there is a need to exercise our children more, if the school don't need it make it a communal green space, maybe build a skate park on it?

This is a current development plan protected pitch N6 allocation. We would object to this change unless one or more of our policy exceptions are met, as set out above, exceptions E1 – E5. Land no longer in use for sport is not an argument for its disposal to other uses. In Sport England's experience it is more likely this is down to the site owner closing the site off rather than lack of demand to make use of the playing field.

PRO-DEVELOPMENT:

In summary, the Site Allocations DPD considers the site to be in the red category, that being a site which are not considered suitable for a housing allocation. However we have shown in this assessment that the analysis carried out by Leeds City Council is flawed in that the site is wholly appropriate for development. We have shown that the site visually and physically already appears to be part of the settlement given it has good access to schools, services and shops and its ability to provide housing within a well contained site. The site is therefore appropriately and sustainably located. In the context of the housing need we have also shown that there are no policy issues which would preclude the allocation of this land in that the site does not perform a material Green Belt function and the site does not flood. We have also shown that there are no technical issues which would preclude the beneficial development of the site. Furthermore we have shown that the site is available for development and lies within a high market area and as such the allocation of the land for residential development in an early phase of the plan period would deliver much needed new houses.

Given all of the above it is concluded that the site should fall within either the green or amber category of the Site Allocations DPD assessment and should be allocated for residential development.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The site is also protected as green space.

Outer North East

3333 Land off Ling Lane, Scarcroft

Site Details

Easting	435069	Northing	441150	Site area ha	2.9	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	98.30	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6812.93
Nearest bus stop	5693
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	277.30

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Only one comment outlinesm of these site (1027, 3134, 3333 and 1106) would:

- 1. Create linear development along the A58 with all of the attendant traffic and access problems.
- 2. Contiguous development of this sort would mean that Scarcroft, Bardsey and perhaps Collingham would lose their village identities, creating massive urban sprawl.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

3334 Land South of A58 Collingham

Site Details

Easting	438294	Northing	445313	Site area ha	6.3	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Poorly defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Large undulating greenfield site in agricultural use which lies to the south west of Collingham. The site does not follow the existing established field boundaries. Mature tree lines run across the middle of the site. The site is surrounded by open fields to the east, south and west. Residential properties are present beyond the main road and beck to the north.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	Yes
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes

Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl
--------------------------------	---

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No

Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary
------------------------	--

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	Yes
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No

Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment
-------------------------	---

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	

Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features
----------------------	---

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Site is detached from the settlement of Collingham, unless adjacent sites are developed first. The site is seperated from the northern part of

Outer North East

3334 Land South of A58 Collingham

Collingham by a beck. Site would also not be contained by any rational field boundaries

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2 buses per hour, 50% primary health & secondary education

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Access looks ok from Leeds Road

5

Local network comments

Spare capacity but cumulative issues

3

Mitigation measures

Total score

10

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Wetherby

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

see 1294

LCC

Ecology support Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the hedgerow with standard trees that runs across the centre of this site, and the hedgerow

along the eastern boundary. This UK BAP priority habitat should be retained within the public open space or transport network. Historical records of species rich Magnesian Limestone Grassland ploughed out since 1977 - there may be relict corners within southern tip of the site so a botanical survey should be carried out and areas retained/enhanced if present. Provide a 10 metre buffer both side of the hedgerow running through the site and also to the eastern boundary hedgerow - these buffers to be planted with native shrubs and small trees (this 10 metre buffer not be allocated as garden space). Also there are a number of scattered trees which are valuable landscape and ecological features and should be retained within POS.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	11051.34
Nearest bus stop	3353
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	210.62

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The development of the site would constitute a significant encroachment into the Green Belt. The site is detached from the settlement of Collingham, unless adjacent sites are developed first. The site is further separated from the northern part of Collingham by Collingham Beck. The site boundary does not follow any field boundaries so no strong defensible boundaries currently exist. A mature tree belt is present along the north-east boundary of the site which creates a strong existing boundary to the existing settlement, even if the adjacent site (1294) was developed. A protected mature tree belt also exists diagonally across the site which could further restrict its development potential. Highways concerns regarding access.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield and landscape. Minor negatives greenspace, biodiversity; climate change; local needs. Minor positive quality of housing.

Summary of reps

Some comments raised concerns with flooding in the area,

PRO- DEVELOPMENT

Part of the Leeds Road site [1294, 3334] may be appropriate for housing for older people.

Medium to long term. If developed in conjunction represent next most suitable site if possible issues could be overcome.

According to the Environment Agency, the site is not within a flood risk zone.

If developed in conjunction with Site Ref No 1294 (see above) it would not be detached from the rest of Collingham. The site is well contained within a bowl and therefore the topography provides a defensible boundary.

The wider site is constrained by a significant slope which creates a natural bowl. The slope prevents further development to the south-west. The slope runs from the A58 in the north and forms a logical western and southern boundary.

If this strategy is taken forward the resulting development should have a minimal impact on the sensitive landscape character at the edge of Collingham, and the visual amenity of the site and its localised and wider surroundings.

If all the above together with SHLAA 1291 were brought forward, it is likely that sufficient funds could be available to provide the necessary infrastructure. This would include new school, new doctor's surgery and bypass for Collingham.

Technical highway and access appraisal have been undertaken by Local Transport Projects. They conclude:

- There is potential to provide two access points into the development site. Detail will be dependent upon the access strategy for the PAS land to the north of the A58, if it progresses.
- A reduction in the posted speed limit to 30-mph would be desirable. Trip generation projections indicate that a 'ghost island' right turn lane arrangement may be required; this can be accommodated within existing site and ownership constraints.
- Regular bus services into Leeds and to the village centre are available along the A58; existing bus stops are located on the site frontage.
- A footway would need to be installed along the site frontage to tie into the point where the existing footway terminates to the southwest of Crabtree Green, to enable suitable access for pedestrians.

ANTI-DEVELOPMENT

Greenbelt.

Prone to flooding.

Upgrading of the flood risk status of the site is currently under consideration by the environment agency

METRO: Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

The designation of SHLAAs 1294, 3334, 2135, 1251 and 1292 (all Red) is agreed with by Collingham residents.

The access would be via a major road which is an accident black spot with previous fatalities.

The development of sites 2135, 3334 and 1294 would significantly extend the existing boundary of Collingham along the A58 towards Bards

Loss of good agricultural land

Development would lead to ribbon development along the A58

Comments on phasing

3334 Land South of A58 Collingham

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The development of the site would constitute a significant encroachment into the Green Belt. The site is detached from the settlement of Collingham, unless adjacent sites are developed first. The site is further separated from the northern part of Collingham by Collingham Beck. The site boundary does not follow any field boundaries so no strong defensible boundaries currently exist. Highways concerns regarding access.

Outer North East

3353 Wetherby LS23 6HJ

Site Details

Easting	443153	Northing	444389	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Other Rural Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mix 50:50
-----------	-----------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

3353 Wetherby LS23 6HJ

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/05326/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26 and 27 of Planning Application 11/02879/FU	A	100

Outer North East

3353 Wetherby LS23 6HJ

11/04428/CA	Conservation Area application to demolish school buildings	A	100
11/02879/FU	Five detached houses to site of former school	A	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.74	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	100.00
-----------------	--------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	11054.70
Nearest bus stop	9114
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	153.82

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Only one comment outlining that development has already commenced on site 3353.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

3363 **Mill Lane, Bardsey**

Site Details

Easting	437113	Northing	443491	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	9082.41
Nearest bus stop	12795
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	240.29

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

PRO-DEVELOPMENT

SITE OWNER: The Steering Committee concluded that 4 sites be put forward as 'Green' sites at the Bardsey Public Consultation Day on 10/11/12.

These were :-

1153 — Catholic Church site, Keswick Lane.

3363 — Stone Gap, Mill Lane.

1027 NE — north-eastern part of land to the west of the A58, south of Bardsey.

3134 S — southern part of land to the east of Woodacre Lane.

In that presentation, 3363 was annotated as :-

— the site can regarded as infill

— quite close to the village core

— close to the A58 and bus routes for both commuting and school travel

The mix of housing could accommodate some elderly people.

Smaller development will have limited impact on the area.

Consider this should be allocated green on the grounds it is infill between existng residential developmet.

Development of this site would not have a visual impact on the rest of the village and is could be considered as infill since it is bounded on 2 sides by roads and on the other 2 sides by only two existing properties.

ANTI-DEVELOPMENT

The site has access issues:

This is a narrow lane frequently used by large agricultural vehicles that already damage verges trying to avoid parked vehicles. The lane, Wood Lane, at the back of the property is only single track with very difficult access to the A58.

Residents on Mill Lane have experienced repeated problems with drainage which would be exacerbated by any further development on Mill Lane.

The numbers of houses on this site are far too high and impractical both in terms of the slopes on the site and the surrounding dwellings2 - The garden of this house has specimen trees which would be a significant loss if the site was developed.

Development would cause destruction of substantial area of wooded landscape - which historically was an extension of Hetchell Wood a local asset of huge importance to the village and City of Leeds (listed within the top 70 tourist attractions of City of Leeds).

LCC has repeated declined planning applications on the site therefore reflect the site's unsuitability: Previous recent applications for much more modest development of this site (1 house) have been declined by Leeds City Council and also at appeal (2004

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

3371 Sweep Farm, Wetherby

Site Details

Easting	440144	Northing	447336	Site area ha	32.8	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	
Outdoor amenity and open space	
Agriculture	
Other	
Other land uses	
Hotel	

Topography	Undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Large greenfield site currently in agricultural use which lies to the south of Wetherby. The site is well contained by the existing road network to the north, east and west, however no significant boundary exists to the south. A hotel is present directly to the north of the site.
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	Yes
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

3371 Sweep Farm, Wetherby

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Wetherby Road currently provides a clear defensible boundary with the Green Belt. Development of the site would breach this boundary creating a significant incursion into the Green Belt. No defensible boundary to the south.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2 buses per hour, 10% primary health & secondary education

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Access ok from Wetherby Road

5

Local network comments

Spare capacity but cumulative issues

3

Mitigation measures

Total score

10

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	Major Impact	Network Status	Likely to require significant physical mitigation
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Wetherby cluster.			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.	

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

3371 Sweep Farm, Wetherby

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Parts of site highly susceptible to surface water flooding.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	13455.15
Nearest bus stop	4869
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	527.62

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Whilst the site has good accessibility to the town centre of Wetherby, Wetherby Road currently provides a clear defensible boundary with the Green Belt. Development of the site would breach this boundary creating a significant incursion into Green Belt with no current defensible boundary to the south side of the site, creating the potential for further unrestricted sprawl. No Highways issues raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor negatives greenspace; climate change; local needs and pollution. Minor positive quality of housing and floodrisk.

Summary of reps

PRO-DEVELOPMENT

The site is wholly appropriate for development given its relationship with the existing settlement of Wetherby. The site has good access to schools, shops and services as well as public transport links to Leeds City Centre. The site is therefore sustainably located.

There are no technical issues which would preclude the beneficial development of the representation site.

Other sites, typically 3135, 3136, 3371, 2158, 1233, 3125 are all the right side of Wetherby to facilitate resident quick and easy access to the main road network - particularly as the sites allow for major works to provide effective and safe access, with little disruption to existing residents.

On the assumption that site ref 1055 is green (I dispute this) then sites 3135, 3136 and 3371 should be also.

ANTI-DEVELOPMENT

Urban sprawl.

Open countryside location detached from urban area.

METRO: Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The development of the site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Site Details							
Easting	440370	Northing	437117	Site area ha	1.7	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics			
Site type	Greenfield		
On-site land uses	Agriculture		
Neighbouring land uses	Agriculture		
Dwellings	Allotment and city farm		
Other land uses	Cricket Pitch to west		
Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Greenfield site currently in agricultural use. The site is bounded by allotments to the north, sports pitches to the west and residential properties to the south. Open field lie beyond the east boundary of the site. Access to the site would be off Elmet Road.
-------------	---

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Yes
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

3375 Boundary between Green Belt and Urban Development

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Site relates well to settlement, however, potential for further sprawl to east

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+ yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

3 buses per hour, 100% primary & secondary education, 100% primary health

Rank (1-5)

4

Access comments

Access ok from Elmet Road

5

Local network comments

Spare capacity but cumulative issues

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

13

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Barwick in Elmet
-----------------	------------------

There is capacity at Barwick in Elmet for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

3375 Boundary between Green Belt and Urban Development

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3508.10
Nearest bus stop	7355
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	344.82

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site does not relate well to the existing settlement form as it abuts open boundaries with greenspace, allotments and Green Belt on 3 sides respectively.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield and landscaping. Minor positive education; health; greenspace; quality of housing; climate change; flood risk; transport access and local needs.

Summary of reps

Pro
The site is sustainably located and that it is well located to the urban area of Barwick in Elmet and its associated infrastructure

The site visually and physically already appears to be part of the settlement and its development will provide community benefits through the provision of an additional area of land to the sports club for use by the community and a car park to serve the primary school. The site has good access to schools, services and shops it is therefore appropriately and sustainably located.

In the context of the housing need we have also shown that there are no policy issues which would preclude the allocation of this land in that the site does not perform a material Green Belt function and the site does not flood. Furthermore we have shown that the site is available for development and lies within a high market area and as such the allocation of the land for residential development in an early phase of the plan period would deliver much needed new houses.

Affordable housing. a recent submission in Barwick is worth considering as amber as Barwick could support 40 new dwellings over 5 to 10 years particularly if the properties are suitable and affordable for first time buyers and young families

Anti
Traffic/Congestion
Impact on character and crime. we have concerns about the extent of development being targeted at ONE, and the negative impact that will have on rural villages like Barwick in Elmet, where we already experience problems with rat-running and crime, the latter not effectively supported by police officers or PCSO's

Green belt
Brownfield sites first
Agricultural land
Site boundary. The site has no defensible boundaries on three sides and would be far better used as space to provide further facilities for the village such as all weather sports field or other facilities in connection therewith

Conservation/Heritage. We support the overall assessment of this site as RED, but note that it is not only Green Belt, but an Area of Special Landscape Interest and SEGI, being close to the Limestone Ridge at Parlington, which has not been referenced in the assessment.

Metro Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
3428	8	Yes	Yes	
Yes				

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

3391 Headley Hall, Bramham, Leeds

Site Details

Easting	444313	Northing	441530	Site area ha	276	SP7	Other
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture
Managed Forest
Dwellings

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture
Managed Forest

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat and undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Poorly defined	Road front	Yes

Description

--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	Yes
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	Yes
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	Yes
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	Yes with mitigation
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Development of the site would create a significant new settlement within the Green Belt. New defensible boundaries could be incorporated within any scheme.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=≤5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5)
Fails all accessibility criteria, but size of site offers opportunities 3

Access comments
Various access points achievable 4

Local network comments
Significant mitigation likely to be required 3

Mitigation measures
Significant measures required - further information required Total score
10

Highways site support
Yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	
--------	--	----------------	--

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Thorp Arch
-----------------	------------

This is a large green belt site which would represent a significant new settlement. The site is remote from a sewage network and any existing treatment facilities.To determine the most appropriate route for the disposal of wastewater the required feasibility study/masterplan referred to in the Issues and Options document should include the provision of water and wastewater infrastructure to serve the development

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

FZ1 over 1 ha. Part PZ2 and 3. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support	
-----------------	--

Outer North East

3391 Headley Hall, Bramham, Leeds

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Very large site and (relatively small) parts of it are susceptible to surface water flooding

Utilities

Gas

Northern Gas networks owns and operates a high pressure pipeline which runs across the southern section of this site. This pipeline will be protected with an easement. The Institution of Gas Engineers and Managers document TD1 Edition 5 recommends a minimum distance of 55m from a normally occupied property. In addition to the Northern Gas Networks apparatus two other high pressure pipelines cross this site, these are owned and operated by National Grid who should be consulted in this enquiry.

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

The barn on north side of farmyard adjacent to west side of Headley Hall and former aircraft hangar approximately 200 metres south east of Headley Hall Farm are Grade II Listed Buildings.
There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that “special regard” should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset (including its setting) are not likely to be harmed.

Natural England

Housing site 3391 partly on ALC Grade 1 and 2. In accordance with the NPPF, Leeds City Council should avoid where possible protect soils, including quality agricultural land

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	98.64	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		

☐

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension		

☒

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Sch. Ancient Mon.	1.00
-------------------	------

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	8714.46
Nearest bus stop	388
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	2275.93

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Development of the site would create a significant new settlement within the Green Belt. The site could be a suitable alternative option given it's scale if a sustainable settlement could be planned. Additional information is required to assess the sites sustainability and capacity credentials, including a detailed feasibility study.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenspace; greenfield; climate cahnge and local needs. Minor negatives education, health; culture; waste; pollution and built environment. Minor positive quality of housing; floodrisk. Uncertain - biodiversity.

Summary of reps

METRO

None

Pro

More suitable than other sites. Would create a new community that would not ruin nearby villages such as Bramham Scholes and Barwick in Elmete, but reduce scale/size of the development. Such a settlement should be a completely sustainable and self-contained community and minimise impact on residents, wildlife

The University feels that this potential new settlement for Leeds could create a vibrant new community and also provide a source of enduring research and learning for the city which the University would wish to contribute and develop in conjunction with partners across the city.

Support but a master plan is required.

The opportunity to undertake a comprehensive development which would have the space and opportunity for the creation of all the elements of required infrastructure has to be preferable to the ad hoc development of infill sites

Close to employment in leeds

Housing supply and growth/ Affordable housing

Sustainable, should be developed in the medium term to alleviate pressure on the other development. It is a suitable alternative option because it is large enough to create a sustainable settlement with its own infrastructure.

Better access than other sites, close to A1 and A64 therefore providing excellent road links and good access to both York and Leeds

Support mixed use

Traffic has direct access onto major road routes to major towns and will not impact on small village amenities such as Boston Spa and Clifford.

No merging of settlements

Anti

Impact on area character. Villages evolve over time giving character and identity, the site is too big and will ruin the surrounding area

Green Belt. Any development, and especially one of this potential size, would dominate and be totally out of character with this area of small, ancient village communities and would represent nothing short of desecration of this beautiful area of Green Belt.

Sustainability. In summary, this allocation would be contrary to the Spatial Strategy, inherently unsustainable and contrary to the City Council's corporate aims for carbon reduction and climate change mitigation.

Poor access

A detailed study done to assess sustainability before it was brought for public consultation. It is, after all not compliant with the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy, and the size of settlement proposed would not be considered sustainable.

Lack of consultation

Conservation/Heritage

Agricultural land

The Agricultural land Classification map shows the area to be a mixture of Grade 2 and Grade 3 land quality. Bearing in mind the underlying geology, it is very likely that some of the Grade 3 land is, in fact, Grade 3a. It is Government and Leeds UDP policy that (that is Grades 1, 2 and 3a taken together), should not be used for non-agricultural development.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation with mixed uses

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Local preference for a new settlement to be planned with residential, general employment, other supporting uses and infrastructure.

Outer North East

3429 Land off Black Moor Lane, Bardsey

Site Details

Easting	435264	Northing	442128	Site area ha	2.6	SP7	Other
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	n/a
-----------	-----

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

3429 Land off Black Moor Lane, Bardsey

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
12/03805/CLP	Certificate of proposed lawful use of the land outlined in red on the submitted site plan for the siting of permanent residential occupation	A	52

12/02398/CLP	Certificate of proposed lawful development for use of site as a residential caravan site	R	64
--------------	--	---	----

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	7748.65
Nearest bus stop	1399
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	844.11

Agricultural classification	Grade 4
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO
None

Pro
None

Anti
None

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

3437 Parlington Estate, Aberford

Site Details

Easting	441870	Northing	436369	Site area ha	2.4	SP7	Other
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Medium (6-10yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3005.73
Nearest bus stop	10202
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	1117.61

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO
None

Pro
None

Anti
None

Neutral
Site should not be developed but is better than others if it has to be.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

3438 **Aberford Road, Aberford**

Site Details

Easting	442407	Northing	435045	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Other
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mixed
-----------	-------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Medium (6-10yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--	--	--	--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--	--	--	--

Education comments

--	--	--	--

Flood Risk

--	--	--	--

Utilities

Gas			

Electric

--	--	--	--

Fire and Rescue

--	--	--	--

Telecoms

--	--	--	--

Other

English Heritage			

Natural England

--	--	--	--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	East Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2169.79
Nearest bus stop	4474
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	667.00

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Site Details							
Easting	438504	Northing	446654	Site area ha	4.1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	12407.98
Nearest bus stop	6144
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	384.96

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO
None

Pro
None

Anti
None

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

3452 Land off Potterton Lane

Site Details

Easting	440341	Northing	439513	Site area ha	17.1	SP7	Other
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	5900.36
Nearest bus stop	1378
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	262.74

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO
None

Pro
This site should be classed as PAS, good access on the A64 has good access via A64 and disused Potterton lane, this would also take the pressure off existing villages and create a self sustainable development. It would be perceived by the residents at Barwick and Scholes that the planners in Leeds are hell bent on giving the developers the sites that they want to develop, sites that they have already tee'd up!!! Sites that residents would support and would not affect our villages like 3452 and 3453 have been sieved out?? Is this so we cannot choose these sites, you have only left the developer chosen sites as amber!!! Corruption springs to mind!! Truth will out, it alwa does.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

3453 Land off Potterton Lane

Site Details

Easting	440099	Northing	439528	Site area ha	1.7	SP7	Other
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	5932.97
Nearest bus stop	11504
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	131.03

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

METRO
None

PRO
Should become a PAS site

ANTI
None

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

3461 Land off Tithe Barn Lane, Bardsey

Site Details

Easting	435937	Northing	442622	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	8182.81
Nearest bus stop	1399
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	81.64

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

ANTI DEVELOPMENT

The site is greenebelt and has access problems.

This is a flat site with access onto Tithe Barn Lane which then has a difficult exit onto Blackmoor

The site is also at the top of the hill, and some distance from the nearest bus route giving problems for transport for those without cars

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

4018 Shadwell Lane

Site Details

Easting	433266	Northing	440222	Site area ha	4.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Outdoor sport facility

Other land uses - None

Topography	Undulating	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Self contained rectangular field bounded by hedgerows. Previously in agricultural use now overgrown. Site adjacent to residential (Emville Ave)to the west. Brandon Golf course is to the north and shares the northern boundary. Shadwell Lane to the South.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	Yes
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	Yes
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

4018 Shadwell Lane

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Development of the site would significantly reduce the Green Belt gap between Leeds urban area and Shadwell and extend the linear form of the existing built up urban area.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

3 buses per hour, 100% primary & secondary education, 100% primary health

Rank (1-5)

4

Access comments

Long frontage with Shadwell Lane should provide adequate access

5

Local network comments

Spare capacity but cumulative issues

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

13

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knothrop

Knothrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

4018 Shadwell Lane

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations			Core Strategy		
N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00		Major Settlement	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00		Minor Settlement	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00		Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
N1A Allotments	0.00				
N5 Open Space	0.00				
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00				
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00				
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00				
UDP City Centre	0.00				
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00				
Proposed Local Centre	0.00				
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00				

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6516.34
Nearest bus stop	6796
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	212.05

Agricultural classification	Grade 4
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Development of the site would significantly reduce the Green Belt gap between Leeds and Shadwell and extend the linear form of the existing built up urban area. No Highways issues raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield. Minor positive education; health; quality of housing; climate change; floodrisk; transport access; local needs.

Summary of reps

Comments are against development and agree with the Council's designation of the site as RED due to reasons outline by the Council.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development of the site would significantly reduce the Green Belt gap between Leeds conurbation and Shadwell and extend the linear form of the existing built up urban area. No Highways issues raised.

Outer North East

4065 Piccolino's, south of A58, Collingham

Site Details

Easting	439231	Northing	446036	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Restaurants and Cafes	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Agriculture	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Existing restaurant premises with car park. Site is on a higher land level than the highway to the front. The west part of the site is situated within a conservation area
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

4065 Piccolino's, south of A58, Collingham

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Poor Public Transport and employment, some local services

2

Access comments

access options for small development

4

Local network comments

small development - negligible impact on local network

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

10

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Wetherby

There is a very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

4065 Piccolino's, south of A58, Collingham

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/00134/FU	Removal of condition 4 of application number 09/00705/FU (use of outdoor area for drinking only)	R	100
09/00705/FU	Re-installation of customer shelter to rear garden area of restaurant	A	99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

Outer North East

4065 Piccolino's, south of A58, Collingham

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	11958.04
Nearest bus stop	2846
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	19.01

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is currently an established restaurant with carparking, situated within the existing settlement. Acceptable for residential development in principle. The west side of the site is situated within the conservation area, which would be taken into consideration at detailed design stage.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative natural resources. Minor negatives climate change and local needs. Major Positive flood risk. Minor positives health; quality of housing; greenspace; greenfield.

Summary of reps

Generally Anti- Development :

The fact that the site is currently in use by an operational restaurant business and its associated car parking. The site is clearly previously development and is located within the sustainable settlement of Collingham. As such, the principle of development on the site is considered acceptable. However, as of July 2013 the site is currently an established restaurant which is well regarded in the local area. We therefore would strongly question the overall deliverability of this site.

Neighbourhood Planning Committee Consultation shows a presumption against development on the site : 26 comments in total, 8 supportive and 18 opposing development.

There would be a loss of employment in the village if the restaurant presently on the site would be shut down.

It is the only restaurant in the village and losing it will affect the community.

Public transport is inadequate and cannot accommodate more development: there is only one bus every hour towards Leeds or Wetherby and no direct bus to Harrogate.

There is a lack of public transport, residents of the new housing estate will be car dependent which makes the development unsustainable.

The UK needs more housing however not 4 bedroom detached housing.

There are other alternative and suitable sites in Wetherby.

PRO- DEVELOPMENT

However, there is some support for development of the site for Elderly due to site's close proximity to facilities in the area.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site situated within the urban area of Collingham. Acceptable for residential development in principle.

Outer North East

4068 Land to the East of Belle Vue Avenue, Scholes

Site Details

Easting	437966	Northing	436713	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Agricultural field with well defined boundaries and an attractive mature tree in the middle. Green Belt boundary runs to the east of the site. The north, west and south boundaries of the site adjoin existing residential development

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

4068 Land to the East of Belle Vue Avenue, Scholes

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

3 buses per hour, 100% primary and health, some local services

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

access achievable from Belle View Road cul-de-sac

4

Local network comments

small development - negligible impact on local network

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

4068 Land to the East of Belle Vue Avenue, Scholes

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/01211/OT	Outline application for mixed use development comprising residential development (C3) of up to 700 houses, including Extra Care residential accommodation (C2); retail and community uses (A1 to A5); health care (D1); and education uses (D1); car parking; means of access; infrastructure; open space; landscaping; and other associated works including demolition of existing house and agricultural building	R	99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

4068 Land to the East of Belle Vue Avenue, Scholes

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2822.72
Nearest bus stop	4490
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	80.96

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is situated within the existing settlement, not within Green Belt, adjacent to existing residential development. Residential development is acceptable in principle. No Highways issues raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative greenfield and natural resources. Minor positives health; quality of housing; flood risk.

Summary of reps

Generally, comments are supportive of development of the site specifically for Elderly Housing, Sheltered Housing and Bungalows for the disabled due to:

The site being in proximity with existing facilities,
The site is relatively small and can be accommodated within the existing infrastructure,
Elderly are less likely to have more than one car which means the impact on traffic congestion would be limited and
The site being close to elderly housing therefore would be an extension of elderly housing in the area.

If development commences, the Parish Council and existing residents are keen to see some of the greenspace retained on the site and also for existing elderly residents of the area to have priority to the new housing provided on the site.

ANTI-DEVELOPMENT

The few comments which are against development on the site are due to:

The availability of alternative sites in Hunslet, East End Park, Meanwood etc. these sites are more suitable for regeneration and the impact will development will have on traffic congestion.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site situated adjacent to existing residential development and not within land defined as Green Belt. The development of the site would form a small infill extension to the settlement. Acceptable for residential development in principle

Site Details

Easting	443444	Northing	438783	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Other Rural Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	Yes

Description

--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Longterm (+11yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	
Removed	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	5867.85
Nearest bus stop	4882
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	310.94

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is situated outside the defined settlement heiracy within the Core Strategy and as such is considered to be an unsustainable location. The site had existing planning permission for 5 dwellings, however this involve the change of use of existing agricultural buildings. This low impact proposal was considered to be acceptable in Green Belt terms. A higher density proposal would not be appropriate for the site given its significant isolated location.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

4072 White House Farm, Bunkers Hill, Aberford, LS25

Site Details

Easting	443365	Northing	436621	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Other Rural Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (= <5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	
Removed	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/03955/FU	5 dwelling houses comprising 3 detached and 2 semi-detached houses	A	93

Outer North East

4072 White House Farm, Bunkers Hill, Aberford, LS25

10/05289/EXT Extension of time period for planning application
08/01099/FU for substitution of housetype to plot 4 for one 5
bedroom dwelling house A 96

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	East Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	4001.66
Nearest bus stop	8198
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	226.09

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is situated outside the defined settlement heiracy within the Core Strategy and as such is considered to be situated in an unsustainable location. The site is also below the 0.4ha size threshold to be covered within the Site Allocations DPD. Given the sites context in terms of being located outside the Green Belt and adjacent to neighbouring residential development a low density residential development may be acceptable on the site. However, such development has already been accounted for within the windfall allowance.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

4074 Forensic Science Lab, Sandbeck Lane, Wetherby

Site Details

Easting	440944	Northing	448937	Site area ha	2	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Brownfield former laboratory site close to the centre of Wetherby. Residential properties exist to the west and south of the site with industrial premises to the east and north boundaries. A belt of mature trees is present to the west boundary of the site.
--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

4074 Forensic Science Lab, Sandbeck Lane, Wetherby

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

2 buses per hour, good access to Wetherby centre and other services

3

Access comments

Existing access provision adequate

5

Local network comments

Potential cumulative impact in area

3

Mitigation measures

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

4074 Forensic Science Lab, Sandbeck Lane, Wetherby

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	
2158+1233+3125+4074 = 1318 houses generates 329.5 primary and 132 secondary children. New 1.5FE primary school or 2FE to include site 1046.	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	
Housing site 1046 is within 750m of Kirk Deighton SAC/SSSI. Sites 2158, 3125, 1233, 4074, 4075 and 4076 within 2km to this site, which is an internationally important site for Great Crested Newts. If these allocations are retained/promoted, the supporting HRA should assess the likely significant effects upon this species. The SA should examine potential significant effects upon the interest features of the SSSI (see citation below) www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation_phtot/200441.pdf	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/02664/DEM	Determination for demolition of all structures on site	A	100
14/00611/FU	Demolition of existing buildings and the construction of 65 dwellings and other associated works.		100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	15221.38
Nearest bus stop	2209
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	109.52

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is brownfield land situated in a central location within the settlement. Residential development is acceptable in principle. No Highways issues raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negatives employment and economic growth; greenspace; pollution. Major positive BF. Minor positive education; health; culture; quality of housing; floodrisk and transport access.

Summary of reps

Pro Development

4074 could be suitable for elderly housing

Anti Development

I am opposed to the designation of the previously commercial use sites (4074, 4076, 4075, 4096)in the town for housing because these should be valuable source of future employment and the opportunity for mixed development will be lost.

No hills to gain access to principle Wetherby amenities.

Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Vacant brownfield site close to the centre of Wetherby with good links to local services. Residential development acceptable in principle.

Outer North East

4075 Mercure Hotel, Wetherby Road, Wetherby

Site Details

Easting	440315	Northing	447766	Site area ha	1.9	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Hotels, boarding and guest houses

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Existing hotel site within the urban area. Residential development lies directly to the north of the site with open fields to the south.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

4075 Mercure Hotel, Wetherby Road, Wetherby

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Meets all criteria

Rank (1-5)

4

Access comments

Existing access provision adequate

4

Local network comments

Potential cumulative impact in area

3

Mitigation measures

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
-----------------	-----------

Supported

Outer North East

4075 Mercure Hotel, Wetherby Road, Wetherby

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing site 1046 is within 750m of Kirk Deighton SAC/SSSI. Sites 2158, 3125, 1233, 4074, 4075 and 4076 within 2km to this site, which is an internationally important site for Great Crested Newts. If these allocations are retained/promoted, the supporting HRA should assess the likely significant effects upon this species. The SA should examine potential significant effects upon the interest features of the SSSI (see citation below) www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation_phtot/200441.pdf

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/04701/ADV	6 wall mounted illuminated signs, 2 non illuminated wall mounted signs and 4 free standing non illuminated signs to hotel	A	97
12/00113/FU	Demolition of existing hotel and erection of a foodstore with associated access, car parking, servicing and landscaping	R	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	1.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		

☐

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension		

☒

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00
-------------------	------

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	13916.32
Nearest bus stop	4869
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	118.13

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site which is well connected to the existing settlement with excellent accessibility to the town centre. However the site is presently in use as a hotel and would result in a loss of local employment.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Major negative natural resources. Minor negative pollution. Minor positives education; health; culture; quality of housing; greenfield; climate change; floodrisk; local needs.

Summary of reps

Generally the representations are pro development as the site is viewed as deliverable. Those who oppose development have concerns regarding the loss of employment and sustainability of the site due to the limited employment opportunities in Wetherby.

PRO DEVELOPMENT

Site 4075 would be suitable as an extension of the Micklethwaite development, but could do with some public amenities, such as park, pub, shop and church.

As a directly affected resident facing onto the carpark of the Mercure Hotel, Wetherby - I would be happy to work with Planners and Housing developers with a view to a sympathetic housing development being built on the site of the Mercure Hotel, Wetherby.

Mercure Hotel, Wetherby could be partly used for elderly housing - as close to Wetherby Town Centre - easy access.

Site of Mercure Hotel, Wetherby could be developed for housing in the shorter term 0-5 years -- so long as developers work closely with Micklethwaite View residents who face directly onto the site, develop something sympathetically to the area, in style and keeping with existing properties of Grange View and Micklethwaite View. Integration would be a key issue for directly affected residents.

The site can be brought forward and delivered within a short timescale and it would make a meaningful contribution towards housing land or other development requirements identified for the Town. However, we consider that this sustainable site could also be suitable for a range of alternative uses including care home, retail use or continuing hotel uses. Indeed, this site could potentially deliver a mix of uses in this location as part of a redevelopment proposal in this prominent location on the edge of Wetherby.

METRO: The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

ANTI-DEVELOPMENT

I am opposed to the designation of the previously commercial use sites (4074, 4076, 4075, 4096) in the town for housing because these should be a valuable source of future employment and the opportunity for mixed development will be lost.

Wetherby needs a balance of low cost/social housing and private housing, together with a variety of mixed retail and commercial sites providing the opportunity for local employment if it is to be a sustainable community of the future.

The Mercure is the only hotel in Wetherby and it fulfils an important local function, providing accommodation for visitors to the town together with leisure and conference facilities which need to be retained.

The existing housing in that part of the town (especially the huge Micklethwaite farm development) is more than sufficient.

Site poorly related to the built up area.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site within the urban area of Wetherby. Close to the Town Centre with good links to local services. Residential development acceptable in principle.

Outer North East

4076 Benfield Ford, Deighton Road, Wetherby

Site Details

Easting	440631	Northing	448638	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield		
On-site land uses			
Vacant building			
Vacant land			
Neighbouring land uses			
Other			
Dwellings			
Other land uses			
Petrol Station			
Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description	
Former car showroom located near the centre of Wetherby. Residential dwellings are surround the site.	

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

4076 Benfield Ford, Deighton Road, Wetherby

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

3 buses per hour, good access to Wetherby centre and other services

Rank (1-5)

4

Access comments

Access potential to York Rd and Deighton Rd

4

Local network comments

Small development - negligible impact on local network

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

12

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Wetherby

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

4076 Benfield Ford, Deighton Road, Wetherby

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing site 1046 is within 750m of Kirk Deighton SAC/SSSI. Sites 2158, 3125, 1233, 4074, 4075 and 4076 within 2km to this site, which is an internationally important site for Great Crested Newts. If these allocations are retained/promoted, the supporting HRA should assess the likely significant effects upon this species. The SA should examine potential significant effects upon the interest features of the SSSI (see citation below) www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation_phtot/200441.pdf

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/03718/FU	Redevelopment to form 63 sheltered apartments for the elderly, including lodge manager's accommodation, communal facilities and ancillary buildings, access, car parking, and landscaping.	AP	99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

4076 Benfield Ford, Deighton Road, Wetherby

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	14842.31
Nearest bus stop	3456
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	46.14

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site situated in a central location within the settlement. Residential development is acceptable in principle. No Highways issues raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negatives employment and economic growth. Major positive BF. Minor positives education; health; culture; quality of housing; climate change; flood risk and transport access; local needs and built environment.

Summary of reps

Comments are generally pro-development though with conditions:

The major site identified in Wetherby for housing (1046) seems a sensible location for infill housing development, although the consequences of the increased traffic movements and access onto Spofforth Hill will need to be carefully addressed. My reservation is that this major site should have a significant affordable housing element.

Suitable for short term housing supply and elderly accommodation

Metro

Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network.

Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.

Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site located close to the centre of Wetherby with good links to local services. Residential development acceptable in principle

Outer North East

4079 **Site of Prison Social Club, Walton Road, Wetherby**

Site Details

Easting	444213	Northing	447258	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mix 65:35
-----------	-----------

On-site land uses

Derelict

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor sport facility

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Site of the former Prison Social Club, with vacant buildings and surrounding greenspace. The site has housing development to the north, a protected playing pitch to the south, undeveloped land to the east and a mixture of greenfield and housing land the west.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

4079 Site of Prison Social Club, Walton Road, Wetherby

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2 buses per hour, poor access to all services - small development - adjacent sites should improve services in area

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

existing access adequate

4

Local network comments

small development - negligible impact on local network

5

Mitigation measures

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Thorp Arch
-----------------	------------

There is no capacity at Thorp Arch for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

4079 Site of Prison Social Club, Walton Road, Wetherby

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	14093.52
Nearest bus stop	5611
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	129.68

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is situated outside the defined settlement hierarchy within the Core Strategy and as such is considered to be situated in an unsustainable location. However, the site is brownfield and lies adjacent to existing housing development. Presently the derelict buildings are an eyesore, so development could improve the area.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negatives education; health; community cohesion; greenspace; greenfield and local needs. Minor positives quality of housing; floodrisk and built environment.

Summary of reps

Generally responses support development that retains some greenspace on the site and addresses highways issues and constraints.

PRO-DEVELOPMENT

Some amber sites (789, 2067, 4079, 1233) represent infill opportunities and should be considered as the infrastructure (roads particularly) in these areas are more developed and could accommodate small additions to traffic flow

Areas 2067 and 4079 offer opportunity for retention of some greenspace and delivering some housing development. . The development needs to be sensitive to the busy Wetherby Road/Wighill Lane/Walton Road and extra facilities for the existing community should be incorporated into the plans.

It should be possible to incorporate some infill housing, sensitive to the current development and still provide greenspace for recreation. Care should be given to ensure that development is sensitive to the busy Wetherby Road/Wighill Lane/Walton Road and pedestrian links to the existing railway line pathway should be incorporated to provide further recreational links to the wider area.

ANTI-DEVELOPMENT

It is not within the settlement hierarchy. It is not close to any existing services. It is in a remote rural location. It has poor accessibility.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

4096 Nidd Vale Motors, Wetherby

Site Details

Easting	440496	Northing	449219	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Derelict

Other

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Other land uses

Car Showroom

Topography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Former garage on the corner of Sandbeck Lane and Deighton Road in the north of Wetherby. Residential areas to the north and west. Industrial area to the south and east.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

4096 Nidd Vale Motors, Wetherby

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

2 buses per hour, good access to Wetherby centre and other services

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

existing access adequate for small development

4

Local network comments

small development - negligible impact on local network

5

Mitigation measures

Total score

12

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Wetherby
-----------------	----------

There is very limited capacity at Wetherby for new development. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Outer North East

4096 Nidd Vale Motors, Wetherby

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Minor surface water flood risk to NW boundary

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing site 1046 is within 750m of Kirk Deighton SAC/SSSI. Sites 2158, 3125, 1233, 4074, 4075 and 4076 within 2km to this site, which is an internationally important site for Great Crested Newts. If these allocations are retained/promoted, the supporting HRA should assess the likely significant effects upon this species. The SA should examine potential significant effects upon the interest features of the SSSI (see citation below) www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation_phtot/200441.pdf

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/00946/FU	Erection of a foodstore with associated access, car parking and landscaping		100
10/03988/ADV	1 internally illuminated freestanding sign	A	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	15361.53
Nearest bus stop	4299
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	56.45

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site located within a central location within the settlement surrounded by existing housing development. Suitable in principle for residential development. No Highways issues raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negatives employment and economic growth and health. Major Positive Floodrisk. Minor positives quality of housing; greenfield; transport access.

Summary of reps

Only three responses to the consultation which are against development of the site.

Metro: 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is being pursued for alternative uses by the land owner, subject to planning permission.

Outer North East

4150 Farfield House, Bramham

Site Details

Easting	442201	Northing	443441	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Dwellings	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Agriculture	
Transport tracks and ways	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	No

Description	The site incorporates an existing detached dwelling set within a large plot with landscaped gardens. The A1(M) runs along the west boundary of the site with agricultural fields to the north. Residential properties are situated to the east and south of the site.
-------------	---

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Yes
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

4150 Farfield House, Bramham

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The site would result in the rounding off of the settlement, low potenital for sprawl

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5)
Meets primary education and health only 2

Access comments
Low speed/ low traffic junction unusual but OK 4

Local network comments
Spare local capacity / cumulative impact 4

Mitigation measures Total score
10

Highways site support
no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------------------------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints
FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation.

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Outer North East

4150 Farfield House, Bramham

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	96.25	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	
Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %0.00

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	9941.24
Nearest bus stop	4526
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	414.95

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Within Green Belt but doesn't function as GB given existing larger residential property with gardens and surrounding land and outbuildings currently onsite. Forms a natural infill of land between the A1/M1 link road and the existing residential properties to the east and south. Access is from a private drive off Wetherby Road.

Site affects others?

Potential to link to 1155, but not contingent for either site.

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site which is related to existing residential development and would effectively round off the settlement.

Site Details

Easting	434029	Northing	439419	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	5459.80
Nearest bus stop	11956
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	486.57

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

4152 Aberford Road, Bramham

Site Details

Easting	442838	Northing	442649	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Other

Neighbouring land uses

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

A narrow flat field, not in use. Well contained by existing hedges along all sides. Located to the east of existing playing fields. Informal pathways cross the site for informal recreation use. Main Road frontage all along the eastern boundary. Significant tree coverage along the western boundary, but not within the site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	Yes
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

Outer North East

4152 Aberford Road, Bramham

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Existing residential development is present to the north of the site and further west. The site shares a boundary with an existing recreational /playing field. The site is well contained with clear defensible boudaries that would round off the settlement. A significant Green Belt gap would remain to nearby settlements.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Meets primary education and health only	2
Access comments	
Sufficient frontage to Aberford Road for access	5
Local network comments	
Footway improvements required	4
Mitigation measures	Total score
Footway improvements / traffic management	11
Highways site support	
no	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints
Site within SPZ3. FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Outer North East

4152 Aberford Road, Bramham

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	99.63	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %

0.00

4152 Aberford Road, Bramham

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	9288.67
Nearest bus stop	388
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	425.94

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is narrow, and therefore layout options for residential use are limited, but the surrounding residential properties and the adjoining recreational playing field would round off this side of Bramham. Aberford Road forms a defensible boundary to the east.

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Existing green space site. Site to be retained for green space use and is not available for development.

Outer North East

4154 Wike Ridge Lane, Alwoodly

Site Details

Easting	433083	Northing	440431	Site area ha	3.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor sport facility (golf course)

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

The site is agricultural land wrapping around three sides of an existing dwelling. To the south of the site is Brandon Close and to the west is Wike Ridge Lane. Brandon Golf Course lies to the east of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	Yes
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The site is bounded to the south by existing residential properties and the site wraps around an existing dwelling. Wike Ridge Lane and well-established hedgerows form boundaries to the site. However development of the site would lead to encroachment into the Green Belt and could lead to unrestricted sprawl to the north.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Meets primary education only	1

Access comments	
May be a problem getting sufficient visibility	3

Local network comments	
Spare local capacity / cumulative impact	4

Mitigation measures	Total score
	8

Highways site support	No
-----------------------	----

Contingent on other sites	
---------------------------	--

Contingent on other sites	
---------------------------	--

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------------------------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	
-----------------	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation. Ordinary watercourse (Brandon Dike) north of the site
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation (Amber) - Hedgerow and pond require mitigation. Pond and hedgerows both UK BAP priority habitats on the site.	

Outer North East

4154 Wike Ridge Lane, Alwoodly

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.90	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.10	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

4154 Wike Ridge Lane, Alwoodly

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6786.86
Nearest bus stop	11634
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	240.47

Agricultural classification	Grade 4
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site adjacent to existing residential development on two sides (separated by Wike Ridge Lane).The site is bounded to the south by existing residential properties and the site wraps around an existing dwelling. Wike Ridge Lane and well-establishd hedgerows form boundaries to the site. However development of the site would lead to encroachment into the Green Belt and could lead to unrestricted spral to the north.

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site adjacent to existing residential development on two sides. Local flooding/drainage concerns. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

4155 Land at Harewood Road, Collingham

Site Details

Easting	437396	Northing	445460	Site area ha	4.1	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Existing residential properties are located to the north, separated by Harewood Road, otherwise the field is sepearted from the settlement. The land is ploughed for arable agriculture and gently slopes to the south towards a dismantled railway and beck beyond, both of which form a natural boundary. Field hedgerows and a farmers track along the western boundary also provide defensible boundaries. All of the northern edge of the site has potential road frontage. Some trees along southern and western boundaries.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

4155 Land at Harewood Road, Collingham

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Existing residential development is present to the north of the site. If considered together with Site 1293 to the east , development of the site would partially round off the settlement. A significant Green Belt gap would remain to Bardsey with a defensible boundary in between.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=≤5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments		Rank (1-5)
Public transport accessibility comments		
Partially meets primary education		1
Access comments		5
Should be sufficient frontage for access		
Local network comments		3
No footway on site side, facilities on opposite side, cumulative congestion issues		
Mitigation measures		Total score
Safe means of crossing required.		
9		
Highways site support		
No		
Contingent on other sites		
Contingent on other sites		

Highways Agency			
Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail	

Yorkshire Water	
Treatment Works	
NOTE: Wetherby Waste Water Treatment Works has no capacity for further new development beyond what is already committed. Upgrades to the works will be required to properly treat foul water from this site	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	
FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation	

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Outer North East

4155 Land at Harewood Road, Collingham

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	98.20	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.22
-----------------	------

4155 Land at Harewood Road, Collingham

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	11069.75
Nearest bus stop	10264
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	182.00

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Existing residential development is present to the north of the site. As such development of the site in association with 1293 would partially round off the settlement. A significant Green Belt gap would remain with Bardsey to the south-west with the disused railway and tree line providing a defensible boundary to prevent further sprawl to the south of the site.

Site affects others?

Yes - 1293

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt Site. The site is reliant on the development of an adjacent site to round off the settlement. Site is steeply sloping. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

4162 Land to the rear of Woodland Gardens, Scarcroft

Site Details

Easting	436314	Northing	440937	Site area ha	1.4	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Medium (6-10yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6490.93
Nearest bus stop	8110
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	153.52

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Site Details

Easting	436219	Northing	440982	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6536.05
Nearest bus stop	5019
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	57.69

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

4165 Hampson House, Bardsey

Site Details

Easting	437067	Northing	443469	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/02057/FU	Replacement and relocation of shed	A	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	9056.67
Nearest bus stop	12795
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	194.26

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

4166 Land South of Shadwell Lane

Site Details

Easting	433312	Northing	439966	Site area ha	6.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Site made up of two parcels of land; two field separated by a hedgerow. Both fields in agricultural use. The eastern (larger) field is well-treed to the eastern; southern and partial western boundary. A small area of woodland sits to the southern part of the western (smaller) field. Shadwell Lane forms the northern boundary. To the west of the site is an existing residential estate. To the north, east and south is largely agriculture.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	Yes
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	Yes
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	Yes
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The development of the site would e a significant incursion into the Green Belt along Shadwell Lane. Although the site is well contrained to the east boundary by a row of mature trees, the development of the site would result in almost no Green Belt gap between Alwoodley and Shadwell.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable physical Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
CS Standards not met	1
Access comments	
Direct access from Shadwell Lane and link to adjacent housing availble	5
Local network comments	
Spare local capacity / cumulative impact	4
Mitigation measures	Total score
	10
Highways site support	
No	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required
Assessment of cumulative impact with other sites needed			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	
FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation	

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Outer North East

4166 Land South of Shadwell Lane

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/04097/FU	Change of use of land to a cemetery with parking and detached store and toiletblock		80
12/00177/FU	Use of site as a cemetery, with provision for parking, grounds keepers building and fencing	W	77

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.82	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.18	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6268.42
Nearest bus stop	14403
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	286.53

Agricultural classification	Grade 4
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Red - Green Belt site. Significant concerns regarding sprawl and coalescence with Shadwell.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site would have a unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of sprawl and coalescence as it would significantly reduce the gap between main urban area of Leeds and Shadwell.

Site Details

Easting	443496	Northing	441073	Site area ha	8.1	SP7	Other
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Green Belt. Located to the south east of Bramham, the field is self contained and used for agriculture (arable). The land is flat (very slight dip to the north) defined by clear field hedges. Surrounded by fields and accessed off a narrow farm track which also serves 4 (2 pairs of semis) residential properties opposite the site.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	Yes
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	Yes
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The site on it's own would form an isolated developemnt in the greenbelt.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Medium (6-10yrs) Suitability: Suitable physical Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
CS Standards not met	1

Access comments	
Direct access off Spen Common Lane possible	4

Local network comments	
Spen Common Lane is a remote, narrow country lane with no footways, unsuitable for development	1

Mitigation measures	Total score
	6

Highways site support	
No	

Contingent on other sites	

Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	
NOTE: Thorp Arch Waste Water Treatment Works has limited capacity for further new development. Upgrades to the works may be required to properly treat foul water from this site	

Environment Agency

Constraints	
Site fully within SPZ 3. FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation.	

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported. Note - Archaeology crop marks.	

Outer North East

4167 Spen Common Lane Infill, Bramham

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership % 0.00

4167 Spen Common Lane Infill, Bramham

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	7975.27
Nearest bus stop	4918
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	1610.75

Agricultural classification	Grade 3b
-----------------------------	----------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Greenbelt Site. Development of the site would lead to an isolated development not supported.

Site affects others?

3391 - site 4167 sites adjacent to 3391, a larger site submitted as a new settlement. 4167 would be best considered together with 3391.

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. This site has been incorporated into site 3391.

Outer North East

4170 Whinmoor Lane, Shadwell

Site Details

Easting	434927	Northing	438850	Site area ha	1.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	East Leeds, Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Horticultural nursery

Public house

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Two agricultural fields separated by a hedgerow and bounded by hedgerows, with individual dwellings beyond.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	Yes
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

4170 Whinmoor Lane, Shadwell

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Would be isolated development unrelated to any settlement.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=≤5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Meets primary education only	1
Access comments	
Direct Access from Whin Moor Lane possible	4
Local network comments	
Whin Moor Lane is a remote, narrow country lane with no footways, unsuitable for development	1
Mitigation measures	Total score
	6
Highways site support	
No	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints
FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation.

LCC

Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation (Amber) - hedgerows to retain and mitigate for otherwise acceptable. Hedgerows within and around the site are a UK BAP habitat. Retain and/or include hedgerows with boundaries between dwellings using locally native species.	

Outer North East

4170 Whinmoor Lane, Shadwell

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	4607.63
Nearest bus stop	5720
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	264.92

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Would be isolated development unrelated to any settlement.

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Do not want to promote new development directly outside the East Leeds Orbital Road; this principle is established all along its route.

Outer North East

4176 High Street, Boston Spa

Site Details

Easting	444005	Northing	445143	Site area ha	2.5	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Neighbouring land uses

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat and undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

A large pastoral field on the edge of Boston Spa settlement, with some buildings (agricultural/small scale/temporary) buildings on site. Existing residential properties along the western boundary, agriculture/fields to the north and east and allotments to the south separated by the A659 High Steet. Significant tree coverage in the NW corner of the site, otherwise open with some internal fencing. Defined boundaries made up of mature hedge rows.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	Yes
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	Yes
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	Yes
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	Yes
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

Outer North East

4176 High Street, Boston Spa

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The site is located on the edge of the settlement limits with residential properties along the western boundary and a couple of properties lie to the north of the site, although these are screened by woodland in the NW corner. The land extends beyond the built up area and although existing hedgerows define the site, it is not considered to round off the settlement and could lead to further sprawl to the east and south (currently allotments). However sprawl to the east would be contained by Firgreen Beck.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+ yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

No PT other OK

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

New access on to A639 requires alteration to speed limit, widening of road on frontage and removal of hedge for visibility splays

3

Local network comments

Frontage footway required, concern over vehicle speed from the east

3

Mitigation measures

Site access/frontage & contribution to cycle route on old railway line.

Total score

9

Highways site support

Yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required
n/a			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation. Site on historic landfill

LCC

Ecology support Not supported

Not supported (Red) - 90m from the River Wharfe SEGI to north and Firgreen Beck to east. These are important wildlife corridors for species such

as otter, bats, fish and birds. The site includes areas of lowland mixed deciduous woodland, a hedgerow adjacent to the main road and a pond. There is a bat roost 25m west of the proposed allocation. These bats will use trees and hedgerows on the site for feeding. Bats are a European protected species. The Firgreen Beck and River Wharfe both have recent records of otter, a European protected species. Otter use of the site is unlikely.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation (Amber) if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4176. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed. Retain the locally native hedgerow adjacent to the main road ideally by providing access from the west. Retain existing mature trees within the site and mitigate any that need to be removed by additional planting along the north and east boundaries. Provide a SUDs wetland for surface water and design to include retained minimum water depth of 500mm and plant with locally native fen and open water communities. Provide a minimum 15m locally native buffer zone tree planting on the north and east side of the proposed allocation - as shown by the Red hatched area. Ensure light pollution in the direction of these water courses is minimised. Provision of SUDs wetland or new wildlife pond to replace pond - if lost to development - this will help mitigate for loss of bat feeding habitat.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Site is located within Flood Zone 1. However, because of close proximity to River Wharfe, FFLs may need to be raised 600mm above the 100 yr flood level.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	11999.11
Nearest bus stop	1296
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	187.89

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt Site on the edge of the settlement with no known physical constraints. Would present a substantial encroachment into the Green Belt.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site in would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

4201 Land at Rose Croft, East Keswick,

Site Details

Easting	436127	Northing	444949	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Allotment and city farm

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	No

Description

Agricultural fields to the north of East Keswick. Adjacent to allotments to the west. Existing residential properties to the south (Rose Croft) and the site backs onto existing residential dwellings on Allerton Drive to the east.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Yes
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes	
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area		Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside		No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)		No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?		No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		No
Does the site contain buildings		No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

4201 Land at Rose Croft, East Keswick,

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=≤5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	
--------	--	----------------	--

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	
-----------------	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support	
-----------------	--

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Outer North East

4201 Land at Rose Croft, East Keswick,

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	10503.93
Nearest bus stop	7262
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	200.12

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Sieved out site- outside settlement hierarchy.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

4218 Thorp Arch & Boston Spa Cricket Ground

Site Details

Easting	443210	Northing	446123	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring land uses

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	No

Description

Existing cricket ground and pavillion with pedestrian access only through a gate from the Pax Inn carpark. Site boundary submitted to include adjoining residential property for access purposes.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

N/A

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Longterm (+11yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	88.68	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12760.32
Nearest bus stop	5069
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	102.49

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Not a Green Belt site, located in the settlement limits of Thorp Arch. Used as a cricket pitch. The pitch is landlocked with pedestrian access only through a gate from the adjoining PH carpark. Need to assess against PPG17 and greenspace needs.

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

4221 Barwick

Site Details

Easting	439786	Northing	437576	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Storage

Other

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Site has heavy mature tree cover which will limit the development potential.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Outer North East

4221 Barwick

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Meets primary education and health only

2

Access comments

Proximity to bend requires removal of trees for visibility

3

Local network comments

Narrow lanes, but existing commercial use of site would make difficult to resist

3

Mitigation measures

Total score

8

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------------------------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation

LCC

Ecology support	Not supported
-----------------	---------------

Red - The northern half of this site is Lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP habitat and should be excluded from the proposed allocation, together with significant tree belts along east and south-west boundaries. Note - next to Barwick Castle. Need to consult Archaeological Advisory Service

Outer North East

4221 Barwick

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation (Amber) if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4221. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent woodland habitat are addressed. Potential adverse impacts on foraging/commuting bats along woodland and tree edges - lighting to be minimised.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/01794/TR	Remove ivy and reduce canopy and crown thin by 20% on tree behind barn and remove limb from sycamore tree. Remove row of 6-8 trees in woodland area near public footpath and replant replacement trees further into woodland. To simply remove existing branches would spoil the overall shape of the trees.	NBJ	93

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	4049.67
Nearest bus stop	3371
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	227.69

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site with well-defined existing boundaries, heavy mature tree cover will limit capacity. Site may require contamination mitigation.

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site, not within the Green Belt. Significant tree cover to the north section of the site. Access concerns.

Outer North East

4229 Land behind Wyncroft Court, Barwick in Elmet

Site Details

Easting	439768	Northing	436787	Site area ha	2.7	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Site submitted forms part of a larger field in agricultural use, therefore no defined boundary along western side. To the east are existing residential properties. Leeds road forms the northern boundary with some housing beyond.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

No defensible boundary to the west therefore high risk of unrestricted sprawl and encroachment into the greenbelt.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments		Rank (1-5)
Public transport accessibility comments		
Meets primary education and health only		2
Access comments		
Access would need removal of hedgerow and traffic calming		3
Local network comments		
Narrow road,		4
Mitigation measures		Total score
Yes		9
Highways site support		
Contingent on other sites		
Contingent on other sites		

Highways Agency			
Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail	

Yorkshire Water	
Treatment Works	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	
FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation. Ordinary watercourse (culvert) crossing through southern section of site	

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Outer North East

4229 Land behind Wyncroft Court, Barwick in Elmet

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	97.27	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

4229 Land behind Wyncroft Court, Barwick in Elmet

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3287.75
Nearest bus stop	11892
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	202.79

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Site affects others?

no

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Outer North East

4234 Field & Well Opposite 4 Oaks Farm, Boston Spa

Site Details

Easting	442554	Northing	445689	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Allotment and city farm

Neighbouring land uses

--

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Currently used and divided into small plots for paddock/ small holdings with temporary small sheds. The site is surrounded on all four sides by residential development. Accessed off a private road/track (Oaks Lane) and with it's own access off High Street. The boundary to the south is an embankment with existing shrubs/hedgerow and some large trees.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Not GB

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments		Rank (1-5)
Public transport accessibility comments		
Meets primary education and health only		2
Access comments		4
Access from High Street possible, with tree loss to widen access.		
Local network comments		5
local capacity		
Mitigation measures		Total score
		11
Highways site support		
Yes		
Contingent on other sites		
Contingent on other sites		

Highways Agency			
Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail	

Yorkshire Water	
Treatment Works	
NOTE: Thorp Arch Waste Water Treatment Works has limited capacity for further new development. Upgrades to the works may be required to properly treat foul water from this site	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	
FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation	

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	

Outer North East

4234Field & Well Opposite 4 Oaks Farm, Boston Spa

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning HistoryApplications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

4234 Field & Well Opposite 4 Oaks Farm, Boston Spa

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12216.67
Nearest bus stop	12875
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	210.01

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is located within the settlement boundary of Boston Spa, in an exisitng residential area, dose to services and facilities. Access is poor, but could be improved.Conservation area

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site situated within consevation area. No suitable options to safely access the site

Outer North East

5001 Thorner Lane, Scarcroft

Site Details

Easting	437254	Northing	441511	Site area ha	2.5	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

5001 Thorner Lane, Scarcroft

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	7130.89
Nearest bus stop	12187
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	821.92

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

5022 Land South Of Main Street, Shadwell LS17 8ES

Site Details

Easting	433699	Northing	440017	Site area ha	4	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Suitability: Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.82	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6141.17
Nearest bus stop	14403
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	186.42

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

5126 Keswick La, Bardsey

Site Details

Easting	436705	Northing	443865	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (Red) - This site appears to be unimproved grassland with a feeder stream into the Bardsey Beck. This lies within the Magnesium Limestone Natural Area and may be relatively species rich. It should not be allocated without a detailed ecological survey - quality of site unclear. Development may need to include culverting the feeder stream which would not be acceptable.	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	9427.89
Nearest bus stop	6128
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	79.03

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

5134 Land at Wetherby Road/Walton Road Walton

Site Details

Easting	443897	Northing	447436	Site area ha	12	SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

3Bph, fails accessibility standards

1

Access comments

Access from Wetherby Road or Walton Lane OK

5

Local network comments

Thorp Arch proposals will improve network

3

Mitigation measures

In conjunction with 1055

Total score

9

Highways site support

Yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

1055

Contingent on other sites

1055

Highways Agency

Impact

Network Status

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported (Green)

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Outer North East

5134 Land at Wetherby Road/Walton Road Walton

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	99.60	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	14190.67
Nearest bus stop	5219
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	203.23
Agricultural classification	Grade 2

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

5139 HALLFIELD LANE WETHERBY

Site Details

Easting	440951	Northing	448552	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

Outer North East**5139 HALLFIELD LANE WETHERBY****SHLAA conclusions****Availability:****Suitability:****Achievability:****Summary of infrastructure provider comments****Highways Agency**

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/05385/EXT	Extension of time for Outline Application 06/06639/OT to erect 9 dwellings on site following demolition of existing veterinary surgery and residential dwelling	A	99

Outer North East

5139 HALLFIELD LANE WETHERBY

12/02592/FU	Demolition of existing buildings and development of 10 dwellings and associated works	W	99
13/04124/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 19 and 20 of Planning Application 12/05021/FU		99
12/05021/FU	Demolition of existing buildings and development of nine dwellings and associated works	A	99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.13
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	14857.32
Nearest bus stop	14330
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	47.47

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

5142 Land north of A58 Wetherby

Site Details

Easting	439785	Northing	447423	Site area ha	13.5	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	Yes
Would development result in an isolated development?	Yes
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	Yes
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

The site in isolation would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Significant ecology concerns given the presence of a SEGI.
--

Outer North East

5142 Land north of A58 Wetherby

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Fails C.S standards

1

Access comments

Access from A58 with widening

3

Local network comments

OK

4

Mitigation measures

Widen A58 for ghost island right turn

Total score

8

Highways site support

No

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact

Network Status

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

LCC

Ecology support

Not Supported

Not supported (Red) - River Wharfe SEGI runs down the west side of this proposed allocation. This river is considered to have more semi-natural characteristics than any other in West Yorkshire. The river retains its flood plain within parts of the site with 3.58ha in flood risk zone 3 and additional 1.343ha in zone 2 - exclude all of flood risk zones 2 and 3 from the proposal site. This proposed allocation also includes a small block of semi-natural woodland with a diverse range of woody species including mature and over mature trees of high nature conservation value -records also indicate that this woodland block supports native bluebell and early purple orchid suggesting long established habitat. The site also has records of calcareous to neutral grassland flora including species such as pignut, glaucous sedge, great knapweed, black knapweed, hoary plantain, lady's bedstraw, quaking grass, salad burnet, sweet vernal grass, upright brome and yellow oat-grass. The site is currently under managed and is dominated by coarse grasses, but more interest is expected to remain within the seed bank. The site used to support 8 species of orchid - they have not been recorded recently but some may still persist in the seed bank. Exclude the woodland and the parts of the scrub/grassland mosaic habitat

Outer North East

5142 Land north of A58 Wetherby

on the more steeply sloping areas as this has more potential for recovering species rich grassland from the seed bank, where the soil profile is thinner and more calcareous. Site may meet Local Wildlife Site criteria - would require an assessment. Forms an locally important part of the Leeds Habitat Network.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation (Amber) if Red hatched area excluded as per Drawing RM/5142 - River Wharfe supports otters and bats both European protected species. It also supports white clawed crayfish, a UK protected species. Ensure that development does not adversely impact on the River Wharfe by increased levels of lighting and recreational activity. Ensure that the hedgerow beside the A58 is retained for much of its length for feeding/commuting bats. Retain over mature and hollow trees as these are most likely now, or in the future, to provide roost sites for bats. Development of this site (as shown on Drawing RM/5142 as Amber) will result in loss of locally valuable scrub and grassland habitats which will should be offset by positive management of the land between the site and the River Wharfe.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00
-------------------	------

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	13440.47
Nearest bus stop	14197
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	598.26

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site in isolation would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Significant ecology concerns given the prescence of a SEGI

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site in isolation would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Significant ecology concerns given the prescence of a SEGI

Site Details							
Easting	438350	Northing	440830	Site area ha	4.1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported - Green.	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Fluvial Flood Risk = Low (FZ1). Surface water flood risk = Low.

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	6709.33
Nearest bus stop	1251
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	97.85

Agricultural classification	Grade 2
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Sieved out - Not within the settlement hierarchy

Outer North East

5158 Meadowside Keswick lane Bardsey

Site Details

Easting	436658	Northing	444001	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture
Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	No

Description

Maintained; mowed field (meadow//paddock?) asociated and accessed from existing property ("Meadowside") to the south. Well treed along western boundary. Existing residential properties (rear gardens) along eastern boundary separated by Bardsey Beck and substantial tree planting. Agricultural fields to the north.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Outer North East

5158 Meadowside Keswick lane Bardsey

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

No/Limited defensible boundary to the north, therefore considered a potential risk to unrestricted sprawl and encorachment into the Green Belt.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	
-----------------	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support	Not Supported
-----------------	---------------

Not supported - RED - largely in the updated 2014 Leeds Habitat Network. Remove the whole site in is too close to the Bardsey Beck. The site is semi-improved grassland adjacent to the Bardsey Beck a UK BAP priority habitat. It is in the strategic flood risk zone. Otters and bats European species use the beck corridor. There are also white-claw crayfish in the Bardsey Beck which are UK protected species. If the house becomes disused, restore the land to wildlife.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Entire site is shown to lie within SFRA FZ2. Bardsey beck runs along the Eastern boundary and it should be assumed that there will be no development within 9m of the beck. A detailed FRA will be required to support any development. Potential surface water flood risk indicated.

Utilities

Gas	
-----	--

Electric	
----------	--

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage	
------------------	--

Outer North East

5158 Meadowside Keswick lane Bardsey

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	76.49	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	9562.30
Nearest bus stop	6128
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	97.32

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Flood risk concerns. Also significant ecology concerns given the close proximity to Bardsey beck. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Flood risk concerns. Also significant ecology concerns given the close proximity to Bardsey beck. Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for an alternative strategic option.

Outer North East

5168 Wood Farm south of Ling Lane Scarcroft

Site Details							
Easting		Northing		Site area ha		SP7	
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward		

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Suitability: Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency			
Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail	

Yorkshire Water	
Treatment Works	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	

LCC	
Ecology support	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	

Utilities	
Gas	

Outer North East

5168 Wood Farm south of Ling Lane Scarcroft

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary	

Site affects others?	

Sustainability summary	

Summary of reps	

Comments on phasing	

DPP Allocation	
Not proposed as housing allocation	

DPP Allocation Conclusion	

Site Details

Easting	442241	Northing	442316	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Other
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--	--	--	--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works			
-----------------	--	--	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support			

Ecology boundary

--	--	--	--

Education comments

--	--	--	--

Flood Risk

--	--	--	--

Utilities

Gas			

Electric

--	--	--	--

Fire and Rescue

--	--	--	--

Telecoms

--	--	--	--

Other

English Heritage			

Natural England

--	--	--	--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/01515/EXT	Extension of time period for Listed Building application 10/02094/LI (carry out alterations and 2 single storey extensions to mansion to form 5 two bedroom flats and 2	A	100

HLA31041 THE BIGGIN GREAT NORTH ROAD BRAMHAM

one bedroom flats)			
13/01415/EXT	Extension of time period for planning application 10/02073/EXT (change of use including 2 single storey extensions of mansion to form 5 two bedroom flats and 2 one bedroom flats and link detached garage block)	A	100
10/02094/EXT	Extension of time period for Listed Building application 06/02123/LI (carry out alterations and 2 single storey extensions to mansion to form 5 two bedroom flats and 2 one bedroom flats)	A	100
10/02073/EXT	Extension of time period for Planning application 06/02119/FU (change of use including 2 single storey extensions of mansion to form 5 two bedroom flats and 2 one bedroom flat and link detached garage block)	A	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	8838.38
Nearest bus stop	388
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	615.94

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

HLA31042 201 HIGH STREET BOSTON SPA

Site Details

Easting	443230	Northing	445503	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:
---------------	--------------	----------------

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/9/00084/MOD	Demolition of showroom and erection of 4 storey block of 9 two bedroom and 1 three bedroom flats, with bike stores, bin store, relocated substation and 16 car parking spaces NON	M01	97

HLA31042 201 HIGH STREET BOSTON SPA

	MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 08/03104/FU: Minor alterations to the design of steel railings and stone walls on the west boundary of the development.		
10/01436/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 of Planning Application 08/03104/FU	SPL	97
13/01574/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 4, 6 and 19 of Planning Application 08/03104/FU	SPL	97
14/02420/FU	Increase in roof height to form storage area; with access stairs and landing area	A	97

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	1.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12158.29
Nearest bus stop	5851
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	133.54

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outer North East

HLA31042 201 HIGH STREET BOSTON SPA

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

HLA31043 FORMER GEORGE & DRAGON, HIGH STREET, WETHERBY, LS22 6LT

Site Details

Easting	440459	Northing	448063	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/02460/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 4 of Planning Application 10/02119/FU	A	100

Outer North East

HLA31043 FORMER GEORGE & DRAGON, HIGH STREET, WETHERBY, LS22 6LT

11/03209/ADV	Two illuminated and two non illuminated signs	A	96
10/02651/FU	3 two bedroom terrace houses	W	58
11/9/00260/MOD	Conversion to outbuilding to form single dwelling and erect 2 storey detached dwelling NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 10/04472/FU New walled bin enclosure with timber gates; sliding gates replace swinging gates; bin/bike store reduced in size; unit 4 plan haded landing window moved to suit; small garden for unit 4 with 1.2m stone boundary wall; reduced window opening to outbuilding west elevation; new french window to outbuilding east elevation; new small bathroom window to north elevation; new window over entrance to units 1 & 2; new window to unit 3 north elevation; changes to roof windows of unit 3; replacement of oriel window with french window with juliet balcony to unit 3	M01	73
10/04472/FU	Conversion to outbuilding to form single dwelling and erect 2 storey detached dwelling	A	73
10/02121/CA	Conservation Area Application to demolish outbuilding and part of annexe to public house	A	95
12/00040/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13 and 16 of Planning Application 11/04830/FU	A	73
10/04970/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 3 of Planning Application 10/02121/CA	A	95
11/04830/FU	Removal of condition 6 of application 10/04472/FU	A	73
10/04968/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 15, 17 and 18 of Planning Application 10/02119/FU	SPL	100
10/03804/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 4 of Planning Application 10/02119/FU	A	100
10/02119/FU	Change of use, including alterations and extension of part of public house to form 3 flats and covered car parking and erect detached block of 2 one bedroom houses	A	100
11/05068/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 13 and 16 of Planning Application 10/04472/FU	W	73

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	1.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	1.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	14242.14
Nearest bus stop	371
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	98.85

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Outer North East

HLA31043 REAR OF 134-140 HIGH STREET, BOSTON SPA, WETHERBY, LS23 6BW

Site Details

Easting	442899	Northing	445632	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Smaller Settlement Infill
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Wetherby	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Outer North East

HLA31043 REAR OF 134-140 HIGH STREET, BOSTON SPA, WETHERBY, LS23 6BW

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/00500/FU	Erection of two 4 bedroom dwelling houses and three 3 bedroom houses and change of use of building, including extensions, to form 1 four bedroom house.	R	100

Outer North East

HLA31043 REAR OF 134-140 HIGH STREET, BOSTON SPA, WETHERBY, LS23 6BW

09/00501/CA	Conservation Area application for demolition workshops and storage buildings	R	100
11/02612/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 3 of Planning Application 09/00500/FU	A	100
13/01063/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 17 of Planning Application 09/00500/FU	A	100
11/00359/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 of Planning Application 09/00500/FU	SPL	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	1.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	12219.49
Nearest bus stop	4151
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	101.40
Agricultural classification	Grade 3
Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outer North East

HLA31043 REAR OF 134-140 HIGH STREET, BOSTON SPA, WETHERBY, LS23 6BW

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted