

Site Details

Easting	421124	Northing	439489	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-
On-site land uses		
Vacant land		
Dwellings		
Neighbouring land uses		
Dwellings		
Allotment and city farm		

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Site bounded on all sides by existing residential developments, which prevent direct access to the site. Site has limited tree coverage, mainly on the site boundaries, these are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). An allotment site lies to the north west 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	Rank (1-5)
Good access to Public Transport, Education and Local Health facilities.	4

Access comments	
New access road requires retaining structures due to levels.	3

Local network comments	
Existing residential estate with some on-street parking issues.	3

Mitigation measures	Total score
Traffic Management measures?	10

Highways site support
Yes - with mitigation

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	Esholt
Various sewers towards western boundary of site	

Environment Agency

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

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Ivy Cottage to the south of this area is a Grade II Listed Building.

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) is 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
------------	----------	----------	-----------

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	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3315.39
Nearest bus stop	9719
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	141.95

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

Access would require removal of existing dwelling. There is a Tree Preservation Order over the site, however, the site has only limited tree cover and this could be considered in detailed design.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Anti				
Near Listed Building.				
My garden runs into this field and because of close proximity and the ground being on a slope i would completely overlook any such property built there.				
If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset (including its setting) is not likely to be harmed.				
Parish Council supports this site's amber designation as the designation acknowledges the issues in bringing forward this site for future development.				
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.				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
126	8	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Access would require removal of existing dwelling. There is a Tree Preservation Order over the site, however, the site has only limited tree cover and this could be considered in detailed design.

Site Details

Easting	421771	Northing	437622	Site area ha	7.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Aireborough, North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

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
14/03733/FU	Variation of condition 7 of planning approval 10/04261/OT to read "No more than 50 dwellings shall be occupied on the site until all the off-site highway works listed in the planning	A	98

obligation dated 10 November 2011, as varied by a Deed of Modification dated 29 October 2013 and as further varied by a Deed of Modification dated 6 January 2014 relating to the adjoining Clariant site have been completed."			
10/04261/OT	Outline Application including means of access to erect residential development for up to 150 dwellings with associated public open space and off-site highway works	R	98
12/02995/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 12 and 15 of Planning Application 10/04261/OT	SPL	98

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.01	% 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	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3053.59
Nearest bus stop	1144
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	819.63
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 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
Neutral
Long term - need to see what impact other development has.

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	420492	Northing	438841	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Horsforth	

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: 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
13/9/00044/MOD	Amendment to approval 10/03015/FU (One 6 bedroom detached house including conversion of chapel to form annexe and one 4 bedroom detached house both with	M01	98

63 Woodlands Drive - Cragg Wood Nurseries, Rawdon

	detached double garages) to alter building positions and replace outbuilding with double garage NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 12/01764/FU: Alterations to site and elevations		
11/05171/LI	Listed building application for repair of tombs and memorial stones and rebuilding of walls	A	98
10/03015/FU	One 6 bedroom detached house including conversion of chapel to form annexe and one 4 bedroom detached house both with detached double garages	A	98
11/05352/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 13, 17 and 18 of Planning Application 10/03015/FU	A	98
10/03014/CA	Conservation Area Application for demolition of outbuildings	A	98
12/01765/CA	Conservation Area Application to demolish outbuilding	A	98
11/04469/COND	-Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 3 of Planning Application 10/03014/CA	A	98
12/01764/FU	Amendment to approval 10/03015/FU (One 6 bedroom detached house including conversion of chapel to form annexe and one 4 bedroom detached house both with detached double garages) to alter building positions and replace outbuilding with double garage	A	98

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		Regeneration Areas		
N5 Open Space	0.00		Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00				

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Guiselley
Nearest train station distance (m)	3746.92
Nearest bus stop	12419
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	468.45
Agricultural classification	Urban

63 Woodlands Drive - Cragg Wood Nurseries, Rawdon

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

Anti
We do not have the infrastructure to deal with the traffic that already uses the road and to lose the fields and woods would be a tragedy not only for residents and the nature which thrives here but for the people who use the road for walking, cycling and generally enjoying the countryside which is easily accessible from the surrounding area.

Pro
Sifted out, but would appear to be ripe for development with minimal impact.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Not within settlement hierarchy

Site Details

Easting	420209	Northing	441344	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield	-
On-site land uses	Residential institution	
Neighbouring land uses	Outdoor sport facility	
	Outdoor amenity and open space	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Flat site set within Nunroyd Park, surrounded by N1 greenspace. There is an exisiting building on site which would suit conversion. There is limited tree cover 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 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: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Good access to bus services, no access to rail	4

Access comments	
The adopted highway would have to be extended from the current end of Swaine Hill Terrace, across the full extent of the site frontage onto the existing access track (Public Right Of Way). The public right of way may require improvements.	4

Local network comments	
Good connection to Kirk Lane and Queensway via Public Footpath	4

Mitigation measures	Total score
Extend adopted highway and improve PROW.	12

Highways site support
Yes - with mitigation

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	Esholt
Private water supply serves site from the south	

Environment Agency

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

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
09/02813/FU	Laying out of access and erection of 2 detached houses, a pair of semi detached houses and 4 terraced houses	R	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.01	
N1A Allotments	0.01	
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 %	2.79
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1605.76
Nearest bus stop	12345
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	194.17

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

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 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

Set within Nunroyd Park the site is surrounded by green space (designated as N1 on the existing Unitary Development Plan). The building is a positive building set within the conservation area and should be retained if possible. Conversion of the existing building would be the best use for the site, this would not require allocation. Adopted highway would need extending but acceptable in highway terms.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Anti
Unsuitable. In Yeadon Conservation Area and would affect park.

Metro

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network - 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).

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
277	8	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Allocate. Conversion site above 0.4ha, detail the requirement that redevelopment would not be acceptable.

Site Details

Easting	419291	Northing	442038	Site area ha	1.9	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments		Rank (1-5)
Public transport accessibility comments	Close to A65 and Guiseley Town Centre. Good access to Bus and Rail. Footway provision on parts of Springfield Road substandard.	4
Access comments	Improvements required along Springfiled Road to improve vehicle and pedestrian access.	4
Local network comments	Congestion on A65. Poor footway connections on Springfield Road site frontage and substandard footway over railway bridge on Springfield Road. Existing parking problems on springfield Road and adjacent residential streets.	3
Mitigation measures	Footway improvements and Traffic Regulation Orders	Total score 11
Highways site support	Yes - with mitigation	
Contingent on other sites		
Contingent on other sites		

Highways Agency			
Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
n/a			

Network Rail
Culvert + General asset protection issues

Yorkshire Water
Treatment Works

Environment Agency
Constraints

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

271 Springfield Road - Springhead Mills, Guiseley**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
13/03645/RM	Reserved Matters application for 54 houses	A	100
11/01857/OT	Outline application including laying out of access road, public open space and erection of 54 dwellings with associated car parking, landscaping AND full application for the refurbishment of industrial building and the replacement of 1 industrial building	A	100
09/05311/OT	Outline application to demolish mill buildings. layout access road and erect residential development comprising dwelling houses (use class C3), including conversion of mill building to residential use, residential care home (use class C2) ,assisted living apartments (use class C3), laying out of public open space, relocation of substation and associated car parking	R	100
14/9/00079/MOD	Reserved Matters application for 54 houses NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 13/03645/RM: - Site layout revised under revision notes L and M to include: Plots 9-13 revised siting, bay windows removed from plots 30-32 (F type) and minor changes to highway. - (Refer to site layout revision notes L & M for details)- House Type F plans and elevations (plots 30-32). Bay windows removed. Plot 10 changed to JV (variation) House Type - Boundary section to plot 10 updated	M01	100
09/00107/OT	Outline application to demolish mill buildings, layout access road and erect residential development, comprising dwellings, sheltered accommodation (use Class C3) and care home (use class C2) and conversion of mill building to residential (indicative only), with car parking	W	100
13/05454/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 31 and 32 of Planning Application 11/01857/OT	A	100
13/05452/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 3 of Planning Application 13/03646/CA	A	100
13/05873/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 11, 21, 24 and 33 of Planning Application 11/01857/OT	SPL	100

271 Springfield Road - Springhead Mills, Guiseley

13/03646/CA	Conservation Area application to partially demolish (removal of northern gable end) of Unit M2 and full demolition of all other buildings	A	100
13/9/00120/MOD	Outline application including laying out of access road, public open space and erection of 54 dwellings with associated car parking, landscaping AND full application for the refurbishment of industrial building and the replacement of 1 industrial building NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 11/01857/OT: Position of garages including alterations; realignments of building plots; amendments to internal road and pathway layouts and amendment to the arrangement of car parking spaces	M01	100
13/05453/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 9 of Planning Application 11/01857/OT		100
13/9/00127/MOD	Outline application including laying out of access road, public open space and erection of 54 dwellings with associated car parking, landscaping AND full application for the refurbishment of industrial building and the replacement of 1 industrial building NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 11/01857/OT:		100
14/02109/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 11, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 26 of Planning Application 11/01857/OT	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	1.00	
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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	466.22
Nearest bus stop	5893
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	151.27
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 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

Lime Green site - Benefiting from an extant planning permission, the site is included within the Council's existing housing supply.

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	417484	Northing	442962	Site area ha	24.6	SP7	Other
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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

734+4043+3026+1255B = 1389 houses generates 347 primary and 139 secondary children. High Royds (site 734) almost complete but in conjunction with other sites close by, a new 1.5FE primary school would be needed.

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
14/02212/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 of Planning Application	W	100

734 Bradford Road - High Royds, Menston

28/199/03/LI			
14/9/00121/MOD	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitches NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 28/198/03/FU: Modifications to the internal layout of the Planning Approved conversion scheme to Block 2; some consequential amendments to External opening and the site plan	M01	100
13/9/00093/MOD	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitches NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 28/198/03/FU: Modifications to internal layout of the approved conversion scheme to building 8; some consequential amendments to external openings and site plan	M01	100
14/01189/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 of Planning Application 28/199/03/LI		100
12/02344/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 11 of Planning Application 28/198/03/FU	INT	100
11/9/00192/MOD	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitchesNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 28/198/03/FU: Modifications to internal layout of building XVII, and amendments to external openings and site plan	M05	100
13/9/00060/MOD	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitches NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 28/198/03/FU: Amendment to internal layout of conversion scheme to building 8, some consequential amendments to external openings and site plan	M04	100
11/03516/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 11, 28 and 29 of Planning Application 28/198/03/FU	A	100
10/9/00085/MOD	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitches,NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Minor modifications to internal layout of the planning approved conversion scheme to building 12. Some consequential amendments to external openings and site plan	M01	100
14/00431/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 6, 8, 29, 40, 44 and 46 of Planning Application 28/198/03/FU	A	100
10/04543/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 of Planning Application 28/199/03/LI	SPL	100
11/9/00039/MOD	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitches,NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Minor modifications to scheme for building 13. Some consequential amendments to external openings and site planning	M01	100
14/9/00122/MOD	Listed building application to alter and demolish part of hospital to form dwellings creche medical & offices NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 28/199/03/LI: Modifications to the internal layout of the Planning Approved conversion scheme to Block 2; some consequential amendments to External openings and the Site Plan.	M04	100
13/01977/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 9, 29, 39, 40, 44, 46 and 49 of Planning Application 28/198/03/FU		100

734 Bradford Road - High Royds, Menston

14/9/00055/MOD	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitches NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 28/198/03/FU: internal layout of the planning approved conversion scheme to Block 5; some consequential amendments to external openings and site plan.	M01	100
12/9/00105/MOD	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitches NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 28/198/03/FU: Amendment to internal layout of building 1 which has led to consequential amendments to external openings and site plan	M01	100
14/01187/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 9, 29,, 40 and 46 of Planning Application 28/198/03/FU	A	100
14/02213/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 9, 29, 39, 40, 44, and 46 of Planning Application 28/198/03/FU	A	100
14/9/00057/MOD	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitches, NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 28/198/03/FU: Plot 230 only plot 229 to be as original planning consent ref 28/198/03/FUPlot 230 minor modifications to internal layout; some consequential amendments to external opening and site plan.	M01	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		Core Strategy	
N32 Greenbelt	100.00	Main Urban Area	0.00
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	Regeneration Areas	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	Inner South RA	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	LB Corridor RA	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	EASEL RA	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00	Aire Valley RA	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	West Leeds Gateway	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00		
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	1.00		

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Guiselay
Nearest train station distance (m)	1565.90
Nearest bus stop	12218
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	465.61
Agricultural classification	Urban

734 **Bradford Road - High Royds, Menston**

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 being built can be removed

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro
Brownfield - already largely built out.
Any further development should be on brownfield land not the green belt.

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	418731	Northing	442635	Site area ha	5.4	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.59	% 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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	440.37
Nearest bus stop	4836
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	115.71

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 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
Existing development.

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	419995	Northing	440357	Site area ha	1	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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: 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
11/05348/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 21 and 22 of Planning Application 11/02980/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	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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2175.85
Nearest bus stop	10299
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	325.35

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 is being developed - shown as lime green

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Anti
Insufficient consultation with people who live adjacent to these sites, confusion about the proposed sites and residents not being made aware of the scale of the developments.
Would lead to the merging of Leeds and Bradford.
Both the A65 and Apperley Lane are often at a standstill. The 'access only' roads e.g. London Lane are already used as rat runs.
Doesn't the building of 529 houses in an area denote a new school? The perfect site is 1308 (Naylor Jennings) rather than houses.
These houses already built are not supporting of your strategy. How is this development supporting the "distinctiveness" of Leeds?
Identify redundant factory sites, unoccupied residencies (5000 empty across Leeds), for example the A65 and the canal at Kirkstall (the old power station site I believe) the old factory sites off Netherfield Road,
A new junction at the Princess Pub area would significantly increase congestion on the edge of what is a conservation area
A particular concern is the volume of traffic from the JCT roundabout down apperley lane to greengates.

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	418881	Northing	442425	Site area ha	3.2	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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: Suitable Achievability: Short (= <5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Access comments	
Access from Netherfield Road	5
Local network comments	
Congestion on A65 and Oxford Road junction	4
Mitigation measures	Total score
Funding to Pedestrian facilities and bus stops	
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

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 (Green)	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Aireborough

742 Netherfield Road, Guiseley

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
13/00894/COND	Consent, agreement or approval of conditions 5 and 29 of Planning Application 11/02690/FU	A	100
12/9/00031/MOD	Laying out of access and erection of 87 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 11/02690/FU: Omission of single storey bay window and increase footprint of house to house types T6, T6 ALT, T10 and T13; omission of render projection on front elevation on house types T9 and T12	M01	100
12/00621/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 of Planning Application 11/02690/FU	SPL	100
11/02690/FU	Laying out of access and erection of 87 dwellings	A	100
12/05231/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 10 of Planning Application 11/02690/FU	A	100
12/01610/FU	Variation of condition number 30 of application 11/02690/FU (extend weekday building start time from 08:00 hours to 07:30 hours)	R	100
13/00938/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 8 and 37 of Planning Application 11/02690/FU	A	100
13/9/00053/MOD	Laying out of access and erection of 87 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 11/02690/FU: Removal of render from Plot 30 and render added to Plot 25	M01	100
11/02910/OT	Outline application to layout access and erect 98 dwellings	W	100
11/01495/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 13 of Planning Application 10/02762/OT	A	100
13/01214/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 9 and 11 of Planning Application 11/02690/FU	A	100
12/00616/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 of Planning Application 11/02690/FU	SPL	100

742 Netherfield Road, Guiseley

13/00893/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 28 of Planning Application 11/02690/FU	A	100
12/00618/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 30, 31, 32 and 33 of Planning Application 11/02690/FU	A	100
12/00612/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 27 of Planning Application 11/02690/FU	A	100
12/00617/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 34, 35 and 36 of Planning Application 11/02690/FU	A	100
12/02504/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 37, 38 and 39 of Planning Application 11/02690/FU	R	100
10/02762/OT	Outline application to layout access and erect residential development of circa 98 dwellings.	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	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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	212.36
Nearest bus stop	6801
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	96.84
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 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
Existing development - not prone to flooding.

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	416668	Northing	441668	Site area ha	1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2257.84
Nearest bus stop	11396
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	1483.06

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

Pro
Travellers do not need houses, but somewhere to stop. Site has good road connection, is not excessively large and will make an excellent site for travellers of all descriptions.
There is no logical reason for filtering out this land

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Not within settlement hierarchy

Site Details

Easting	418208	Northing	442605	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mixed	
On-site land uses		
Vacant land		
Neighbouring land uses		
Dwellings		

Other land uses - None

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

Description	
Small site on the edge of established residential area. Northern section of the site has significant tree cover.	

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
The site meets all accessibility standards	4

Access comments	
Access would be through the approved housing layout - some amendments may be required to footway provision.	4

Local network comments	
The small scale of development would not impact on the local network.	5

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
n/a			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Esholt

Environment Agency

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

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported - but White-clawed Crayfish recorded nearby	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	

Aireborough

1103 Bradford Road, Guiseley LS20

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
11/04269/FU	6 houses with garages and new access, parking and landscaping	W	100
12/00979/FU	Erection of 4 houses with garages and new access, parking and landscaping	A	100
14/00475/FU	Erection of three houses with garages and new access, parking and landscaping	A	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.03	% 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
-----------------	------

1103 Bradford Road, Guiseley LS20

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	760.06
Nearest bus stop	2903
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	152.38

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 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

Planning permission implemented but not complete. Site boundary amended to delete retail element from site. Site considered suitable for residential development, and has extant permission.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro

Only 4 houses there - could it not take a few more?

Metro

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. 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.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
132	4	Yes	Yes	

Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Planning permission implemented. Site boundary amended to delete retail element from the site. Site suitable for housing, but too small for allocation..

Site Details

Easting	420272	Northing	440229	Site area ha	2.2	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mixed	-
On-site land uses		
Allotment and city farm		
Agriculture		
Neighbouring land uses		
Agriculture		
Wholesale distribution		
Dwellings		

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site north of Green Lane, just west of junction with Apperley Lane. Eastern side of the site is dominated by existing employment use and bounded by mixture of employment uses and residential development. Warm Lane frontage and west/northern area of the site is part of the city farm, opening onto further fields 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?	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 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?	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

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

Green Belt site. Development of site 1104 in isolation would constitute urban sprawl, but development along with sites 2162 and 3033 would be contained by development on 3 sides.

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		
Good access to Public Transport, Education and Local Health facilities.		4
Access comments		3
Site has an existing acceptable access point onto Warm Lane but footway provision along Warm Lane is substandard.		
Local network comments		2
Local congestion issues. Warm Lane is already traffic calmed (speed cushions).		
Mitigation measures		Total score
Widen footway along site frontage		
Highways site support		9
Yes - with mitigation		
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	Esholt
Combined and surface water sewers along southern boundary	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	
FZ1 over 1ha. Part of this site lies in SPZ2. See comments in main text of our response.	

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

4020+2163A,+1180A+ 1311A,+2038+ 1221+ 2162+1104+ 3033+1308 = 1000 houses generates 250 primary and 100 secondary children. All sites combined would require a new 1FE primary school. 2FE secondary required across whole HMCA – land may be required to expand existing schools.

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	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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2435.70
Nearest bus stop	5982
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	218.36

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

Green Belt site. Existing city farm on site. Development of site 1104 in isolation would constitute urban sprawl, but development along with sites 2162 and 3033 would be contained by development on 3 sides. Highways consider that the site can be suitably accessed.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro
Agree subject to site 2162 being developed first. If new houses are not built over the coming years, lack of supply will continue to fuel the spiralling house prices and even more of the population will be priced out of the freehold market. Any access on to Gill Lane and/or Warm Lane would crea further traffic.
Whilst we recognise that there is potential for some development on site 1104 this needs to be limited to the position of any buildings that are to be demolished.

Anti
It will also mean promotion of urban sprawl as Leeds and Bradford continue to merge.
A65 new road is already massively congested. It is indisputable that the River Aire creates a bottleneck in the area, there being only 3 severely congested bridges at Saltaire, Horsforth and A658 Apperley Bridge. Peak journey times between Greengates junction and Green Lane (the JCT roundabout) can be 45 minutes for 2 miles.
Adding 600+ more cars to this will cause even more congestion/accidents. Airport expansion will also create more traffic on these local roads. There is no easy access to a railway station.
Brownfield first - Two examples are the One Stop facility in Rawdon and Kirkland House on Queensway that has been empty for some time now.

Also there is an estimated 5000 homes sat empty across the city
Where did Leeds get its Housing Target numbers? They seem to be higher than anywhere else in England despite having the lowest projected population growth.
Should be looking for smaller sized developments such as those found on Windmill Lane in Yeadon (near the junction with Grange Avenue), or the development on New Road Side in Rawdon (near to the junction with the B6152).
The hamlets of High Fold, Ghyllroyd and Nether Yeadon will disappear along with their heritage.
There are at least 10 listed buildings at last count. Conservation team should be consulted. It is likely that, following a heritage assessment of the site and its surroundings, development of this site will be un-realistic based on the impact upon the identified heritage assets.

The existing city farm is a valuable local amenity.
Sites 1221 and 1308 offer more potential.
More time should be given to allow the local residents to get together and discuss these proposed plans.

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.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
250	5	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Existing city farm on site. Development of site 1104 in isolation would constitute urban sprawl. Significant public objections. Proposed conservation area.

Site Details							
Easting	419046	Northing	441426	Site area ha	2	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Allotment and city farm	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Agriculture	

Other land uses - None

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

Description
Existing allotment site within residential area. Site is flat with limited tree cover. Road frontage along eastern side. Number of temporary structures associated with allotments across 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: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Within 800m of railway station. 50% of site accessible to buses. 50% of site within acceptable distance to employment and town centre. Accessible to education and healthcare.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Access possible from Silverdale Ave or extension to Silverdale Mount, both 'traditional estate roads', pedestrian access possible on to Coach Road with improvement.

5

Local network comments

Silverdale Ave, existing on street parking to houses towards Park Road problematic, this is the shortest route out, Coach Rd is narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road so not to be encouraged. Capacity issues at Park Road / A65 Gyratory.

3

Mitigation measures

Traffic calming may help but won't provide the full solution.

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes - with mitigation

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	Esholt
-----------------	--------

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Possible flood risk from watercourse / ditch along the NW boundary 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	97.66	
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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	808.91
Nearest bus stop	8389
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	284.08

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

Loss of allotments would need to be considered through the greenspace review. (See Greenspace section page 23 question G8).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro
It may be that Silverdale residents would prefer to lose the allotments if by doing so they were able to retain the valued rural access to Esholt Woods (or other Green Belt sites) which would otherwise be threatened by development.
Release the land for housing as it is derelict and unsightly, with a risk of attracting rats.
The land is not open for the enjoyment of the public, there being no public right of way across or through the land. Suitable for release.

Anti
Shortage in available allotments this land should be made available to new allotment tenants.
Still in use, used by 5 owners in about 4-5 acres of the 10-11 acre site
It has been deliberately and offensively left derelict for many years in the hope of gaining permission to but still demand for allotments.
There is a Covenant on this land preventing the erection of more than one house per plot.
Strongly disagree with the documents use of the words "Surplus". It is said there are surplus allotments in the area but with several hundred names on waiting lists.

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)				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
390	5	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Allocate the site for housing with stipulations that half of the site looking onto Silverdale Avenue be laid out for allotments with a management plan to ensure that they are available for public use. Demand for allotments in the area and proper laying out of the site will increase useage.

Site Details

Easting	417776	Northing	442413	Site area ha	20.5	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-
On-site land uses	Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	Dwellings	
Dwellings	Agriculture	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Large area of Green Belt land north west of Guiseley used for agriculture. Site is bounded to the east by Bradford Road, and to the southeast by Thorpe Lane. Site is bounded on all other sides by further agricultural land. Site slopes down from Thorpe Lane and has limited tree cover, which predominantly runs along field boundaries. Thorpe Lane has a significant tree line.
-------------	--

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?	
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?	No
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
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

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

Development of the site would result in a breach of Thorpe Lane, an important boundary preventing sprawl towards Bradford. The Green Belt is necessary to prevent coalescence between settlements of Guiseley and Menston.

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

Only approximately 50% of the site is within Public Transport accessibility standards, only approximately 30% of the site is within accessibility to other services, no footways on Thorpe Lane.

Rank (1-5)**2**

Access comments

Access could be created on Thorpe Lane but no footways on Thorpe Lane at moment and trees will need to be removed. Preferred access off Guiseley Drive with signals on Bradford Road but Guiseley Drive appears to be private for High Royds development, access onto Bradford Road not suitable.

4

Local network comments

Local congestion issues on A65.

3

Mitigation measures

Possible signals on Bradford Road from private Guiseley Drive, extend adopted highway on Guiseley Drive, access improvements onto Thorpe Lane, footway required on Thorpe Lane, footway needs to be wider on Bradford Road, pedestrian/cycle access onto Bradford Road directly, bus service to divert into site if possible, junction capacity improvements along A65 likely

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
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

n/a

Network Rail**Yorkshire Water**

Treatment Works	Esholt
-----------------	--------

Large surface water sewer in north eastern corner of site

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response. Mire Beck runs through the site.

LCC

Ecology support	Not supported
-----------------	---------------

Not supported (RED). No designated sites but Mire Beck flows through the site which is an important wildlife corridor together with the adjacent grassland for breeding Curlew. White-clawed Crayfish, Bullhead, Brown Trout to consider.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/1148. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitat are addressed i.e. protecting and enhancing the wildlife corridor function of the Mire Beck, and pond towards southern boundary.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Potential flood risk from Mire Beck (ordinary watercourse), which runs through the site. Also, OS plan indicates a possible spring in the SW 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
10/01445/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 26, 28 and 29 of Planning Application 28/84/05/RE	A	77

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	4.70	
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 %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1101.42
Nearest bus stop	1771
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	358.93

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 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

Green Belt site. Development of the site would result in a breach of Thorpe Lane, an important boundary preventing sprawl towards Bradford. The Green Belt is necessary to prevent coalescence between settlements of Guiseley and Menston. The site is attractive and a designated Special Landscape Area. Part of the site is also N6 greenspace in the current UDP (see question G9, page 24). Development would require footway improvements on Thorpe Lane and access through High Royds site.

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - biodiversity (ecology objection) and greenfield site. Minor negative - community cohesion and local distinctiveness (size of site in relation to settlement), greenhouse emissions, transport network, accessibility, landscape and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - flood risk.

Summary of reps

Support

It has reasonable road accesss, which could be diverted through the High Royds development, thus removing the need to make further access points to the A65
An extension of High Royds village could ensure appropriate education, transport, health, shopping and infrastructure as was originally propsoed for High Royds, a compromise is required.
Perhaps it is red for political reasons ie influential nimby voters on Tranmere?!
Would provide for a natural extension of the existing settlement area and would relate well to the existing urban environment. Good transport links - Guiseley Railway Station approximately 750m-1km away, within 250m of a parade of shops and 500m of a school.
The site is considered to be more suitably located compared with the 'amber' site at land between Mire Beck and Ings Lane (site 3026).
Legal/Ownership/Tenancy Issues - The proposed site is owned by a single client.

Anti

Performs an important role in preventing coalescence.
Retain as green space - possible future alternative use for golf.
Main comments related to other sites as well, particularly if 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65.

Sport England

It is identified as amenity green space in the open space audit and put forward as housing. 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.

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).

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
391	4	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development of the site would result in a breach of Thorpe Lane, an important boundary preventing sprawl towards Bradford. The Green Belt is necessary to prevent coalescence between settlements of Guiseley and Menston. The site is attractive and a designated Special Landscape Area.

Site Details

Easting	419075	Northing	441233	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Agricultural site south of junction with Coach Road and Spring Road (track). Site slopes towards Spring 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?	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

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

Green Belt site. Site A (the northern section) relates well to the urban area when considered with 1311A and 2163A.

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 is outside bus and rail accessibility standards but accessible for health and education.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Access could be created onto Coach Road with provision of footway on frontage.

5

Local network comments

Route through Silverdale estate not suitable for large increase in traffic because of existing on street parking to houses on Silverdale Ave towards Park Road which prevents two way free flow of traffic. As an alternative route out, Coach Rd is unadopted, narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road which can't be addressed with this

3

Mitigation measures

Traffic calming throughout the Silverdale Avenue would help to meet street design guide requirements for a 25mph design speed but won't provide the full solution as the on street parking near Park Road will remain.

Total score

10

Highways site support

Yes - with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

Yes

Contingent on other sites

Yes

Highways Agency

Impact

Network Status

No objection

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Esholt

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported - no objections

1180A Coach Road (land off), Guiseley LS20

Ecology boundary

Education comments

4020+2163A,+1180A+ 1311A,+2038+ 1221+ 2162+1104+ 3033+1308 = 1000 houses generates 250 primary and 100 secondary children. All sites combined would require a new 1FE primary school. 2FE secondary required across whole HMCA – land may be required to expand existing schools.

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

This site adjoins the boundary of the Guiseley Park Gate 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

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"/>	

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	

1180A Coach Road (land off), Guiseley LS20

Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00
-------------------	------

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1003.72
Nearest bus stop	8389
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	471.04

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 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. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development due to Highways concerns and the fact that development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. A comprehensive development along with sites 1311A & 2163A would be appropriate. Site A (the northern section) has a road frontage and relates well to the urban area, when considered with 1311A and 2163A. This smaller site (ie site A) will put less pressure on the road network. Traffic calming in Silverdale Estate would be required.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to education and health services and greenspace and overall accessibility and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti
Coach Road is partly narrow and partly unmade. Development of Coach Road (2163A, 1180A and 1311A) is simply ludicrous. All three sites would need to access Park Road. Access for cars would have to be made out onto Park road and over the railway line into Ghyllroyd. The road is heavily used by cyclists, runners, walkers and horse riders to access Spring Woods and the cycle track to Yeadon. Important nesting sites fro curlews & lapwin. Important for recreation, cycling, horse riding, running, dog walking. Very close to Esholt Woods. Historic Parkland adjacent to listed building. The plan is destroying a conservation area of Park Road Estate. The land was more useful for alternative uses - suggest medical centre or school, access allowing, allotments, recreation, agriculture as alternative use.

Pro
Development of this site would constitute sustainable development with no significant adverse impact. The site is available as soon as required, is developable without any insurmountable physical constraints to development, and is deliverable in the short term. This site is extremely well located to the facilities and services in Guiseley and access to public transport. It is located close to bus stops and Guiseley railway station, as well as shops, the retail parks, primary and secondary schools, healthcare facilities and areas of employment

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
549	5	No	No	No

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

A comprehensive development along with sites 1311A and 2163A would be appropriate. Traffic calming in Silverdale Estate would be required.

Site Details

Easting	418970	Northing	441156	Site area ha	2.7	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-
On-site land uses	Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	Agriculture	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Agricultural site south of junction with Coach Road and Spring Road (track). Site slopes towards Spring Road. Tree coverage along field boundary lines.
-------------	---

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?	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

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

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development due to the fact that development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern.

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)

This part of the site (Site B) does not meet any of the accessibility standards.

2

Access comments

Adequate access can be provided through site A.

3

Local network comments

The route through the Siverdale estate is not appropriate for this level of development.

2

Mitigation measures

Total score

7

Highways site support

No

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact

Network Status

No objection

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Esholt

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Support - no objections

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	99.87	% 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
-----------------	------

1180B Coach Road (land off), Guiseley LS20

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1062.80
Nearest bus stop	8389
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	519.61

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

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development due to Highways concerns and the fact that development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. The quality of the road network would prevent a large development (both A and B) in this area.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site and natural resources (agricultural land).Minor negative - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive -flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti
Historic Parkland adjacent to listed building.
Access and traffic would be very hard to manage and totally clog up the silverdales feeding into gridlock on park road and the gyratory.
Forms an important greenbelt break between Leeds and Bradford

Pro
There could be a small number of houses to blend in with these areas.
The site is well related to the existing urban area and is close to shops and services, community and leisure facilities, public transport, education and local health facilities.
It is located close to bus stops and Guiseley railway station, as well as shops, the retail parks, primary and secondary schools, healthcare facilities and areas of employment. This site is considered to be in a highly sustainable and suitable location for new housing development.

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
662	5	No	No	No

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development due to Highways concerns and the fact that development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern.

Site Details							
Easting	420358	Northing	443426	Site area ha	3.4	SP7	Other
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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
11/05005/FU	Use of site as all weather turnout and exercise menage with 4 stables, tack room and timber barn	A	57

1186 Cross Lane (land at), off Carlton Lane, Guiseley LS21

12/00978/COND Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 5 and 7 of Planning Application 11/05005/FU A 57

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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1928.31
Nearest bus stop	2187
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	1229.75

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

Pro
Travellers do not need houses, but somewhere to stop. As all these sites have a good road connection, are not excessively large, they will make excellent sites for travellers of all descriptions.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Not within settlement hierarchy

Site Details							
Easting	421982	Northing	442947	Site area ha	2.6	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Otley and Yeadon	

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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	3207.92
Nearest bus stop	4872
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	198.50

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

Pro
Travellers do not need houses, but somewhere to stop. As all these sites have a good road connection, are not excessively large, they will make excellent sites for travellers of all descriptions.
Not sure why these were filtered out. Many small villages in this area lack affordable housing for the young.
Would be much more appropriate than any sites at Carlton Lane, Banksfield Mount, Gill Lane or Warm Lane/Appley Lane.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Not within settlement hierarchy

Site Details

Easting	417242	Northing	441646	Site area ha	2.2	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield -						
On-site land uses	Agriculture						
Neighbouring land uses	Agriculture						
Dwellings							
Outdoor sport facility							
Other land uses	Woodland						
Topography	Sloping			Landscape	Limited Tree Cover		
Boundaries	Existing well defined			Road front	Yes		

Description

Site located at junction of Thorpe Lane and Hawksworth Lane. Site is surrounded on 3 sides by green fields, residential use is established to the east, but Thorpe Lane provides a well defined boundary. Western border is heavily covered by trees, and there is no substantial boundary to the open green fields to the north. Site slopes towards Hawksworth 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?	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?	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

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

Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and acts a strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban 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)

No access to Public Transport.

1

Access comments

Access possible onto Thorpe Lane and Hawksworth Lane.

4

Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage?

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

n/a

Network Rail**Yorkshire Water**

Treatment Works Esholt

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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

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	99.92	% 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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1713.63
Nearest bus stop	3062
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	1068.30

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 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 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 considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and acts a strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban sprawl.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor negative - access to health and greenspace and natural resources (agricultural land).

Summary of reps

Pro
Main comment - It has been excluded on the grounds that it is not connected to an urban area. However it is on the edge of Tranmere Park and although on the “wrong” side of Thorpe Lane should be considered as it is a relatively small site and would not make a great deal of impact.
This would appear to be a good site for a small development, as the local Primary School would be within walking distance. The area has a relatively low housing density, so a small development would not put excessive strain on the existing infrastructure.

Anti
Performs an important role in preventing coalescence of Guiseley with Menston, Hawksworth and Yeadon respectively.

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
1241	4	No	No	No

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and acts a strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban sprawl.

Site Details

Easting	424481	Northing	440361	Site area ha	11.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Aireborough, North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Site bordering existing residential area to the south east. Bounded to the west by railway line and to the north by field boundary and dense tree coverage.
-------------	---

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?	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?	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

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

Majority of site PAS. Only 12% in green belt (western section).

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)
Portion of site accessible for education and public transport but distant from local services. 2

Access comments 3
Access via Moseley Wood Rise, limit capacity to 200. Requires secondary link.

Local network comments 3
Local congestion issues

Mitigation measures Total score
Unknown at this stage 8

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

F/B at LEH1 5 miles 396 yds to be made equality compliant (ramps)? Horsforth station improvements general asset protection issues

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop High Level
Various large sewers cross the whole site north/south east/west	

Environment Agency

Constraints	FZ3 beck running through site
Part of the Site is FZ3. See comments in main text of our response. Moseley Beck runs through site	

LCC

Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (RED). No site-based designations but contains the Moseley Beck, semi-improved grassland areas and adjacent rank and wet grassland that forms a wildlife corridor function. Great Crested Newts to consider.	

1199 Moseley Wood Gardens (land off), Cookridge LS16

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/1199. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats and Great Crested Newts are addressed i.e. minimum 20 metres buffer adjacent to Moseley Beck protected and enhanced, habitat enhancement to link beck to the woodland to the north-east, pond creation near beck for Great Crested Newts.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1 but parts of the site susceptible to flooding from Moseley Beck. There are also a number of combined and a foul public sewer within the site. Complaint received from local resident that the area currently acts as a giant sponge for surface water and that this will be lost if development goes ahead.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing sites 1199 and 3010 are within 2km of Breary Marsh SSSI (see citation below) and LNR. Significant effects should be screened out before allocating, in accordance with the NPPF. 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
14/04270/OT	Outline application for residential development for circa 135 dwellings, including means of vehicular access from Moseley Wood Rise and pedestrian/cycle link from Cookridge Drive		61
13/04148/OT	Outline planning application for the residential development of circa 200 dwellings and associated landscaping	R	84

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

1199 Moseley Wood Gardens (land off), Cookridge LS16

N32 Greenbelt	12.97	% overlap	Main Urban Area	0.04	% overlap	
N34 PAS	87.03		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					
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00					
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00					
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00		Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap	
UDP City Centre	0.00		LB Corridor RA	0.00		
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00		EASEL RA	0.00		
Proposed Local Centre	0.00		Aire Valley RA	0.00		
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>		West Leeds Gateway	0.00		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00					

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1222.96
Nearest bus stop	5639
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	438.07

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 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

Protected Area of Search (PAS) site on existing UDP. Most of the site falls within North Leeds area, but capacity and area have been split between Aireborough and North Leeds on a pro-rata basis. However, the part of the site within Aireborough is Green Belt. The railway is considered to form a strong defensible boundary which would prevent further sprawl. Capacity limited to 200 due to access constraints (split over two areas).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield, ecology objection and flood risk. Minor negative - access to health facilities, greenhouse emissions, accessibility and landscape.

Summary of reps

Pro

Site served by existing amenities in Cookridge, Horsforth and Holt Park.
Near railway station (1.3km) and bus route (550m).
The site is well placed to access local educational facilities.
transport consultants confirm a scheme for up to 200 dwellings can be developed off a single access point located on Moseley Wood Rise.
Delivery of new family housing including open market homes and affordable housing

Anti

Inadequate road infrastrure to cope with traffic.
An increase in traffic will exacerbate existing problems and make it more dangerous for other drivers and pedestrians
Children's heritage must be preserved.
No play/recreation provision for children
Increase in pollution
Size and duration of development totally unacceptable.
Inadequate infrastructure to cope with educational and medical needs.
Emergency services overstretched/potentially unable to access roads.
Parking already an issue - will only get worse.
Loss of privacy
Current roads unable to cope with plant/heavy machinery needed for development.
Extra traffic, together with the movement of plant and machinery, will damage the surface of Moseley Wood Gardens.
Local traffic will be a problem in particular around Horsforth bridge.
There are already empty (and boarded up) properties in Cookridge (and across Leeds).
Road surfaces will deteriorate as traffic increases.
Roads in a poor state of repair already.
The area is not suitable for new development.
Disturbance whilst being built.
There must be more suitable and less contentious sites.
Roads difficult to access especially in winter - in the winter roads are impassable.
Only one access road - Moseley Wood Gardens and then into a small road, Moseley Wood Rise.
This green land provides a habitat for a diversity of wildlife, including rare/protected species.
Very important wildlife area + the great crested newt. Archaeology must be checked at WYAAS
The area is lacking in facilities/local amenities to support an increasing populace.
Any housing development on this scale must be combined with a development of local services and infrastructure.
Flooding is a major problem. This development will increase surface run off and affect the railway line.
It is considered that Site 1199 is sequentially not acceptable or suitable to be identified as a potential development site due to it being within Flood Zone 3a.
Existing roads too narrow to cope with any more traffic especially Green Lane.
Moseley Wood Lane being used as a rat run shortcut.
Woodhill Road is extremely busy at peak times. That situation will worsen substantially with the new development.
Local Schools and services such as dentists and health centres cannot cope with more demand.
There is a need for affordable/social housing, not what is planned for this site.
Any new development must be built in the right way and with the right infrastructure in place to make it sustainable.
Cookridge is already densely populated.
The plans to build on a known flood plain will only affect insurance and other homes along the beck line.
When horse riding in the area cars already present enough of an added danger without the increase in traffic which would be inevitable
The development will be detrimental to Cookridge.
Further development would have an impact on all the elderly people who have retired into cookridge for a quiet life.
A new development will adversely affect quality of life for existing residents.
Proximity of development to railway line and airport flight path may put people off living in this location.
The proposed only entrance/exit will create an intolerable situation for residents and difficulties for emergency services.
Planning permission has been refused before - there is even more reason for its refusal now.
The development will make the area a less desirable place to live.
Inadequate parking at railway station. Commuters park on Cookridge roads.
Underlying sandstone rock. Land not flat (as stated in Taylor Wimpey report).
Distance from public services.
The public space provision does not seem well considered.

1199 Moseley Wood Gardens (land off), Cookridge LS16

What needs to be considered is further access to improve roads, paths, provide local council services and build new schools to support this new structure.

Statutory

British Rail states development at Mosely wood Bottom would have adverse effect on the train line
Metro states that, "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

Protected Area of Search (PAS) site on existing UDP and small part to south west in Green Belt. Most of the site falls within North Leeds area, but capacity and area have been split between Aireborough and North Leeds on a pro-rata basis. The railway is considered to form a strong defensible boundary which would prevent further sprawl. Capacity limited to 200 due to access constraints (split over two areas).

Site Details

Easting	420097	Northing	440562	Site area ha	5.9	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

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

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Green open space located between Greenlea Ave/Road, New Road and Gill Lane. Neighbouring land is in established residential use. Site is generally flat, with tree coverage concentrated towards the centre of the site. Site has an extended road frontage along New 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	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?	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

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

Green Belt site. Well contained site with strong connections to the urban area. Site performs well against the purposes of 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	Rank (1-5)
Good access to Public Transport, Education and Local Health facilities.	4
Access comments	
Vehicle access onto Gill Lane not possible due to limited site frontage. Vehicular access would have to be via A65 only and dependant upon level of development may require two access points.	4
Local network comments	
Local congestion issues on A65.	3
Mitigation measures	Total score
Unknown at this stage?	11
Highways site support	
Yes- with mitigation	
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	Esholt
Mains and surface water sewer within north and eastern boundaries	

Environment Agency

Constraints	no constraints but drain running through
FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.	

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

4020+2163A,+1180A+ 1311A,+2038+ 1221+ 2162+1104+ 3033+1308 = 1000 houses generates 250 primary and 100 secondary children. All sites combined would require a new 1FE primary school. 2FE secondary required across whole HMCA – land may be required to expand existing schools.

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Low Hall and 24 and 26 Gill Lane to the south of this area 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, before allocating this area, there would need to be some assesment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the significance of these buildings and what effect its loss and subsequent development might have upon the significance of thses assets. If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets (including their 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
------------	----------	----------	-----------

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	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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2063.68
Nearest bus stop	1686
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	150.57

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 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. Well contained site with strong connections to the urban area. Site does perform well against the purposes of Green Belt. Access onto A65, limited frontage onto Gill Lane.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor positive - access to education and health services, greenspace, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and overall accessibility and energy and natural resources (Area of Search for Wind Energy).

Summary of reps

Anti
If our roads cannot cope now how will it be when 767 houses bring 1,000 more cars to this area? The A65 is gridlocked twice a day, as is the A658 from the JCT roundabout to Greengates.
If something could be done, perhaps in the way of a second route being created, for example between the south end of Gill Lane or Apperley Lane (A658) and Hollins Hill (A6038) via the sewage works area, then building on site 1221 would become viable.
This proposal is in addition to approximately 1500 houses that have been built in the area since 1993, and also on top of the housing that is being planned by Bradford City Council in Menston and Addingham along the same A65 road.
Airport expansion will also create more traffic on these local roads.

Building here will further add to the urban sprawl as Leeds and Bradford continue to merge.
Green belt land and divides the communities of Westfield and Rawdon
The site is used by the residents of Westfield, who without access to a park use it for dog walking, children playing, and sledging.

Pressure on local services - This will particularly effect children and elderly residents as these social facilities become strained / closing amenities such as our local library.
Does the building of 529 houses in an area denote a new school? The perfect site is 1308 (Naylor Jennings) rather than houses.
The Council's conservation department should be consulted as they will be fully aware of the listed properties and the historical value of the area.
Negative effect on the setting of the listed buildings in this area eg. Highfold Farm, Low Hall and the conservation area of Little London. The SHLAA report makes no mention of 3 listed building on one side of the site - Low Hall and 24 / 26 Gill Lane.

Why not now plan for a new town, away from existing settlements, where all the transport links and facilities could be planned appropriately.
The city of Leeds has 140 Brownfield sites in its ownership, covering 150 hectares of potential development land. Many of these sites have lain dormant since the 1980s and 1990s and these sites are steadily increasing.
Leeds Core Development Framework Housing Targets are higher than ANYWHERE else in England DESPITE having the lowest population growth.
Need to qualify whether the group that makes up the SHLAA is a fair and unbiased group with the interest of making best decisions for the community or for themselves? Who are the members and what are their roles or connections to developers or estate agencies?
What studies have been completed to look at the impact on the following: schools, roads, public transport, employment, services like sewerage, water, electricity, gas, other local and national services like refuse collections, doctors, dentists, pharmacies etc.
Not suitable for housing - suggest recreational, medical facilities

Pro
The site has good access to public transport, education and local health facilities. The site is approximately 2km from Guiseley railway station where regular train services to Bradford, Leeds and Ilkley can be accessed.
There are bus stops on New Road and Greenlea Avenue on the north and east boundary of the site.
The site is extremely well placed to access local education facilities. the closest GPs to the site are Rawdon Surgery on New Road Side, a distance of approximately 900m.
The site has a strong likelihood of early delivery as Barratt Homes have agreed promotional terms with the landowners. The site is available, achievable and developable in the short term.

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.				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
133	5	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. This site is well contained and related to the urban area, with no Highways objections raised. The Core Strategy acknowledges that to meet the housing requirement green belt sites will need to be released, and development of this site will be of less harm

Aireborough

1221 Gill Lane, Yeadon LS19

to green belt purposes than other suggested green belt sites.

Site Details

Easting	419377	Northing	443079	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Other
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1008.86
Nearest bus stop	2187
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	549.59

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro
Travellers do not need houses, but somewhere to stop. As all these sites have a good road connection, are not excessively large, they will make excellent sites for travellers of all descriptions.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Not within settlement hierarchy

Site Details

Easting	420328	Northing	442306	Site area ha	6.8	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-
On-site land uses	Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	Agriculture	
	Unmanaged Forest	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Poorly defined	Road front	No

Description	Site A is to the north of site B which is to the rear of properties on northern side Coppice Wood Avenue/Crescent and Banksfield Crescent. Site slopes from east to 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?	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	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

Aireborough

1255A Shaw Lane (land at), Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

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

Development of site A would constitute urban 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

The site is reasonably served by Public Transport and other local services

Rank (1-5)

4

Access comments

Site has no highway frontage - requires access through 1224 & 1225C or 1225B

3

Local network comments

Full development may cause issues on local network

3

Mitigation measures

improved access

Total score

10

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

1224 & 1225C or 1225B

Contingent on other sites

1224 & 1225C or 1225B

Highways Agency

Impact

Network Status

No objection

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Esholt

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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

1255A Shaw Lane (land at), Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the adjacent Deipkier Local Nature Area. Provide a suitable buffer zone to the north-east.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Potential flood risk from Calfhole beck, which runs along the NE boundary 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	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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1472.01
Nearest bus stop	173
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	304.07

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

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 type="checkbox"/>

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Site 1255 has been split into two sections, as the northern section is not considered suitable for development. By splitting the site in two the southern section relates better to the settlement and a lower capacity puts less pressure on the existing highway network. Development of site A would constitute urban sprawl.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - ecology (mitigation), greenhouse emissions, transport network and overall accessibility and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to health services, greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti				
Not suitable for housing because they are part of Yeadon Banks Village Green.				
Brown Sites, such as ie, Ex Mill Green Lane [1308], the now defunct Kirklands Home Site [4019], the Old Dog Mill Site (off Kirk Lane) should be developed first.				
The access options in the Site Assessment (Banksfield Mount, Coppice Wood Close and Howson Close) all have on street parking problems. It would not be a good site for housing, being on the LBA flight path.				
It is too close to Deipkeir Woods which is an important are for wildlife and birds, and also it would destroy the open vista from Yeadon Banks				
Pro				
Should be considered, the site does not appear to pose any threat to existing housing (in terms of flooding, etc).				
Given its accessibility to services, facilities and public transport in Guiseley it is considered that development of the site would constitute sustainable development. This site does not serve any Green Belt purposes and is therefore an ideal candidate to be allocated for housing.				
With 1255B it could create a larger development site or at least to allow Public Open Space from the development site to be used over a larger area to maximise the development land.				
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.				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
323	8	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Site 1255 has been split into two sections, as the northern section is not considered suitable for development. Development of site A would constitute urban sprawl and unacceptable pressure on highway capacity.

Site Details

Easting	420315	Northing	442133	Site area ha	8.9	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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	Green Belt site. Site B is to the rear of properties on northern side of Coppice Wood Avenue/Crescent and Banksfield Crescent. Site slopes from east 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?	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	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

Aireborough

1255B Shaw Lane (land at), Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

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

Green Belt site which after splitting, site B relates well to 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

The site is reasonably served by Public Transport and other local services

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Site access available from A639

4

Local network comments

Full development may cause issues on local network

3

Mitigation measures

Total score

10

Highways site support

Yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact

Network Status

No objection

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Esholt

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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

1255B Shaw Lane (land at), Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the adjacent Deipkier Local Nature Area. Provide a suitable buffer zone to the north-east.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

734+4043+3026+1255B = 1389 houses generates 347 primary and 139 secondary children. High Royds (site 734) almost complete but in conjunction with other sites close by, a new 1.5FE primary school would be needed.

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Potential flood risk from Shaw beck along the Eastern boundary of the site, as well as an un-named watercourse which runs along the Western boundary 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	98.47	% 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	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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1458.31
Nearest bus stop	173
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	136.63

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Site 1255 has been split into two sections, as the northern section is not considered suitable for development. By splitting the site in two the southern section relates better to the settlement and a lower capacity puts less pressure on the existing highway network. Single point of access from Banksfield Mount limits site capacity.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - ecology (mitigation) and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to health services, greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti

Site should not be put forward for future housing because it shares the same attributes as 1255A. The proposed site is immediately next to site 1256 and near 3029 which has been excluded from building - cannot see a reason why site 1255B should be any different. Reference is made in the Site Assessment to the site being "connected in part to adjacent site 3029A depending on overall number of dwellings" but Shaw Lane Gardens road does not appear to connect with Site 3029 (there does not appear to be a Site 3029A) and there does not appear to be any vacant frontage on Shaw Lane Gardens to form an access.

A65 is gridlocked - traffic congestion at the junction with Hayworth Lane and the junctions at Green/Town Street, also site near Queensway School making access to Coppice Wood Crescent difficult. Area beyond Banksfield Mount was a safety zone leading to the runway at Leeds/Bradford International Airport.

No habit surveys have been carried out. Beck floods when there is medium to heavy or prolonged rainfall. Development will destroy much of the open aspect from the bottom end of Yeadon Banks, which has not long been made into a Village Green.

Alternatives - this would be a good place to put a new Aireborough Education Leisure and Outdoor Pursuits Centre with cycleways and bridleways nearby. It would release space at the old site in Guiseley for a larger school and some new homes. This land is better considered for amenities - suggest farming, recreation, school, Aireborough Leisure Centre, medical centre, retirement homes. It would appear that Leeds City Council has applied a generic housing quota to each area, not taking into account the particular role and character of Aireborough.

Pro

If the Victoria Avenue site is not chosen for housing, do not object to the part of the Shaw Lane site at the end of Banksfield Mount being used for housing, as this part of the Shaw Lane site is in a slight depression and not very visible from surrounding areas. Site does not appear to pose any threat to existing housing (in terms of flooding, etc) Sites 1255A and 1255B should both be considered suitable as a whole. Splitting the site is considered to relate better to the settlement, although the proposed site boundaries appear somewhat arbitrary in parts.

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.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
323	8	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Site 1255 has been split into two sections, as the northern section is not considered suitable for development. By splitting the site in two the southern section relates better to the settlement and a lower capacity puts less pressure on the existing highway network. Single point of access from Banksfield Mount limits site capacity.

Site Details

Easting	419801	Northing	442510	Site area ha	11.1	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Large greenfield site to the north of the built up area. Some existing residential development across Carlton Road on the western boundary. Site slopes gently southwards. There is minimal tree coverage on site, and in the main trees exist only on field boundaries. Beyond the site to the north and east, is extended areas of open land.
-------------	---

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	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	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

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

Green Belt site. The site is not well connected to the urban area, and would not constitute rounding off of the settlement. As such development would represent urban sprawl.

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		
Only 50% of the site is accessible to Public Transport, Health and education facilities.		2
Access comments		2
Only limited frontage to Carlton Lane, which has inadequate carriageway width and no footways. Very substandard existing access at corner of Carlton Lane/Moor Lane - poor visibility onto Moor Lane.		
Local network comments		1
Local network poor i.e. Carlton Lane and Moor Lane.		
Mitigation measures		Total score
None that would overcome site deficiencies.		
Highways site support		5
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	Esholt
Various sewers and mains in western and southern boundaries	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	beck runnig through
FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response. Small watercourse runs through the site.	

LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but a semi-improved grassland area in the north-east which should be excluded from the site.	

1256 Wills Gill (land at), off Carlton Lane, Guiseley

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/1256. Mitigation will still be required to ensure adjacent habitats are protected and enhanced, and hedgerows and water courses are protected and enhanced.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Potential flood risk from un-named watercourse which runs N to S through the centre 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	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 %	0.19
-----------------	------

1256 Wills Gill (land at), off Carlton Lane, Guiseley

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	987.26
Nearest bus stop	2187
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	300.64

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 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 well connected to the urban area, and would not constitute rounding off of the settlement. As such development would represent urban sprawl. The site has access constraints.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site, biodiversity (ecology objection) and transport network. Minor negative - community cohesion and local distinctiveness (size of site in relation to settlement), greenhouse emissions and accessibility, landscape and natural resources (agricultural land).

Summary of reps

Pro

Although large, the site is largely supported as a housing site above 3026 and 4043.

Anti

It is an important link in the open area and is a valuable resource as open fields and for recreational amenity.
Council should issue a statement giving a clear indication that the infra-structure eg, Schools, Doctors/Clinics, Dentists have enough capacity to cater for the additional intake.

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).

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
385	8	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is not well connected to the urban area, and would not constitute rounding off of the settlement. As such development would represent urban sprawl. The site has access constraints.

Site Details							
Easting	420834	Northing	440446	Site area ha	6	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	Manufacturing and Wholesale
Dwellings	
Vacant land	
Neighbouring land uses	Office
	Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Brownfield site within built up area, residential development on 3 sides, with employment use to the west. Southern side of the site is dominated by existing employment buildings. Northern part of the site contains two ponds, with a moderately dense cover of trees in the eastern corner of the site. Site is flat.
-------------	---

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)
Public Transport not in line with accessibility standards (contary to Metro info), 50% of site accessible to employment and town centres, site accessible to education and healthcare.	3

Access comments	
Narrow footway, stone boundary wall and mature trees may mean achieving visibility is impossible without removal. Pedestrian linkage to Henconner Lane needs improving.	3

Local network comments	
Local congestion issues on A65 + Green Lane Harrogate Road junction a problem. Footways on Green Lane narrow and intermittent.	3

Mitigation measures	Total score
To create vehicular access and improve pedestrian linkages.	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
n/a			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Esholt
Various culverted watercourses and surface water sewers with outfalls near to ponds. Water mains and sewers in southern road frontage	

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 open water features. Bats and Great Crested Newts to consider, Great Crested Newts recorded on-site.	

1308 Green Lane (land to the rear of Naylor Jennings Mill) , Yeadon

Ecology boundary

Education comments

4020+2163A,+1180A+ 1311A,+2038+ 1221+ 2162+1104+ 3033+1308 = 1000 houses generates 250 primary and 100 secondary children. All sites combined would require a new 1FE primary school. 2FE secondary required across whole HMCA – land may be required to expand existing schools.

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Large open balancing ponds on site, attenuating flow from YW sw sewer. FRA will need to include details of compensatory flood storage if it is proposed to modify these in any way. [Nb. This is also flagged as a potential retail 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
13/02409/FU	Redevelopment including demolition of dyeworks site, construction of 109 houses and retention of mill facade to form 14 flats; associated landscaping, formation of new access and provision of open space	W	100
13/02408/CA	Conservation Area Application for the demolition of part of dye works, one chimney and associated out buildings	W	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"/>	

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	

Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00
-------------------	------

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2650.12
Nearest bus stop	11710
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	310.93

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 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 urban area. There are some restraints on site (large ponds and trees) but these could be mitigated against and would not prevent the site coming forward. Planning application 14/05524/FU under consideration for 93 new build, 46 conversion of mill buildings, 64 bed care home.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - pollution. Minor negative - employment and economic growth (loss of existing employment), ecology (mitigation). Significant positive - flood risk. Minor positive - access to education, health and greenspace and energy and natural resources (Area of Search for Wind Energy). Minor positive for occupied brownfield site.

Summary of reps

Pro
A sustainable site for low denisty housing (suggestion of smaller units)/care/affordable or a mix of uses but acknowledge there will be traffic issues so limit the number of dwellings or have a mix of uses to keep the impact on congestion low. Utilise the ponds as green space. Improve access from Mill onto Focus Way. Don't have an access through Cricketers Green. Both Green Lane and Harrogate Road are already congested. The junction should be a roundabout. A route to the airport could be opened if Scotland Lane was widened. The cross roads junction of Yeadon High Street/Hayton Lane/Harrogate Road whould be re-examined at the very least. Right filter lane.

Anti
Development would have a detrminetal impact on the local community and infrastructure - both services and transport, and the local environment. Great Crested Newts nearby. Bats. Plenty of empty properties across Leeds.

Metro
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 other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to
Primary Health				
420	9	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site within urban area, so residential development acceptable in principle.

Site Details

Easting	419242	Northing	441218	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-
On-site land uses	Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	Agriculture	
Dwellings		
Wholesale distribution		

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Green Belt site to the south of Coach Road, bounded by train line to east. Spring Road track makes up western boundary. Site is currently in agricultural use and is flat. Trees form a defensible boundary on all sides.
-------------	---

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 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

1311A Coach Road (land to the south of) , Guiseley

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

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two. Site A relates well to the urban area when considered with 1180A and 2163A.

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		
The site is outside bus and rail accessibility standards but accessible to health and education, but not town centre/employment.		2
Access comments		5
Access could be created onto Coach Road with provision of footway on frontage.		
Local network comments		2
Route through Silverdale estate not suitable for large increase in traffic because of existing on street parking to houses on Silverdale Ave towards Park Road which prevents two way free flow of traffic. As an alternative route out, Coach Rd is unadopted, narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road which can't be addressed with this		
Mitigation measures		Total score
Traffic calming throughout the Silverdale Avenue would help to meet street design guide requirements for a 25mph design speed but won't provide the full solution as the on street parking near Park Road will remain.		
Highways site support		9
Yes - with mitigation		
Contingent on other sites		
Yes		
Contingent on other sites		
Yes		

Highways Agency		
Impact		Network Status
No objection		

Network Rail	

Yorkshire Water	
Treatment Works	Esholt
Surface water sewer in northern boundary	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported - no objections	

1311A Coach Road (land to the south of) , Guiseley

Ecology boundary

Education comments

4020+2163A,+1180A+ 1311A,+2038+ 1221+ 2162+1104+ 3033+1308 = 1000 houses generates 250 primary and 100 secondary children. All sites combined would require a new 1FE primary school. 2FE secondary required across whole HMCA – land may be required to expand existing schools.

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	94.35	% 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

1311A Coach Road (land to the south of) , Guiseley

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

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1066.53
Nearest bus stop	8394
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	476.94

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 2163A would be appropriate. Site A (the northern section) has a road frontage and relates well to the urban area, when considered with 1180A and 2163A. This smaller site (ie site A) will put less pressure on the road network. Traffic calming in Silverdale Estate would be required.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to education and health services and greenspace and overall accessibility and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Pro
A small amount of housing may be acceptable.
Site is well located for employment opportunities.
It wouldn't lead to isolated/ribbon development if developed as a whole (A & B).
Suggest agriculture, allotments, recreation, medical centre or school, access allowing as alternative use.

Anti
This field is an integral part of the Spring Woods Recreational Area.
Site should be designated as open space. Adverse impact on the local environment. Threat of coalescence with Bradford - the buffer between Leeds and Bradford will be miniscule and comprise just those three small fields. The gap is getting smaller.

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 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
481	4	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 2163A would be appropriate. Traffic calming in Silverdale Estate would be required.

Site Details

Easting	419237	Northing	441119	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-
On-site land uses	Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	Agriculture	
	Storage	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Site to the south of Coach Road, bounded by train line to east. Spring Road track makes up western boundary. Site is currently in agricultural use and slopes to the south. Trees form a defensible boundary on all sides.
-------------	--

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	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

1311B Coach Road (land to the south of) , Guiseley

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

Development of the site would extend further into the green belt and not relate well to the existing settlement pattern.

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 is outside bus and rail accessibility standards but accessible to health and education, but not town centre/employment.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Access could be created onto Coach Road with provision of footway on frontage alternatively could be developed with 2163 with access onto widened Old Hollings Hill

5

Local network comments

Route through Silverdale estate not suitable for large increase in traffic. Silverdale Ave, existing on street parking to houses towards Park Road problematic, as an alternative route out, Coach Rd is narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road which can't be addressed with this site. Capacity issues at Park Road / A65 Gyratory.

2

Mitigation measures

Total score

9

Highways site support

No

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact

No objection

Network Status

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Esholt

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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

1311B Coach Road (land to the south of) , Guiseley

LCC

Ecology supportSupported

Supported - no objections

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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1158.19
Nearest bus stop	8394
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	568.68

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development. Development of site B would extend further into the green belt and not relate well to the existing settlement pattern.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor negative - greenhouse emissions and overall accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health facilities, greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Pro				
There could be a small number of houses here. Suggested Agriculture, allotments recreation. If it was to be used then some have suggested a medical centre, school, or school sports field. Access allowing.				
Anti - should be open space				
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 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
481	4	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development. Development of site B would extend further into the green belt and not relate well to the existing settlement pattern.

Site Details

Easting	421859	Northing	443241	Site area ha	13.4	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Otley and Yeadon	

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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	3170.82
Nearest bus stop	4872
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	218.86

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
Sites at coney park would be much more appropriate than any sites at Carlton Lane, Banksfield Mount, Gill Lane or Warm Lane / Appley Lane.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Not within settlement hierarchy

Site Details

Easting	419407	Northing	441003	Site area ha	7.2	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mix 30:70	-
On-site land uses		
Manufacturing and Wholesale		
Vacant land		
Neighbouring land uses		
Dwellings		
Transport tracks and ways		

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Site in employment use, south of Guiseley. Railway line runs along the western boundary. Further employment sites are located to the north, with residential areas to the east. There is substantial tree coverage in the centre of the site, with no coverage beyond this. Site undulates.
-------------	---

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

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?	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	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?	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?	No
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

Only 0.01% of the site falls within the Green Belt. Detailed planning design can mitigate any potential impact on the purposes of the green belt.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (later)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

90% of the site is outside bus accessibility standards and all of the site is outside rail accessibility standards. 60% of site meets requirements for health and education, but only 10% town centre/employment.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Ghyll Royd functions as an industrial road and is not conducive to pedestrian movement from a residential development. Milner Road is narrow with discontinuous footways and not capable of improvement.

1

Local network comments

Ghyll Royd and Milners Road are the only two means of access, both are unsuitable particularly for pedestrians. Local congestion on A65.

1

Mitigation measures

None

Total score

4

Highways site support

No, unless significant mitigation.

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

n/a

Network Rail

Drainage (beck under railway) capacity. Also general asset protection issues

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Esholt

Many sewers of varying sizes and culverted watercourses within site including outfalls.

Environment Agency

Constraints FZ3 large proportion of site

A large proportion of this site is in FZ3. See comments in main text of our response. Watercourse runs through the site

LCC

Ecology support Supported with mitigation

Red - the site contains an area of UK BAP Priority Habitat Woodland and grassland of unknown quality.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation (Amber) if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary substantially amended as per drawing RM/2038 Revised. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent woodland/scrub/grassland habitat are addressed. Parts of the site are potential Local Wildlife Site - need to be assessed.

Education comments

4020+2163A,+1180A+ 1311A,+2038+ 1221+ 2162+1104+ 3033+1308 = 1000 houses generates 250 primary and 100 secondary children. All sites combined would require a new 1FE primary school. 2FE secondary required across whole HMCA – land may be required to expand existing schools.

Flood Risk

Large parts of the site in Flood Zone 3. Nun Royd beck flows SW through the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing site 2038 is adjacent to Yeadon Brickworks and Railway Cutting Geological SSSI and contains areas of deciduous woodland BAP Habitat. Development should avoid damaging the exposed rock features and any woodland habitat.

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	0.01	% 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 %	35.15
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1328.48
Nearest bus stop	3957
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	479.40

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

This is a brownfield site currently allocated for employment use in the existing UDP. The site would require significant works to enable residential development. The site dips into a valley through the centre which may limit the potential capacity. However, the site is not in the green belt and is well contained. Highways have raised concerns regarding access and accessibility of the site; Milners Road and Ghyll Road both lack good footway provision, Milner Road would need land from the Council's waste site for widening.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - overall accessibility. Minor negative for employment and economic growth (loss of employment site), biodiversity (ecology mitigation), greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor positive - access to greenspace, occupied brownfield site and energy and natural resources (Area of Search for Wind Energy)

Summary of reps

Pro

Many years ago Leeds Council had a plan to create access via Ghyll Royd - this would not involve a dangerous right angled bend, and would add a second access point to relieve the Dibb Lane junction. If this were done, then housing in this area would be acceptable. However the newly created access should not be allowed to destroy the Sustrans track 1396, an important green corridor linking the Engine Fields to the Esholt Woods, and itself a Safer Route to Schools (in particular the schools on the Westfield campus, and Guiseley School).

Site has good transport links. not suitable for residential but may suit temporary residents. Would create less congestion

Would be dependent on moving the recycling depot elsewhere- possible the present fire station site.

Site would be good for employment/industry.

Anti

shown red for employment as contaminated so how can it be acceptable for housing?

Loss of employment site. Loss of site as bus garaging.

Statutory 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. Site is 461m from the core network. 4 buses an hour. Yes access to Primary and secondary schools and public healthcare.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Allocate site for housing. The site is not in the green belt and is well contained. Flooding and Highway issues regarding access can be mitigated against as part of the design and layout of the site.

Site Details

Easting	420857	Northing	441609	Site area ha	2.3	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Otley and Yeadon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-
On-site land uses		
Other		
Neighbouring land uses		
Dwellings		
Outdoor amenity and open space		
Other land uses		
Site is a Village Green		

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Large greenfield site overlooking Guiseley. Site is designated as a Village Green and is used for recreation. Site has existing residential development on 3 sides, with a road frontage on Haw Lane. Site slopes generally southwards but also has a substantial gradient to the west. There is no tree cover.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

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?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

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	

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	

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	

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

Protected Area of Search site, not Green Belt

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

Accessible to Public Transport, most of the site meets accessibility standards for local services, schools and healthcare.

Rank (1-5)

4

Access comments

Vehicle access onto Haw Lane OK with Manual For Streets standards.

5

Local network comments

Local congestion issues on A65.

4

Mitigation measures

None

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

n/a

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Esholt

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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

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	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"/>	
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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2087.78
Nearest bus stop	12022
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	262.11

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 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 a Protected Area of Search (PAS) site in the existing UDP, but has since received designation as a Village Green and so is not considered suitable for development.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to greenspace, greenhouse emissions, transport network, accessibility and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti
This is a piece of green space. Village green.
Housing should be for the local population and housing number of the area should reflect the amount of housing that has already been delivered here, including windfall sites and permissions that havent been built out yet.
Statutory Metro - 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. 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). Distance to the core network 285, buses 4, yes access to primary, secondary schools and primary healthcare.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

This site is designated as a Village Green and so is not considered suitable for development.

Site Details							
Easting	421428	Northing	439971	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	
Agriculture	
Dwellings	
Outdoor amenity and open space	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description
Agricultural land to the north of Larkfield Dam. Existing residential development lies to the north of the site. The west of the site is bounded by Larkfield Road, which has residential development along it. This is also the only road frontage to the site. West boundary is open with no defensible boundary. Site slopes to the north west. There is no tree coverage on 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?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

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	

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	

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	

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

Protected Area of Search (PAS) site, not Green Belt.

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)
Good access to Public Transport, Education and Local Health facilities. 4

Access comments
Site is located close to a brow and as such an acceptable access does not appear to be possible. 2

Local network comments
None 1

Mitigation measures Total score
None that would overcome site deficiencies. 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	Esholt
Water mains in southern road frontage	

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

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	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"/>	
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
-----------------	------

2119 Canada Road, Rawdon

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3105.76
Nearest bus stop	5530
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	82.33

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 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 a Protected Area of Search (PAS) site in the existing UDP. Whilst the site is considered to be well related to the urban area, Highways object to development of the site due to poor visibility of site access.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - transport network. Minor positive - access to education and health facilities, greenspace, greenhouse emissions, accessibility, flood risk and energy and natural resources (Area of Search for Wind Energy).

Summary of reps

Pro. Some of the site could be developed where housing exists. Site would round up development with mitigation. Wouldn't represent urban sprawl. The representation made on behalf of the housing developer includes a transport assessment which demonstrates that the site can be delivered. PASS TA TO HIGHWAYS TO ASSESS BEFORE DETERMINING SITE ALLOCATION.

Anti

Brownfield first.

Statutory Metro - Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

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). 320, 6 buses an hour, Yes access to primary and secondary schools and public healthcare. Parish Council - Not suitable for housing.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Whilst the site is considered to be well related to the urban area, Highways object to development of the site due to poor visibility of site access.

Site Details

Easting	423998	Northing	440140	Site area ha	72.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Aireborough, North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mixed	-	
On-site land uses			
Agriculture			
Dwellings			
Neighbouring land uses			
Agriculture			
Dwellings			
Other land uses			
Airport			
Topography	Undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Large site to the east of Scotland Lane, to which there is an extended road frontage. Site includes a few private properties. Tree coverage is concentrated along field boundaries. The site generally slopes to the south with some undulations. Railway forms the eastern 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?	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?	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?	Potentially
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

Listed buildings on site - impact on these would need to be considered. Large site that relates poorly to settlement. Development would set a precedent 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

Rank (1-5)

Accessibility to Public Transport not in line with Core Strategy standards for majority of site.

2

Access comments

Highway frontage but adequate access can not be achieved for level of development proposed.

1

Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage.

Total score

6

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact	Material impact	Network Status	No objection subject to satisfactory mitigation
--------	-----------------	----------------	---

Network Rail

F/B at LEH1 5 miles 396 yds to be made equality compliant (ramps)? Horsforth station improvements general asset protection issues

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knothrop High Level
-----------------	---------------------

Water main crosses the southern part of the site

Environment Agency

Constraints	FZ3 along railway no other constraints
-------------	--

Area of FZ3 along railway. FZ3 adjoins site to east on slightly onto site. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support	Not supported
-----------------	---------------

Not supported (RED). Includes Sims Pond Site of Ecological and Geological Importance (SEGI), species-rich grasslands alongside the railway and Moseley Beck, and woodland along a beck in the north of the site.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/2160. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on Great Crested Newts are addressed and hedgerows and some semi-improved grassland areas within the site are retained as parts of the public open space.

Education comments

Should this come to fruition, particularly in conjunction with site ref. 1199, we would request land from part of the development for new school provision. Part of this site is within the Horsforth primary planning area.

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Scotland beck runs W to E across the site, and Moseley Beck rund down the Eastern boundary of the site. There are also other minor drainage channels within the site.

Utilities

Gas

A high pressure pipeline runs north-south through the site. This is the East Bierley to Pannal pipeline. The pipeline will be protected with an easement which restricts the work which may be undertaken adjacent to the pipeline. No properties may be constructed within the easement. There are gas mains running in the carriageway and services running to existing properties.

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	99.57	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.12	
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	0.43	% 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	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1086.37
Nearest bus stop	6740
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	535.76

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

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 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 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. The capacity and site area has been split - 27.6ha, 724 capacity in Aireborough, 45.33ha, 1189 capacity in North Leeds. Development of such a large site would represent unrestricted urban sprawl and Highways objections include local congestion that would arise if developed.

Site affects others?**Sustainability summary**

Significant negative - greenfield and ecology objection. Minor negative - access to health facilities, community cohesion (site size relative to settlement), greenspace, greenhouse emissions, transport network, accessibility, landscape, historic environment and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - flood risk.

Summary of reps**Pro**

Support a small amount of development if it is to support the retention of the listed buildings. The road infrastructure would need improving. Suggested TASC and Gossell Hall as other sites too.

Anti

See rep 07882 site least suitable for development. survey submitted. Please refer to this.

Site is unsuitable for development. road infrastructure cannot cope. Already a lot of traffic on these roads (rat running) which are too narrow. Footpaths are too narrow, Need to keep the greenbelt/rural fields/greenfields/greenspace. other sites should be used first with the order being: identifying unoccupied housing, redeveloping rundown and dilapidated existing buildings, developing brownfield sites, building sites in already urbanised areas.

In the PSZ for the airport. Already suffer from

Statutory Metro - 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. 687m from the core network. 6 buses an hour. Yes access to primary, secondary schools and healthcare.

Comments on phasing**DPP Allocation**

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is not supported by Highways and development would lead to urban sprawl.

Site Details							
Easting	419418	Northing	440796	Site area ha	3.2	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	Unmanaged Forest
Other	
Neighbouring land uses	Dwellings
Wholesale distribution	
Other land uses	SSSI on west part of site

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	No

Description	Site wraps around existing employment site off Milner Lane. Eastern part of the site is adjacent to residential area, and is heavily treed. Western area of the site is more open, and is bounded by the railway line and further heavy tree cover. Site has no direct road access. Site is generally flat.
-------------	---

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	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)	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	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

The western part of the site is Green Belt. The development of this site alone would represent an isolated development unrelated to the existing settlement unless linked with adjacent site 2038. The site is also a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

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 accessibility to all services.

Rank (1-5)**2**

Access comments

Requires adopted highway and private road to be converted, poor bend further up road.

3

Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

Mitigation measures

highway works, signal improvements

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
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Network Rail**Yorkshire Water**

Treatment Works	Esholt
-----------------	--------

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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). Yeadon Brickworks and Railway Cutting Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) covers most of this site, and the remainder is a mixture of lowland mixed deciduous woodland, a UK Biodiversity Priority Habitat and some grassland which is of unknown quality.

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	62.14	% 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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1523.68
Nearest bus stop	10299
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	449.41

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Part Green Belt. The site has no road frontage and would require the development of the adjoining SHLAA site 2038 for access purposes. The western section of the site is a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and could not be developed. The eastern section is covered in dense trees and is also considered unsuitable.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site and biodiversity (ecology objection). Minor negative - employment and economic growth, greenhouse emissions, accessibility, landscape and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Pro. Suggested light industry in line with the SSSI status

Anti. New town by the back door. Site is a SSSI - Yeadonian Shale.

Statutory Metro - 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. 557m from the core network. 5 buses an hour. Yes access to primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Part Green Belt. The site has no road frontage and would require the development of the adjoining SHLAA site 2038 for access purposes. The western section of the site is a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and could not be developed. The eastern section is covered in dense trees and is also considered unsuitable.

Site Details

Easting	420126	Northing	440269	Site area ha	2.8	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-
On-site land uses		
Agriculture		
Neighbouring land uses		
Allotment and city farm		
Dwellings		
Agriculture		

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Site to the north of Warm Lane, bounded to the north by Gill Lane. To the west of the site beyond a heavily treed area, is an established residential area. To the east there is more sporadic spread of mixed uses. The site has rfoad frontages with both Gill Lane and Warm Lane. Site is generally flat although there is a more undulating profile on the western boundary of the site. Tree coverage is concentrated to the northern limits of the site, with a small number of trees in the centre 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?	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	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

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

Green Belt site. Development of site 2162 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, but development along with sites 1104 and 3033 would be contained by development on 3 sides.

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)
Not all of the site is within accessibility standard to Public Transport, accessible to employment /Town Centres	2

Access comments	
Gill Lane has no footways along the majority of its length including along site frontage, it also has substandard forward visibility at points along its length and is not considered to be suitable to serve additional development. Access from Warm Lane may also be difficult due to the road alignment and potential conflict with existing access points. If linked with adjacent sites 1104 and 3033	2

Local network comments	
Local congestion issues. Warm Lane is already traffic calmed (speed cushions).	2

Mitigation measures	Total score
None that would overcome site deficiencies.	6

Highways site support
Yes with mitigation, if linked with adjacent sites

Contingent on other sites
1104 and 3033

Contingent on other sites
1104 and 3033

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
n/a			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Esholt
Culverted watercourse to north of site	

Environment Agency

Constraints
FZ1 over 1ha. Part of this site lies in SPZ2. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildlife corridor function of Yeadon Gill towards north of the site - by providing a 20 metre buffer from the water course.	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

4020+2163A,+1180A+ 1311A,+2038+ 1221+ 2162+1104+ 3033+1308 = 1000 houses generates 250 primary and 100 secondary children. All sites combined would require a new 1FE primary school. 2FE secondary required across whole HMCA – land may be required to expand existing schools.

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Potential flood riskfrom minor watercourses within the site and along the Eastern 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	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

2162 Warm Lane (north of), Yeadon

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

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2320.25
Nearest bus stop	5982
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	293.27

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 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 site 2162 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, but development along with sites 1104 and 3033 would be contained by development on 3 sides. Highways consider that the site can be suitably accessed.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor negative - biodiversity (ecology mitigation), greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health and greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Pro
Agree and some sites should be considered more closely for this round of allocations e.g. 2162, 1104 and 3033.
Agree, but shouldn't be developed on its own.

Anti
It will also mean promotion of urban sprawl as Leeds and Bradford continue to merge.
A65 new road is already massively congested. It is indisputable that the River Aire creates a bottleneck in the area, there being only 3 severely congested bridges at Saltaire, Horsforth and A658 Apperley Bridge. Peak journey times between Greengates junction and Green Lane (the JCT roundabout) can be 45 minutes for 2 miles.
Adding 600+ more cars to this will cause even more congestion/accidents. Airport expansion will also create more traffic on these local roads. There is no easy access to a railway station. The proposal to re open a Rail Station at Apperley Bridge, coupled with increased Airport travel will result in unacceptable traffic numbers.
Brownfield first - Two examples are the One Stop facility in Rawdon and Kirkland House on Queensway that has been empty for some time now.

Also there is an estimated 5000 homes sat empty across the city
Where did Leeds get its Housing Target numbers? They seem to be higher than anywhere else in England despite having the lowest projected population growth.
Should be looking for smaller sized developments such as those found on Windmill Lane in Yeadon (near the junction with Grange Avenue), or the development on New Road Side in Rawdon (near to the junction with the B6152).
The hamlets of High Fold, Ghyllroyd and Nether Yeadon will disappear along with their heritage.
There are at least 10 listed buildings at last count. Conservation team should be consulted. It is likely that, following a heritage assessment of the site and its surroundings, development of this site will be un-realistic based on the impact upon the identified heritage assets.
More time should be given to allow the local residents to get together and discuss these proposed plans.
Sites noted as 1221 and 1308 offer more potential.
The average price for houses in this area is between £200,000 - £250,000 and not affordable to the majority of first time buyers.

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.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
297	5	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development of site 2162 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern. Significant public objection. Proposed conservation area.

Site Details

Easting	418894	Northing	441318	Site area ha	2.9	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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	Green Belt site has a road frontage with Coach Road. Site is in agricultural use, being mainly flat. Tree cover is largely along field 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?	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

Green Belt site. Site A (the northern section) has a road frontage and relates well to the urban area, when considered with 1180A and 1311A.
--

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

Site A is just outside Public Transport accessibility distances and meets other requirements.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Access could be created onto Old Hollings Hill with significant widening with the loss of a stone boundary wall and mature trees. Coach Road frontage is onto the narrow section of Coach Road and doesn't have sufficient frontage to the west to improve the full substandard length, alternative route through Silverdale estate not suitable for large increase in traffic. A comprehensive

4

Local network comments

Old Hollings Hill would require significant widening with the loss of a stone boundary wall and mature trees. Silverdale Ave, existing on street parking to houses towards Park Road problematic, as an alternative route out, Coach Rd is narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road which can't be fully addressed with this site. Capacity

4

Mitigation measures

Old Hollings Hill would require significant widening with the loss of a stone boundary wall and mature trees. Traffic calming in Silverdale estate may help but won't provide the full solution. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 1311A would be appropriate.

Total score

11

Highways site support

Yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

1180A & 1311A

Contingent on other sites

1180A & 1311A

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	
No objection			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Esholt
Water mains in east of site	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation.	

Ecology boundary

Mitigation is required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats (potential Leeds Habitat Network) are addressed.

Education comments

4020+2163A,+1180A+ 1311A,+2038+ 1221+ 2162+1104+ 3033+1308 = 1000 houses generates 250 primary and 100 secondary children. All

2163A Park Road (South of) Sodhall Hill, Guiseley

sites combined would require a new 1FE primary school. 2FE secondary required across whole HMCA – land may be required to expand existing schools.

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

This site lies within the Guiseley Park Gate 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

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	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

2163A Park Road (South of) Sodhall Hill, Guiseley

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

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	896.26
Nearest bus stop	8389
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	353.96

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 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. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 1311A would be appropriate. Site A (the northern section) has a road frontage and relates well to the urban area, when considered with 1180A and 1311A. This smaller site (ie site A) will put less pressure on the road network. Traffic calming in Silverdale Estate would be required.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site, biodiversity (ecology objection) and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to greenspace, flood risk and transport network.

Summary of reps

Pro. Has good transport links. Keep to develop for employment. Keep to use for playing fields for the school. Suggest Agriculture, allotments, recreation, medical centre or school, access allowing as alternative use.

Anti - loss of use as a leisure facility for walkers etc. Coach Road is too narrow.

Statutory - Metro - 743m from network core. 5 buses an hour. No access to primary school. Access to secondary school and healthcare

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 1311A would be appropriate. Site A (the northern section) has a road frontage and relates well to the urban area, when considered with 1180A and 1311A. This smaller site (ie site A) will put less pressure on the road network. Traffic calming in Silverdale Estate would be required. Need to reserve land for primary school on this site or 1180A or 1311A.

Site Details							
Easting	418846	Northing	441135	Site area ha	13	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Dwellings	
Unmanaged Forest	
Neighbouring land uses	
Agriculture	
Dwellings	
Unmanaged Forest	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Far eastern boundary is the railway line. Western edge of the site fronts Old Hollings Lane, though this is heavily treed. There is further dense tree coverage to the southwest of the site. Site slopes down 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?	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?	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

Green Belt site. Development of Site B would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern.

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 Rank (1-5)
The site is outside bus accessibility standards and only a small proportion of the site falls within 800m of a train station. Only the edges of the site meet accessibility standards for health and education. 1

Access comments 3
Access could be created onto Old Hollings Hill with significant widening with the loss of a stone boundary wall and mature trees. Coach Road frontage is onto the narrow section of Coach Road and doesn't have sufficient frontage to the west to improve the full substandard length, alternative route through Silverdale estate not suitable for large increase in traffic.

Local network comments 3
Old Hollings Hill would require significant widening with the loss of a stone boundary wall and mature trees. Silverdale Ave, existing on street parking to houses towards Park Road problematic, as an alternative route out, Coach Rd is narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road which can't be fully addressed with this site. Capacity

Mitigation measures Total score
7

Highways site support
No

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact Network Status
No objection

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Esholt
Surface water sewers adjacent to pond in north west of site

Environment Agency

Constraints

LCC

Ecology support Not supported
Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but includes areas of woodland, a beck, pond and species-rich grassland (potentially part of the Leeds Habitat Network).

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There are a series of ponds and drainage channels within the main body of the site. The bottom SE corner of the site is potentially at risk of flooding from Guiseley 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	64.75	% 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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1078.25
Nearest bus stop	4411
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	504.83

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development due to Highways concerns and the fact that development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. The quality of the road network would prevent a large development (both A and B) in this area.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site, biodiversity (ecology objection), greenhouse emissions, accessibility and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor negative - access to greenspace and transport network. Minor positive - flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti Suggested Agriculture, allotments, recreation, nature reserve as alternative use.

Statutory Metro - 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. 568m to the core network. 5 buses an hour. No access to primary school. Access to secondary school and healthcare facilities.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development due to Highways concerns and the fact that development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. The quality of the road network would prevent a large development (both A and B) in this area.

Site Details

Easting	418248	Northing	442788	Site area ha	11.3	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-
On-site land uses		
Agriculture		
Neighbouring land uses		
Dwellings		
Education		
Other land uses		
Open Countryside		

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

Description

Site to the north of the existing residential area of Guiseley, bounded to the east by a railway line, to the north by playing pitches, and west and south by existing development. Site is flat with very little tree cover. A small number of farm buildings occupy an area adjacent to Ings Lane.

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	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 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

Green Belt site. Site is well contained. Development would round off the settlement.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Medium (6-10yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments		Rank (1-5)
Public transport accessibility comments		
Via Ings Lane no bus service but 1km to rail station and within town centre walk.		2
Access comments		
Access from Ings Lane achievable with mitigation. No access to A65 which would resolve bus service and improve accessibility in general.		4
Local network comments		
Local congestion issues on A65.		3
Mitigation measures		Total score
Unknown at this stage?		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
n/a			

Network Rail	
General asset protection issues	

Yorkshire Water	
Treatment Works	Burley Menston
Large surface water sewer adjacent to railway track at east	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	FZ3/2 de minimis
Small amount of flood zone 2/3 to north of the site. See comments in main text of our response.	

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the Mire Beck wildlife corridor - retaining a minimum 20 metre buffer from the beck. Otter, White-clawed Crayfish and feeding bats to consider.	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

734+4043+3026+1255B = 1389 houses generates 347 primary and 139 secondary children. High Royds (site 734) almost complete but in conjunction with other sites close by, a new 1.5FE primary school would be needed.

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Potential flood risk from Mire beck, which runs along the Eastern boundary 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	99.04	% 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 %	0.17
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	839.06
Nearest bus stop	11896
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	158.66

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 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. Site is well contained. Development would round off the settlement. Highways concerns about local road congestion, mitigation measures would be required.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - biodiversity (ecology mitigation), greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor positive - access to greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti
Proposals have been put forward to expand St Oswalds and Guiseley Infant School, but it has been acknowledged by the Council that even this will only cope with children from the exisiting developments in Guiseley, and that a new School will be required in Guiseley to provide for any further residential development.
Its proximity to a large Senior School together with the failure to provide the promised school for High Royds, mean a substantial part of this Site should be reserved for future educational use.
Last year most of this area was under water, flooded by the Mire Beck which is feed from the land above above and east of High Royds, and then the storm drains from the High Royds development feed into Mire Beck via a "seasonal pond", which causes further flooding.
When the farmer tried to get planning permission to reinstate the derelict farm buildings on the land adjoining Ings Lane, he was declined on reason of Ings Lane not being suitable for access for new dwellings.
Ings Lane and Netherfield Road are minor roads and would not be suitable for the volume of traffic that would be generated.
If 1148 is coded red because it is green belt preventing the coalition of Menston and Guiseley then looking at the map 3026 and 4043 continue that line across the A65. If local congestion can be quoted as a reason for 2160 to be coded red then surely it must be even more relevant for 3026 and 4043 which together constitute 629 more dwellings in an already congested area coming to terms with the 326 new dwellings currently being built on Netherfield road. If 3028 would constitute urban sprawl why not 3026 and 4043?

Pro
Sites on Ings Lane (3026 and 4043), although I would have thought that only one should be considered for development, not both
Part of 3026 suitable for retirement and assisted living homes.
Keep to develop as employment use.

Technical highways work has demonstrated that the site presents no insurmountable issues in terms of access arrangements and highways capacity.
The Council's assessment of site 3026 unequivocally concludes that site 3026 meets none of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.
Adequate site access can be achieved via a single priority junction on Ings Lane.
Site lies within an area of low flood risk according to the EA Flood Risk Maps.
The site is located less than 1km (circa 840m) from Guiseley railway station and within 200m of regular bus series along Otley Road.
Whilst the Issues and Options version of the Site Allocations Plan identifies site 3026 as having a capacity of 535 dwellings, master planning work undertaken by CEG demonstrates a yield of 200-250 units to comprise a more appropriate development density which provides for a high quality development which accommodates public open space and identified site constraints

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.				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
319	4	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site relates well to urban area and is contained by adjacent development, including the school to the north west. Development would round off the settlement. Highways mitigation measures would be required.

Site Details

Easting	419100	Northing	442786	Site area ha	11.5	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mixed
-----------	-------

-

On-site land uses

Agriculture
Outdoor amenity and open space
Dwellings

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture
Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Substantial site to the rear of properties on Kelcliffe Lane and The Poplars. Site rises up above the existing residential areas, before becoming flat to the north. West side drops steeply to new development, and has significant tree cover and recreational value. Remainder of the site is largely in agricultural use, with little tree cover.

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	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?	No
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
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

Green Belt site. Visible location above the urban area. Development would constitute urban sprawl, unrelated to the existing settlement pattern.

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)
Not accessible to public transport. Half site is within accessibility standards to services. 2

Access comments
Landlocked, not clear why extra field to Moor Lane not included. 1

Local network comments
Local congestion issues on A65. 3

Mitigation measures Total score
Unknown at this stage? 6

Highways site support
No due to access, mitigation if access possible.

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	Esholt
Large abandoned water mains through the centre of the site	

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

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	0.00	% 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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	620.74
Nearest bus stop	2187
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	469.32

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 type="checkbox"/>

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Visible location above the urban area. Development would constitute urban sprawl, unrelated to the existing settlement pattern. Highways issues regarding access.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - community cohesion and local distinctiveness (size of site in relation to settlement), greenhouse emissions, transport network, accessibility and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - flood risk.

Summary of reps

Sites 3026 and 4043 should be designated red. I believe their position on the outskirts of Guiseley make them important green belt areas preventing urban sprawl.

Access would be no better onto Ings Lane than 3028 onto Moor Lane3026 in particular is prone to flooding which cannot be ignored. Ings means water meadow and Mire Beck is self explan.

Given that Guiseley has absorbed 953 of the 1105 new dwellings being built in Aireborough with permission at 31.3.12. , then 3026 and 4043 constitute an overload.Traffic congestion, overcrowded trains, oversubscribed doctors and dentists, overflowing schools and not enough significant local employment opportunity are already a symptoms with this increased development it becomes more serious.

we need to keep space for allotments and should be promoting them as a greener way of living

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
625	8	No	No	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Visible location above the urban area. Development would constitute urban sprawl, unrelated to the existing settlement pattern. Highways issues regarding access.

Site Details

Easting	419789	Northing	442279	Site area ha	5.1	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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	Agricultural land to the rear of properties on Shaw Lane Gardens. Track runs through part of the site. Site is flat, with some tree cover on boundaries. A public right of way runs along the western boundary. The site is within a conservation area.
-------------	---

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?	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

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

Green Belt site. The site is well connected to the urban area but does perform a role in safeguarding the countryside from further sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments		Rank (1-5)
Public transport accessibility comments		
The majority of the site is within walking distance of access to bus services. The Railway Station is a bit further afield.		3
Access comments		4
Potential for direct access to Queensway subject to satisfying junction spacing and visibility requirements. Pedestrian link to Shaw Lane Gardens is possible. Also could be linked in part to site 1255B depending on overall number of dwellings.		
Local network comments		3
Traffic Managemnt issues on Queensway.		
Mitigation measures		Total score
Traffic caliming on Queensway		
10		
Highways site support		
Yes - with mitigation		
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	Esholt
Combined sewers and water mains in north and western boundary of the site	

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

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	0.00	% 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 %	0.09	

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	932.75
Nearest bus stop	7412
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	196.07

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 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. The site has been redrawn to exclude the residential properties along Wills Gill. The site is well connected to the urban area but does perform a role in safeguarding the countryside from further sprawl.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - flood risk.

Summary of reps

Streets already too narrow roads around the Banksfield/Coppice Wood Estate Area.

General support for the red colour coding of the site with particular concerns relating to local road congestion and safety, Green Belt, local infrastructure and the historic character of the site. Two comments were supportive of development.

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).				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
198	8	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is well connected to the urban area.

Site Details

Easting	420833	Northing	441738	Site area ha	3.8	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Otley and Yeadon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-									
On-site land uses											
Vacant land											
Neighbouring land uses											
Dwellings											
Agriculture											
Other land uses											
Village Green											

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Site to the rear of properties on Banksfield Crescent, bounded to the east by Tarn Lane. Open land lies to the north. Site slopes steeply towards the south, and also falls away steeply to the east. A number of well used Public Rights of Way cross the site. There is no tree cover on 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?	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?	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

Aireborough

3030 Banksfield Crescent, Yeadon

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

Green Belt site. Part of the site also falls within the designated Village Green. Development of the site in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern and constitute urban sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: Unsuitable

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

60% of site meets Public Transport accessibility standards, 40% of site meets accessibility standards to local facilities, education and healthcare

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Direct access from Haw Lane possible on 'country lane' section. Haw Lane will need to be widened with footways along site frontage, footways extended south.

4

Local network comments

Local congestion issues on A65.

4

Mitigation measures

Haw Lane widening and footways, improve footpath link to Bankfield Cres

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes - with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

better if combined with 2118

Contingent on other sites

better if combined with 2118

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
n/a			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Esholt
-----------------	--------

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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

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	0.00	
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	
			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 %	40.55
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Guisseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2029.95
Nearest bus stop	12022
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	259.60

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 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. Part of the site also falls within the designated Village Green. Development of the site in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern and constitute urban sprawl.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield land. Minor negative - natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to greenspace, flood risk and transport network.

Summary of reps

This area should not have been included in the proposals.

Site registered as a Village Green.

The Council's appraisal suggests that development of the site in isolation would be unrelated to the settlement pattern and contribute to urban sprawl. The City Council's appraisal is flawed and the site should be categorised as a GREEN.

The residual area not covered by the Village Green status is not covered by the village green designation.A modification to the site submission is required following designation of part of the SHLAA site (3030) and PAS land to the south as Village Green.

i) Sustainability
Guiseley/Rawdon and Yeadon are identified as major settlements and are therefore inherently sustainable locations. The site is within 700m of the facilities in Yeadon town centre and the facilities and service it offers. There are regular and frequent bus services to Leeds City Centre

ii) Brownfield preference
The land is currently pasture land, but does include agricultural buildings and an area of hardstanding.

iii) Green Belt Purposes
The site does not contribute to the general openness of the Green Belt The Council contends that the site is unrelated to the settlement pattern and would constitute urban sprawl. This belies the position on the ground that the entirety of the Haw Lane frontage opposite is developed with a range of semi-detached houses, there is a bungalow and gardens to the south of the site and a well defined ridgeline which encloses the site visually to the north.In fact the site is well contained on three of its boundaries, by Haw Lane to the east and by the village green designation to the west and south. Given these circumstances it is difficult to consider how the site contributes to the general characteristics and openness of the Green Belt, or for that matter reflects the purposes for keeping land in the Green Belt.
The site should be removed from the Green Belt with the boundary realigned along the northern boundary as indicated on the attached plan which is marked by an established wall and hedgeline.
Given that the Village Green area was removed from the Green Belt as not deeming to serve a Green Belt function we can see no justification for it being put back into the Green Belt.

iv) Distinctiveness
Much of the housing stock around the site is of varying materials comprising a mixture of brick and render under concrete roof tiles to the east with intermittent dwellings constructed of stone. Much of the land comprising the Village and Town Green is pasture land, which is used informally by walkers and dog walkers. It is considered therefore that a modest sized development on part of the site as indicated in Appendix B would contribute to housing stock. Such a scheme with access from Haw Lane could include dwellings fronting on to and overlooking the Village Green and providing some natural surveillance from the principal windows. Advice from local estate agents indicates a strong demand for new housing stock in the area, and a lack of available sites. The site is considered attractive and can come forward to provide a mix of housing types which are suitable for the site to reflect that market advice from local estate agents.

v) Lead in times and Construction
The site is available and can come forward within two years subject to the planning process.

vi) Greenspace
A modest housing development on the site can be designed in such a way as to provide surveillance over the Village Green.

General support for red colour coding with specific reference to the Village Green designation of the site reflecting local greenspace and amenity value. Concern about local infrastructure and traffic congestion. One respondent supporting new housing development on the residual area of land outside VG designation; the site is in a sustainable location close to public transport and services; it does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt; housing is deliverable; and therefore the site boundary should be redrawn to reflect the established wall and hedgeline.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Part of the site also falls within the designated Village Green. Development of the site in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern and constitute urban sprawl.

Site Details

Easting	419550	Northing	440546	Site area ha	1.3	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mixed	-
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	No

Description

Site comprising two agricultural fields to the rear of Westfield Oval. Site slopes downwards along Ghyll Mount. Site includes properties at the end of Ghyll Mount which is an unpaved track, and the sole access to the site. There is tree coverage along the field boundaries, running down the centre of the site. Site is bounded to the north and east by residential development, with open fields to the south 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?	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	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

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

Green Belt site, not particularly well related to the existing settlement pattern. Highways objections.

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)
Poor access to Public Transport and Health facilities. Close to local Primary and Secondary Schools. 1

Access comments
Appears to be insufficient space to accommodate an adopted access road. 2

Local network comments
High levels of on-street parking in Westfied Estate. Congestion on A65. 2

Mitigation measures Total score
None that would overcome site deficiencies. 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	Esholt
Culverted watercourse in eastern part of site	

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

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	99.35	% 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

3031 Land Behind 1-19 Westfield Oval, Yeadon

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1804.79
Nearest bus stop	10299
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	306.98

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, not particularly well related to the existing settlement pattern. Highways concerns re access - adoptable highway not considered achievable.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site, greenhouse emissions, accessibility and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor negative - access to health and leisure facilities and community participation due to poor access , and transport network. Minor positive for access to education and greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Much better use could be made of this land, suggesting employment/industry.

General support for red colour coding of site. One respondee supportive of development for housing and another for alternative development for employment/industry.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site, not particularly well related to the existing settlement pattern. Highways concerns re access - adoptable highway not considered achievable.

Site Details							
Easting	420267	Northing	439979	Site area ha	8.2	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Mixed
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Dwellings	
Neighbouring land uses	
Agriculture	
Dwellings	
Allotment and city farm	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Agricultural fields to the the south of Warm Lane and Apperley Lane junction. Site slopes downwards towards Warm Lane. A car sales area is located in the southern corner of the site, a private property to the north eastern corner and a farm is located to the north western corner. There is very little tree cover across the site. Area to the west and south is very open in nature.
-------------	--

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	Yes
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?	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

Green Belt site. Development of site 3033 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, but development along with sites 1104 and 2162 would be contained by development on 3 sides.

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)
Poor access to Public Transport, Health facilities, Local Primary and Secondary Schools.		1
Access comments		
Although there are opportunities for accesss along Apperley Lane the existing footway provision is substandard where it exists and there is generally no footway along the Apperley Lane site frontage. Opportunity for limited access on to Warm Lane. However footways also substandard in this location.		3
Local network comments		
Congestion on A65. Poor footway connections on Apperley Lane and Warm Lane site frontages.		2
Mitigation measures		Total score
Footway improvements and Traffic Regulation Orders. Full assessment of impact on A65 and Apperley Lane may require othere measures.		6
Highways site support		
Yes, with mitigation		
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	Esholt
Surface water sewer in northern part of site	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	SPZ2
FZ1 over 1ha. Part of this site lies in SPZ2. See comments in main text of our response.	

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

3033 Land to east of Apperley Lane

Ecology boundary

Education comments

4020+2163A,+1180A+ 1311A,+2038+ 1221+ 2162+1104+ 3033+1308 = 1000 houses generates 250 primary and 100 secondary children. All sites combined would require a new 1FE primary school. 2FE secondary required across whole HMCA – land may be required to expand existing schools.

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Small area of land in the NE corner, just North of Warm Lane, may be at risk of flooding from un-named watercourse within the site boundary.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

There are a number of Listed Buildings at the northern end of this area (five Grade II buildings at Fold Farm and Old Rawdon Manse on Apperley Lane). 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. The southern part of this area also adjoins the boundary of the Rawdon Little London Conservation Area. Consequently, before allocating this area, there would need to be some assessment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the significance of the Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area, and what effect its loss and subsequent development might have upon the significance of these assets. If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets (including their 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
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

3033 Land to east of Apperley Lane

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 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	% 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	Guiselley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2640.72
Nearest bus stop	4123
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	353.99
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**

Green Belt site. Development of site 3033 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, but development along with sites 1104 and 2162 would be contained by development on 3 sides. Highways consider that the site can be suitably accessed.

Site affects others?**Sustainability summary**

Significant negative - greenfield site, greenhouse emissions, transport network, accessibility, pollution and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Warm Lane is used by local people for walking and cycling.

The urban sprawl is damaging to the environment, reduces farm land thereby destroying British agriculture and forces more food and milk imports.

Where are the employment sites for the people destined to live in the proposed developments? This proposal is another nail in the coffin for Yeadon and Rawdon. They are no longer separate communities but dormitory suburbs for Leeds destroying their character.

These will most likely be housing for people who either work outside of Leeds/in Yeadon or Bradford and these sites have great access to all of these.

The LCC web site where we have been directed to lodge our objections is overly complicated and confusing. The council has a responsibility both to promote and facilitate the comments of residents. They have failed to do this.

Currently to buy any house in Rawdon you are talking about £200-300, 000 plus so I don't think these are affordable to most people and because it is a wonderful part of Leeds and really attractive to buyers they will be quite within their rights to start charging high prices for a new build home..... so really what is the point because you are going to exclude the first time buyers and young families that you want to attract to the area.

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network - 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.

Concern raised about the impact of development of the site on the Green Belt leading to urban sprawl and the merging of Leeds and Bradford. The environmental quality of the area in terms of landscape, views and biodiversity of the area providing a habitat for birds and recreational value. The effect upon the historic environment in particular listed buildings and the Little London Conservation Area. Pressure on local infrastructure (roads, schools, GPs, dentists and local services) and constraints of public transport with no easy access to Guiseley railway station. Concern about the number of housing sites proposed in the Nether Yeadon/JCT area proportionate to the overall number for Aireborough.

Comments on phasing**DPP Allocation**

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development of site 3033 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern. Significant public objection. Proposed conservation area.

Site Details

Easting	421945	Northing	439941	Site area ha	74.6	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough, North Leeds				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield -						
On-site land uses	Agriculture						
Neighbouring land uses	Dwellings						
	Agriculture						
	Other						
Other land uses	Local Nature Area						
Topography	Flat			Landscape	Limited Tree Cover		
Boundaries	Existing well defined			Road front	Yes		

Description	Site of Cold Harbour Farm and associated land to the south, commonly known as Rawdon Billings. Farm track runs through the middle of the site. There is little to no tree coverage on the site, which undulates. Western boundary is residential, open land stretches 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 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?	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	Significant 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

Large site. Development would have a significant impact on the openness of the green belt and result in a large area of urban sprawl. Site currently performs important countryside function and surrounds an important nature 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	Rank (1-5)
80% of this site is accessible to Public Transport, but only approx 30% of the site is accessible to services.	2

Access comments

Bayton Lane too narrow and has no footway but mitigation can be completed, left turn out of site only onto Bayton Lane. Access to Larkfield Road required through another site (this access essential for larger site) but access not suitable due to brow of hill access visibility issues. Access to Belmont Grove likely to be unsuitable due to junction with A658/B6152 unless significant	2
---	---

Local network comments

Local congestion issues on A658, A65, Bayton Lane.	2
--	---

Mitigation measures

No suitable mitigation for access onto Larkfield Mount which is essential to progress larger site and distribute trips on network, other mitigation around network possible on Bayton Lane and Bellmount Grove.	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
n/a			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Esholt
Large water main runs north/south through site towards western boundary.Culverted watercourses near to small pond and various mains (some abandoned) near to abandoned covered reservoir	

Environment Agency

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

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported - Great Crested Newts to consider.	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Should this come to fruition, we would request land from part of the development for new school provision.

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	99.81	% overlap	Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.02		Major Settlement	1.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00		Minor Settlement	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.07		Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
N1A Allotments	0.00				
N5 Open Space	0.00				
N6 Playing Pitch	0.22				
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				

Other Spatial Relationship		
LCC ownership %	0.09	

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2602.70
Nearest bus stop	5530
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	599.44

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

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

Green Belt site. The site covers the area commonly known as Rawdon Billings and envelopes Billing Hill, a protected nature area. The site is large and development would have a serious impact on the openness of the Green Belt and result in a large area of urban sprawl. The area and capacity has been split - 2.66ha, capacity of 70 in North Leeds housing market characteristic area, majority (56.25ha) in Aireborough.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield. Minor negative - community cohesion and local distinctiveness (site size relative to settlement), greenhouse emissions, transport network, accessibility and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

The land around Rawdon Billing has been an amenity for public recreation for generations and should never be developed.

Rawdon Billing Hill is a very prominent piece of Green Belt space, visible from near and far, successfully visually separating the Communities of Horsforth, Rawdon, Guiseley and Yeadon and thereby assisting with individual local identity.

It is the particular location and prominence of Rawdon Billing which makes it different to other Green Belt locations. There are many sites within the Green Belt which are not particularly attractive, cannot be readily seen, are not open to public access and could quite readily be developed, without particular concern. This does not apply to Rawdon Billing, which is a very sensitive visual location.

The location of these sites being on the fringe of Horsforth and Yeadon provide a valuable and much loved open green space for residents of Horsforth and Yeadon to enjoy for walking and leisure purposes. Celebrated community/charitable events such as Rawdon Fun Day are held on site 3328. Losing these spaces would impact on the community negatively.

This area is a landmark and always has been, used by walkers, runners, children playing, dog-walkers and has a trig point. From the top of the Billing you can see all the towns around for miles.

Terrible questionnaire. I don't know if I am voting for or against green land here after completing this. Just for the record I am in favour of keeping the Rawdon Billing and its surrounding land as greenspace land and not to be built on.

immensely popular recreation site for the whole area

immensely popular recreation site for the whole area

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site covers the area commonly known as Rawdon Billings and envelopes Billing Hill, a protected nature area. The site is large and development would have a serious impact on the openness of the Green Belt and result in a large area of urban sprawl. The site is not supported by Highways.

Site Details

Easting	420729	Northing	441188	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Otley and Yeadon	

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

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (later)

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	Supported
Supported	

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
14/04075/RM	Reserved Matters application for a new extra care housing comprising 45 apartments with communal facilities at ground floor level (C2 Use Class)	A	91

3164 Haworth Court, Chapel Lane

10/02227/LA	Outline application for residential development comprising of C2 (residential institution)	A	99
13/03677/EXT	Extension of time period for planning permission 10/02227/LA Outline application for residential development comprising of C2 (residential institution)		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	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 %	99.83
Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2132.47
Nearest bus stop	5790
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	33.17
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 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

Deleted too small

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	420560	Northing	440548	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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

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
09/02882/FU	Demolition of garage and outbuildings and erection of 4 four bedroom terrace houses with access, parking and landscaping and extension/laying out of car park to public	A	99

	house		
10/05349/FU	Demolition of garage and outbuildings and erection of 5 dwelling houses and extension/laying out of car park to public house	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	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	Guiselley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2380.76
Nearest bus stop	12468
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	62.80

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 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

Deleted too small

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	421003	Northing	439923	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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

Aireborough

3229 Batter Lane, Rawdon

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
10/02175/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5 and 17 of Planning Application 06/05572/FU	SPL	100

3229 Batter Lane, Rawdon

10/02328/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4 and 9 of Planning Application 06/05572/FU	A	100
10/05696/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 18 of Planning Application 06/05572/FU	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	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 %	0.78
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Guiselley
Nearest train station distance (m)	3136.75
Nearest bus stop	10127
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	89.53

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 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 to deleted

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Anti
Current congestion levels on the A65 and the sounding roads are really bad.
Closure of Rawdon Fire Station, closure of Otley Police Station - surely increase in population = increase in crime - has this really been thought through!

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	421966	Northing	440811	Site area ha	7.6	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Otley and Yeadon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-
On-site land uses		
Agriculture		
Neighbouring land uses		
Agriculture		
Other land uses		
SEGI on site.		

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

Description	Site located between airport and Bayton Lane. Generally flat site with limited tree cover. North western side of the site contains Rawdon Ponds, an important Site of Ecological or Geological Interest (SEGI).
-------------	---

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	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 encroahment

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?	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

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

Green Belt site. The site contains a Site of Ecological or Geological Interest (SEGI) and is not considered suitable for development. The area not covered by a SEGI is separated from the 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)

Average accessibility to all services.

3

Access comments

Access onto adopted highway achievable, Bayton Lane has narrow width and no footways for large volumes of traffic.

4

Local network comments

Significant local congestion at peak times, unlikely to be able to mitigate.

2

Mitigation measures

highway works, signal improvements

Total score

9

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

yes with site 3034 and comprehensive highway improvements

Contingent on other sites

yes with site 3034 and comprehensive highway improvements

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail**Yorkshire Water**

Treatment Works	Esholt
-----------------	--------

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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.

3326 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

LCC

Ecology support

Not supported

Not supported (RED). The northern section of this site is Rawdon Ponds Site of Ecological and Geological Importance (SEGI) - an important site for Great Crested Newts (European Protected species). The site includes breeding ponds and terrestrial feeding and hibernating habitat.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There is an existing pond 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	0.01	
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	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	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2969.50
Nearest bus stop	11647
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	326.37

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

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 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. The site contains a Site of Ecological or Geological Interest (SEGI) and is not considered suitable for development. The area not covered by a SEGI is separated from the settlement and given the sensitive nature of the area development is not considered appropriate.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site and biodiversity (ecology objection). Minor negative - pollution and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - flood risk

Summary of reps

Anti development:
Highly visible important green belt area. The Billing area is a valuable asset, an amenity for public recreation, well used by local residents. Development would have a major negative impact on the character of the area and village community. The site forms a buffer between Rawdon and Horsforth. Development would constitute urban sprawl. Site 3326 should not be developed because of a SEGI. It has important ecological features. The Billings is an area of outstanding natural beauty.

Roads are narrow and busy. Congestion on A65 and A658, especially in view of the expansion of the airport. The site should be preserved to prevent further sprawl towards the airport where noise levels are high anyway.

New housing should reflect the needs of the population. Needs to be recognition of the scale of recent housing developments in the area and no. of permissions not built out eg Highroyds, and the high level of windfall sites.

Neutral:
Some of site 3326 could be considered where properties already exist.

Pro development:
The site is above flood plains and does not form a green buffer between existing towns or villages/would not result in the coalescence of Rawdon/Yeadon with Horsforth. Development would not pose any threat to existing housing in terms of flood risk and is more suitable than other sites. The site has become untidy waste land.

The land to the north of Bayton Lane, Rawdon (Site Ref: 3326) forms part of the wider land parcel at Cold Harbour Farm, which lies to the south of Bayton Le. The site should be considered as part of the Cold Harbour Farm site, but due to the Site of Ecological or Geological Interest (SEGI), this site is less suitable for comprehensive development than the land to the south. The site could deliver some dwellings to connect the development of the larger site with existing dwellings and built development to the north of Bayton Lane and east of Victoria Avenue (A658). This site should be identified for allocation alongside the Cold Harbour Farm site. The Masterplan for the whole land parcel identifies site 3326 as an area of Common Land with no development proposed. At the very least the site should be incorporated into the Cold Harbour Farm site to support the delivery of this area of open space as part of the wider development. However, it is maintained the site could sustain some development, which would form a natural extension to the built development to the west and the development proposed as part of the Cold Harbour farm site. The larger site splits into 2 development parcels with a country park between them which ensures development does not result in a large area of urban sprawl but will provide access to the countryside and protect and enhance Billing Hill nature area. Development will provide other benefits to the city in the form of part of the airport relief road (between A65 and airport to bypass Yeadon) and a park and ride facility. The site is wholly accessible to local services and can be suitably accessed.

The Council is relying on UDP allocations and extant permissions - we question the deliverability of some of the sites and therefore the number of dwellings proposed to be deducted from the requirement in the area. The site can be developed in the short term, has no development constraints and is suitable, deliverable and developable.

Metro:
Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network
Sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. 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).

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
355	8	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site contains a Site of Ecological or Geological Interest (SEGI) and is not considered suitable for development. The area not covered by a SEGI is separated from the settlement and given the sensitive nature of the area development is not considered appropriate.

Site Details

Easting	422303	Northing	438903	Site area ha	3.6	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough, North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

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 fields to the rear of properties on Layton Lane. The site is bounded to the east by a tree line, though there is limited tree coverage on the remainder of the site. Site slopes from north to 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?	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	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

Due to the enclosed nature of the site, development would have limited impact on 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

Rank (1-5)

Good accessibility to employment and Public Transport, poor accessibility to local services.

4

Access comments

Frontage with side road off Laytone Lane, possible junction works with A65. Adopted spur road between 24 & 26 Layton Lane is wide enough to create access to the site, access also available between 64 & 68 but is private. A single point of access would be adequate for the proposed level of development c100 units. Support with mitigation.

5

Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

2

Mitigation measures

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
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Network Rail**Yorkshire Water**

Treatment Works	Esholt
-----------------	--------

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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

3329 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wooded beck corridor that runs down the eastern side of this site, and the hedgerow/line of trees that runs across the site. The beck and lowland mixed deciduous woodland are UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority habitats. A minimum 20 metre buffer to be provided to the wooded areas and planted with native shrubs, small trees. A minimum 5 metre buffer on both sides of the hedgerow/line of trees across the site (this feature provides a valuable east-west habitat link and any break in it for access should be kept to an absolute minimum and mitigated for by significant hedgerow planting elsewhere around the boundaries).

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Gill beck runs along the Eastern site boundary.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing sites 3329, 4095 and 3331 are all within 2km of the Leeds-Liverpool Canal SSSI. Leeds City Council should ensure there are no significant cumulative effects as a result these allocations upon this nature conservation site's interest features. See citation www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation/citation_photo/1004146.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

3329 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

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	

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	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2130.84
Nearest bus stop	2947
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	245.03

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 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 well contained due to the trees along the eastern boundary, which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and provide natural screening. Due to the enclosed nature of the site, development would have limited impact on the Green Belt. The adopted spur road between 24&26 Layton Lane is wide enough to create access to the site, access also available between 64 & 68 but is private. A single point of access would be adequate for the proposed level of development c100 units.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site and biodiversity (ecology objection). Minor negative - pollution and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - greenhouse emissions, flood risk and accessibility.

Summary of reps

ENVIRONMENT

Greenbelt Land

The above sites are green belt areas and were contained in the Guiseley / Rawdon ward, but now appear to be located in Horsforth ward. The boundaries have been altered (manipulated) to include these sites in a ward that shows a surplus of green space.

There are lots of bats in the trees surrounding the field, which I'm sure you are aware are protected, birds including Red Kites, Woodpeckers, foxes and deer are frequently seen as well as the plants and trees in the fields behind Layton Lane.

There are underground streams and any building work would cause major problems to existing houses and road

Housing development of other areas further along the A65 towards Guiseley and Menston and development of the Clarion site will also add to the current vehicular congestion of the A65, making development of the Sites even less sustainable;

There is evidence of Coal Mining in the area surrounding the Sites. Along Layton Lane one house has a mine marked as "Zone of Interest" ("ZOI") which means that the Coal Authority believe that they need to undertake surveys to determine whether the mine is safe and if not, what works are required to render it safe. The shafts relating to that mine cannot be identified by the Coal Authority and their location is therefore not traceable — how does this sit with development of Site 3329 for housing if shafts are not traceable? Surely that renders the Site unsafe for human habitation?

The land is one of a former mine, integral to the successful settlement & growth of Rawdon & Horsforth. The landscape still bears evidence through its field patterns, drainage runs, trees, topography & physical evidence of mine openings. To allocate this land for housing on the basis that it is 'well screened' by its TPO'd edge when a significant number are Ash. We are too aware of the risk that ash dieback is posing. Up to 90% of ash trees could be lost leaving the site exposed, destroying the loved characteristics it has & forever harming the countryside setting of Rawdon if it is developed

Around 50 to 60 years ago it was suggested that Layton Lane including the part near the main road, however, this idea was, also, abandoned because coal was suspected there

We need the green spaces to compensate for the traffic you encourage to flow through our ward. Taking the green spaces for housing will generate more traffic and pollution, having a double, negative impact on all who live here.

A Tree Preservation Order on plot 3329 is cited as a positive aspect of the potential reclassification of the land from its Green Belt status. The TPO was certainly not passed to justify new building projects on protected land. Protecting our native tree species is of paramount importance and I would request a proper survey into this impact on the referenced plots.

TRAFFIC

Layton Lane is already a very busy road.

Only public transport is bus on already congested A65 and Brownberrie Lane

The area is becoming very congested, as there has been major developments at the Clarion Works, Riverside Works, the old Cromplan parkerian site, silvercross site, Netherfield Road site with most of the traffic going to Leeds

It is also worth remembering that a further 400 houses are proposed for the former Clariant works site at Horsforth (without including the Riverside works site adjoining it). This could add a further 800 cars into the local road network. None of the local facilities/amenities/stations can be reached from these areas other than by car.

The A65 should be dealt with first and foremost before any development should be even considered.

At the moment site 3329 is green belt land and is meeting the National Planning Policy Framework stated opportunities and benefits

A right-angled junction would be developed at the top of Knott Lane adjoining the A65. It is difficult to understand how this will resolve the access issues onto the A65.

We constantly suffer from electrical power outages across lower Rawdon. Without an upgrade to the local grid, the additional houses on plots 3329, 3331 and 4095 would only serve to exacerbate this problem.

HOUSING

The former Clariant site I believe has had planning permission passed for new houses surely this is sufficient for this area.

There are 3 large sites in the area that currently have planning permission and which are Brownfield sites which have yet to be developed (Kirkstall Forge, Clariant and Woodside Quarry

OTHER

Not feasible

The existing trees on the site can not serve as a boundary, as they are not substantial or sufficient enough to separate the two.

The local infrastructure in general is simply incapable of supporting a development of this size.

Further, we constantly suffer from electrical power outages across lower Rawdon. Without an upgrade to the local grid, the additional houses on plots 3329, 3331 and 4095 would only serve to exacerbate this problem

Local brown site land (the Sandoz site at Horsforth, the Kirkstall Valley site, Naylor Jennings, Green Lane & land on Green Lane, Rawdon adjacent to the church, the site of St Joseph's, Horsforth) is undeveloped

At the moment site 3329 is green belt land and is meeting the National Planning Policy Framework stated opportunities and benefits

Farm land

The proximity of an international airport and it's flight path.

FOR DEVELOPMENT (DIFFERS FROM MAJORITY)

3329, 4095, 3331 would be more suitable for elderly accommodation in as much as there would be less use of roads by elderly residents, and no school issues, but there are no nearby amenities.

A smaller, less intrusive development which would impact less on the environment, both natural and in terms of infrastructure, might be possible.

If due to government targets for housing we have to build, these sites have the least impact on the surrounding countryside from further encroachment.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Safeguarded land (PAS)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site adjoining the southern boundary of 5145. The 2 sites together would create a relatively self contained site, notwithstanding the fact that the site does form part of the Green Belt gap between Rawdon and Horsforth. The site is well contained due to the trees along the eastern boundary, which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and provide natural screening. Potential for development in the longer term. Designation as safeguarded land considered most appropriate.

Site Details

Easting	422117	Northing	438506	Site area ha	1	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough, North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-
On-site land uses	Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	Agriculture	
Dwellings	Unmanaged Forest	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Triangular site to the south of Knott Lane/Layton Lane junction. Site is bounded by trees to the south. There is some further tree coverage in the centre of the site, which acts as screening for small managed area of site. Site slopes 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?	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?	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

Green Belt site, but well contained and would not constitute sprawl if developed.

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)
Good accessibility to all services. 5

Access comments
Frontage with Knott Lane good, possible junction works with A65. 5

Local network comments
Local congestion issues. 2

Mitigation measures 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
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Esholt
-----------------	--------

Large surface water sewer crosses the site towards north and in the east

Environment Agency

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

LCC

Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
-----------------	---------------------------

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wooded beck corridor that runs down the eastern side of this site, and the hedgerow that runs part of the way along the eastern boundary. The beck and lowland mixed deciduous woodland are UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority habitats. A minimum 20 metre buffer to be provided to the wooded/beck corridor and planted with native shrubs, small trees.

3331 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Gill beck runs along the Eastern site boundary.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing sites 3329, 4095 and 3331 are all within 2km of the Leeds-Liverpool Canal SSSI. Leeds City Council should ensure there are no significant cumulative effects as a result these allocations upon this nature conservation site's interest features. See citation www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation/citation_photo/1004146.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	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	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

3331 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

LCC ownership %	0.66
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2389.26
Nearest bus stop	12849
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	120.13

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 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, but well contained and would not constitute sprawl if developed. Could be developed along with site 4095; the sites would need to jointly provide a realignment of Knott Lane to provide a 90 degree approach to the A65. Accessibility by public transport and to facilities is good.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - access to greenspace, biodiversity (ecology mitigation) and pollution. Significant positive - access to greenspace and accessibility. Minor positive - flood risk.

Summary of reps

ENVIRONMENT

Site is in the greenbelt, therefore cannot be developed.

The plot contains an abundance of wildflowers and grasses, as well as being home to jays, barn owls, red kites, a grey heron, stoats, foxes, frogs, toads, newts, butterflies and moths. There is also a deer population in the area which grazes in this and neighbouring fields. The plot contains an abundance of wildflowers and grasses, as well as being home to jays, barn owls, red kites (on RSPB Amber list), a grey heron, stoats, foxes, frogs, toads, newts, butterflies and moths.

Wildlife such as badgers, bats, kestrel, sparrow hawk, woodpecker, goldcrest, nuthatch, siskin, black caps, wrens and common garden birds.

Green field site which as such enhances local people's standard of living.

Mining: There are some 11 coal shafts in the vicinity of the proposed development.

Gas mains that runs through Site 3331.

There are underground streams which cause flooding in the area.

3331 is part of the Rawdon Cragg Wood conservation

Problems already exist with the 225mm diameter combined foul and surface water which is inadequate to service the existing infrastructure.

This is clearly visible after any heavy rainfall when the manholes are lifted, the latest incident being as recent as 23 & 25 July 2013, which resulted in raw sewage running down Knott Lane, leaving used toilet paper, sanitary towels and associated detritus

Water: water pressure has considerably been reduced over the last 14 years by Yorkshire Water due to a significant number of leaks and insufficient supply

TRAFFIC

A65 should be dealt with first and foremost before any development is considered.

A65 road into Leeds is extremely busy and congested which ignites safety issues not only on the road but children at school.

Major developments at the Clarion Works, Riverside Works, the old cromplan parkerian site, silvercross site, Netherfield Road site will increase the congestion.

The only public transport within walking distance is the bus route on the A65, this is heavily congested at peak times so bus times are unreliable.

Any realignment of Knott Lane would not improve the issue due to the high volume of traffic along the A65.

Car parking at the existing stations in Menston, Guiseley and Horsforth (all accessed via the A 65) is already unable to cope with the volume of cars which spill out into surrounding street

CONSULTATION

There was little or no publicity in Rawdon from the Council on the proposal.

The Parish council undertook a consultation, 438 participants considered this site in their response and whilst there was some support for use of this site for housing it was outweighed by the objection:

Very Suitable for Housing - 13

Suitable for housing - 89

Not sure - 88

Not suitable for housing - 89

This site should be protected from Building - 156

This site is suitable for another use - 3

The Parish Council is therefore unable to support the designation

HOUSING

Following the approval for the development of the Clariant site, combined with the approvals for Menston and other various approvals for housing that have yet to be developed, the area has gone beyond saturation point.

Any development on the greenbelt land will cause urban sprawl and merging of Rawdon with Horsforth.

COMMUNITY

Site 3331 directly borders Rawdon crematorium. The crematorium is sacred ground and needs to be a quiet, reflective place. Any construction work on plot 3331, and neighbouring 4095, would clearly be intrusive and emotionally distressing for anyone using the crematorium.

Erosion of green belt makes this natural countryside less and less accessible to inner city families.

The current infrastructure and local services cannot accommodate for development.

Any development on the greenbelt will negatively affect the quality of life in the area

OTHER

The above sites are green belt areas and were contained in the Guiseley / Rawdon ward, but now appear to be located in Horsforth ward. The boundaries have been altered (manipulated) to include these sites in a ward that shows a surplus of green space.

The preceding Core Strategy was not clearly evidenced at the presentation, so that the granular nature of the consultation was not entirely clear.

Further, we constantly suffer from electrical power outages across lower Rawdon. Without an upgrade to the local grid, the additional houses

3331 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

on plots 3329, 3331 and 4095 would only serve to exacerbate this problem.
Electricity: The area is blighted by power cuts, the last occurring at the start of July 2013. It is considered that the local infrastructure is already exceeding its capacity before any proposed development.

NATIONAL/LOCAL POLICY
We do not believe that the Sites fall within the Exceptions set out in the NPPF because this Consultation is about housing only and not any type of development whatsoever.
Parliamentary Under Secretary for Planning, Nick Boles, replying to a question from Otley's MP Greg Mulholland, also stressed that the authority would have to consult "extensively" to gain residents' support before such changes could happen.
Mr Boles told him: "Only in exceptional circumstances can development take place on the Green Belt, and the local authority will need to consult extensively with the community to gain its support for any proposed change."
Suitable sites should commence with available brown field sites before green field.
the allocation process for future development being a government proposal imposed on the council.

PRO DEVELOPMENT
Accept the housing needs position and in the context of this consider that the Knott Lane and Layton Lane sites are more suitable housing sites than those identified as red. Layton Lane and Knott Lane should perhaps be amber not green as they are in the green belt

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Safeguarded land (PAS)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green belt site, but well contained and would not constitute sprawl if developed. Could be developed along with 4095. The sites would need to jointly provide a realignment of Knott Lane to provide a 90 degree approach to the A65. Accessibility by public transport and to facilities is good. Site proposed as safeguarded land as less sequentially preferable to other sites.

Site Details

Easting	421790	Northing	441405	Site area ha	3.9	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Otley and Yeadon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield		
On-site land uses			
Agriculture			
Neighbouring land uses			
Agriculture			
Outdoor amenity and open space			
Terminals and Interchanges			
Other land uses			
Residential - Dwellings			
Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Site adjacent to Yeadon Tarn, bounded by the airport to the north. There is existing residential use to the south. Site is flat.
-------------	--

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?	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

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

Green Belt site. Self contained between existing housing and airport runway. Development would constitute rounding off of 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)

Poor accessibility to Public Transport and employment, good accessibility to local services.

3

Access comments

Frontage with Victoria Avenue but access works required as access visibility and road layout challenging. Site would need to be accessed from a new roundabout on Victoria Avenue.

4

Local network comments

Significant local congestion at peak times, unlikely to be able to mitigate all sites in area including this one.

2

Mitigation measures

access signals/rdt will be required, poss cumulative fund for congestion in area

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
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Esholt
-----------------	--------

Combined and surface water sewers cross the site and converge in the centre

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 Yeadon Tarn Local Nature Area (LNA) (immediately adjacent to north-west) - an important site for wildfowl and passerine birds, amphibians and water voles. Provide a buffer zone between the development and the LNA of 20 metres.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Yeadon Tarn located immediately to 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	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
-----------------	------

3366 Land at Victoria Avenue, Leeds

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	3040.44
Nearest bus stop	2046
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	195.57

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

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 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. Self contained between existing housing and airport runway. Development would constitute rounding off of settlement. Site would need to be accessed from a new roundabout on Victoria Avenue.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - biodiversity (ecology mitigation) and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to health and flood risk.

Summary of reps

METRO
Land at Victoria Avenue, Leeds G 3.90 575 8 Yes Yes Yes

Pro - a number of comments including rounding off/more suitable than others/access is ok/site if reduced in size is suitable/no harm to green belt/

Anti - site is too close to runway/green belt/increase terrorism risk/ traffic Glenmere Mount onto Harrogate Road/wildlife/view/house prices

Neutral - A route to the airport could be opened if Scotland Lane was widened. The cross roads junction of Yeadon High Street/Hayton Lane/Harrogate Road should be re-examined at the very least. Right filter lane/ airport runway too

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Self contained between existing housing and airport runway. Development would constitute rounding off of settlement. Site would need to be accessed from a new roundabout on Victoria Avenue

Site Details

Easting	420335	Northing	441562	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield	-
On-site land uses	Residential institution	
Neighbouring land uses	Dwellings	
Outdoor amenity and open space	Shops	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Former Kirland House residential care home. Existing building on site surrounded by gardens. Trees form the southern boundary. Site is flat, with access onto Queensway.
-------------	--

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

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Accessibility to public transport. employment, health and education good.	5
Access comments	
Access possible from Queensway, traffic calming may need to be reconfigured.	4
Local network comments	
No concern for level of development possible.	4
Mitigation measures	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
Comments Awaited			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Esholt
Combined and foul sewers in northern boundary	

Environment Agency

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

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
12/00548/DEM	Determination for demolition of former care home	A	99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% 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 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 %	100.00
-----------------	--------

Nearest train station	Guiselley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1613.50
Nearest bus stop	1269
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	131.36

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 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 located in residential area. Site was formerly in residential use as a care home. Residential use therefore considered acceptable and no Highways issues raised.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health, leisure facilities, greenspace, derelict brownfield site and energy and natural resources (Area of Search for Wind Energy).

Summary of reps

METRO
Kirkland House, Queensway, Yeadon G 0.47 34 8 Yes Yes Yes
Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus 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

Pro - All coments pro - close to transport and facilities.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site in urban area. Residential acceptable in principle.

Site Details

Easting	418346	Northing	441154	Site area ha	3	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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	Site to the rear of properties on Hawkstone Avenue, south of junction of Hawksworth Lane and Hollins Hill. Northern side of site is flat, southern area of site slopes upwards. There is no tree cover. Site is in agricultural use.
-------------	--

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	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

Green Belt site. Development would form an extension to the existing residential area on the eastern boundary. However, development could set a precedent for unrestricted urban sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions**Availability:** Medium (6-10yrs)**Suitability:** LDF to determine**Achievability:** Short (=<5yrs)**Summary of infrastructure provider comments****LCC Highways Comments**

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Poor accessibility to public transport and employment, health and education good accessibility.

3

Access comments

Access onto Hollins Hill would require widening to provide ghost island right turn due to proximity with Park Rd junction which is to be signalised.

4

Local network comments

Local capacity issues.

3

Mitigation measures

Widening of Hollins Hill for ghost island

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
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Comments Awaited

Network Rail**Yorkshire Water**

Treatment Works	Esholt
-----------------	--------

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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

Ecology boundary

Education comments

4020+2163A,+1180A+ 1311A,+2038+ 1221+ 2162+1104+ 3033+1308 = 1000 houses generates 250 primary and 100 secondary children. All sites combined would require a new 1FE primary school. 2FE secondary required across whole HMCA – land may be required to expand existing schools.

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	99.84	% 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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1177.15
Nearest bus stop	3062
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	195.77

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

Green Belt site. Development would form an extension to the existing residential area on the eastern boundary. However, development could set a precedent for unrestricted urban sprawl.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - access to greenspace and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - flood risk.

Summary of reps

METRO
Hollins Hill and Hawkstone Avenue,
4020 Guiseley A 3.04 1047 4 Yes Yes Yes
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.

Anti

Main concerns green belt/flooding/loss of wildlife/agricultural site/food production/spoils view/urban sprawl/55k volt electrical cable runs through site/access and highways issues A6038 Bradford Road, Hawksworth Lane and Park Road/public right of way through site

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Development would form an extension to the existing residential area. A strong defensible boundary will be required to prevent urban sprawl.

Site Details

Easting	418431	Northing	443004	Site area ha	3.6	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

Site Characteristics

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

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

Description	Land to the west of Netherfield Road, bounded by railway line to the west and Ings Lane to the south. Open fields are beyond the northern boundary. Public house to the south west. Tree line provides screening along this boundary. There is little tree coverage on the remainder of the site. Site slopes down towards 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?	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

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

Green Belt site. Site is contained by existing development & the railway line and so relates relatively well to 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

The site is outside bus and rail accessibility standards but local centre and health/education accessibility reasonable

Rank (1-5)**3**

Access comments

No footway nearside - required to achieve access

3

Local network comments

A65 congestion.

3

Mitigation measures

footway and TM measures

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
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Network Rail**Yorkshire Water**

Treatment Works	Esholt
-----------------	--------

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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
<p>Not supported (RED). No site based designations but this site consists mainly of low lying damp grassland (UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitat Lowland Rush Pasture) and has records of breeding and wintering Red and Amber list Birds of Conservation Concern - including Teal, Lapwing, Curlew, Snipe. The railway line helps to provide a wildlife corridor function along the western boundary.</p> <p>21/08/2014 - Further comment by Ecology Officer following submission of ecology report from interested agent: I have read the ecological report produced by JCA Ltd. for the above site and have the following comments:</p> <p>The survey was carried out at a sub-optimal time of year (late November) which is acknowledged by the consultant – who recommends a botanical survey between April and September. I agree with this and therefore cannot accept the report as accurately reflecting the vegetation communities that are present. I have two main concerns about this site (use throughout the year by ground nesting birds and presence of wet grassland/rush pasture areas), both of which I feel can be overcome by amending the boundary and putting in place the measures that I have suggested in my formal response to this allocation – if my recommendations are being challenged we will need the following surveys to be carried out prior to further consideration:</p> <p>NVC survey of the grassland areas and an agreed assessment of whether any parts of the site meet UK BAP Priority Habitat definitions (i.e. do parts of the grassland meet Lowland Meadow or Purple Moor Grass and Rush Pasture) or Local Wildlife Sites Criteria (Gr criteria).</p> <p>I am aware that a number of notable birds of importance that are associated with the South Pennines Moor SPA have been recorded on this site at different times of the year and therefore an ornithological survey should be carried out at different times of year (to identify both wintering and breeding species). The following link gives some guidance on the level of bird survey effort that we would find acceptable – this is intended for wind turbine developments but is equally relevant to this site – and as we know there is suitable habitat present there should be a “Moderate” bird survey effort carried out – but note that we would require one additional survey period during the winter months to confirm activity at this time of year. For information some of the birds present on this site include Teal, Snipe, Curlew, Lapwing, Redshank and Oystercatcher.</p> <p>http://www.ecology.wyjs.org.uk/documents/ecology/Guidance%20for%20birds%20and%20small%20wind%20turbine%20developments%20(version%201).pdf</p> <p>Barn Owls are also present in the surrounding area and therefore we need to see evidence of specific surveys for use of the site by foraging Barn Owls</p>	
Ecology boundary	Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4043. Mitigation will be required to off-set the loss of an area of wet grassland within the site by creating new wet scrapes in the excluded area to the north-west. Mitigation will be required to provide permanent fencing along the north boundary to reduce potential unauthorised access that would disturb ground nesting wildfowl, and measures agreed to protect and enhance the adjacent/on-site areas of wet grassland. The boundary with the railway to be enhanced through appropriate planting of a minimum 20 metre buffer.
Education comments	734+4043+3026+1255B = 1389 houses generates 347 primary and 139 secondary children. High Royds (site 734) almost complete but in conjunction with other sites close by, a new 1.5FE primary school would be needed.
Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	

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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	899.20
Nearest bus stop	6546
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	166.46
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 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. Site is contained by existing development & the railway line and so relates relatively well to the existing settlement. Sufficient frontage for access, would require footway on frontage and crossing points to footway opposite. Accessibility to public transport poor, other facilities acceptable.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to greenspace and flood risk

Summary of reps

METRO

Ings lane, Guiseley A 3.57 589 4 No No Yes

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.

Anti

Major concerns are wildlife/greenbelt/visual impact/flooding/access/ traffic in particular Ings Lane, Netherfield Road, Buckle Lane, Coach Road, Silverdale Avenue, Oxford Road, Chevin Road & A65.

Urban sprawl and coalescence are a concern as well as lack of employment, schools, doctors, shops and general services/infrastructure/poor parking at train station

The majority of responses are a circular

Pro

More suitable than other sites which are green

Comments on phasing

After site 3026

DPP Allocation

Safeguarded land (PAS)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is contained by existing development & the railway line and so relates relatively well to the existing settlement. Sufficient frontage for access, would require footway on frontage and crossing points to footway opposite. Accessibility to public transport poor, other facilities acceptable. Identified as safeguarded land as less sequentially preferable to other sites.

Site Details

Easting	422040	Northing	438657	Site area ha	1.9	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-									
On-site land uses	Agriculture										
Neighbouring land uses	Manufacturing and Wholesale										

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Land to the east of the A65, north of junction with Knott Lane and New York Lane. Site slopes down to industrial buildlings to the west. There is no tree coverage on 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?	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 encroahment

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 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 openeness and permanence

The site is well contained by existing development and would not constitute sprawl if developed.
--

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)
Good access to PT - reasonable to other services	4
Access comments	
Could be developed along with 3331, the sites would need to jointly provide a realignment of Knott Lane to provide a 90 degree approach to the A65.	3
Local network comments	
A65 congestion issue	3
Mitigation measures	Total score
	10
Highways site support	
yes with mitigation	
Contingent on other sites	
3331	
Contingent on other sites	
3331	

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Good access to PT - reasonable to other services	4
Access comments	
Could be developed along with 3331, the sites would need to jointly provide a realignment of Knott Lane to provide a 90 degree approach to the A65.	3
Local network comments	
A65 congestion issue	3
Mitigation measures	Total score
	10
Highways site support	
yes with mitigation	
Contingent on other sites	
3331	
Contingent on other sites	
3331	

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail**Yorkshire Water**

Treatment Works	Esholt
-----------------	--------

There is capacity at Bradford Esholt 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	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support	Not supported
-----------------	---------------

Not supported (RED) - buffer needed to western boundary. Potential for amphibians associated with adjacent pond. Provide terrestrial habitat links. Loss of 0.19ha of site. Will also provide increased screening for neighbouring factory.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation (Amber) provided that Red area shown on Drawing RM/4095 is removed. There is a mill pond, a UK BAP priority habitat to the immediate west of the proposed allocation. Another mill pond lies 130m north of this. WYE do not hold any survey data for either pond but they are likely to support amphibians. Provide an increased buffer of 10m from the top of the bank around the pond and enhanced links to the north and south in the form of woodland or scrub planting on the western boundary of the site. Potential for great crested newts - no survey data.

Education comments**Flood Risk**

Flood Zone 1. Culverted watercourse in SW corner. YW public (surface water) sewer crosses the site.

Utilities**Gas**

No Northern Gas Networks mains cross this site. The nearest mains are in the c/w and so would not be affected by new site access roads crossing the verge/footway.

Electric**Fire and Rescue****Telecoms****Other****English Heritage****Natural England**

Housing sites 3329, 4095 and 3331 are all within 2km of the Leeds-Liverpool Canal SSSI. Leeds City Council should ensure there are no significant cumulative effects as a result these allocations upon this nature conservation site's interest features. See citation www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/citation/citation_photo/1004146.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	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 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	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2429.17
Nearest bus stop	14185
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	60.96

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 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. Site is well contained by existing development and would not constitute sprawl if developed. Could be developed along with site 3331; the sites would need to jointly provide a realignment of Knott Lane to provide a 90 degree approach to the A65. Accessibility by public transport and to facilities is good.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site and natural resources. Minor negative - pollution. Minor positive - access to education and health, greenhouse emissions, flood risk and accessibility.

Summary of reps

METRO

4095 Land to west of Knott Lane, Rawdon G 1.92 67 8 Yes Yes Yes The sites in this list are supported for housing growth

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

There are a lot of concerns about the access of this site including the traffic congestion it would create, particular mention was given to Knott Lane, Layton Lane & the A65 while a lot of people cited the crematorium as causing a lot of traffic problems already and this will make it worse.

Public transport was also cited as an issue not enough buses/no train station and lack of services. This work is government driven/not needed/to create jobs/caused by immigration

Won't be the right type of housing/too close to crematorium/underground streams/site more suited to industrial units.

PRO

None other than ticked.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Safeguarded land (PAS)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Site is well contained by existing development and would not constitute sprawl if developed. Could be developed along with site 3331; the sites would need to jointly provide a realignment of Knott Lane to provide a 90 degree approach to the A65. Accessibility by public transport and to facilities is good. The site is proposed as a safeguarded site as it is less sequentially preferable to other sites.

Site Details							
Easting	421877	Northing	438443	Site area ha	4.9	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	
Agriculture	
Dwellings	
Manufacturing and Wholesale	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	
Agricultural use, sloping site with road frontage along northern boundary and access through existing small estate to east. Employment site directly to the north and residential dwellings to the north east. Trees line the boundary to the south and west containing 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?	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?	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?	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

Green Belt site. Adjacent to residential development and industry to the north. Surrounded on three sides by development. Less sequentially preferable to other sites. Within conservation / special landscape area but site is not in prominent location or particularly visible within immediate 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

Rank (1-5)

Access comments

New York Lane unsuitable to provide vehicular access, access on to Knott Lane only possible if combined with Woodlands Drive, but visibility would be substandard

2

Local network comments

Knott Lane barely suitable for additional development, Knott Lane /A65 junction alignment poor for additional development

3

Mitigation measures

Improvements to Knott Lane and A65 junction

Total score

Highways site support

not on its own

Contingent on other sites

Combine with 4095 would allow Knott Lane to be improved and access taken through this site

Contingent on other sites

Combine with 4095 would allow Knott Lane to be improved and access taken through this site

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 running through east of site

LCC

Ecology support	Not supported
-----------------	---------------

Red - this proposed allocation includes an area of Lowland mixed deciduous woodland High Knott Wood a UK BAP priority habitat. Remove this area from the proposal site and buffer the remaining area by a minimum of 10m to reduce the impact of development - which is to be planted with

locally native woodland edge mix. There are also significant trees along the western boundary that will need bufferring and not including in gardenspace (to avoid future removal pressure) by a minimum 10m - but can become part of the informal POS through ecological enhancement such as meadow creation with informal mown path.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation (Amber) if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4254. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent woodland habitat are addressed - see comments on left.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Although the site is located in Flood Zone 1, there are significant surface water flood routes through the site and these will need to be considered within the FRA.

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	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2637.17
Nearest bus stop	12849
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	311.39

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 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. Adjacent to residential development and industry to the north. Surrounded on three sides by development. Less sequentially preferable to other sites.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

To complete. Significant negative - ecology. Accessibility comments to be provided.

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Adjacent to residential development despite being set away from the main urban area.

Site Details							
Easting	419595	Northing	442135	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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

Electric

[illegible]

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

[illegible]

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site
<p>1. 2009-2010</p> <p>2. 2011-2012</p> <p>3. 2013-2014</p> <p>4. 2015-2016</p> <p>5. 2017-2018</p> <p>6. 2019-2020</p> <p>7. 2021-2022</p> <p>8. 2023-2024</p> <p>9. 2025-2026</p> <p>10. 2027-2028</p> <p>11. 2029-2030</p> <p>12. 2031-2032</p> <p>13. 2033-2034</p> <p>14. 2035-2036</p> <p>15. 2037-2038</p> <p>16. 2039-2040</p> <p>17. 2041-2042</p> <p>18. 2043-2044</p> <p>19. 2045-2046</p> <p>20. 2047-2048</p> <p>21. 2049-2050</p> <p>22. 2051-2052</p> <p>23. 2053-2054</p> <p>24. 2055-2056</p> <p>25. 2057-2058</p> <p>26. 2059-2060</p> <p>27. 2061-2062</p> <p>28. 2063-2064</p> <p>29. 2065-2066</p> <p>30. 2067-2068</p> <p>31. 2069-2070</p> <p>32. 2071-2072</p> <p>33. 2073-2074</p> <p>34. 2075-2076</p> <p>35. 2077-2078</p> <p>36. 2079-2080</p> <p>37. 2081-2082</p> <p>38. 2083-2084</p> <p>39. 2085-2086</p> <p>40. 2087-2088</p> <p>41. 2089-2090</p> <p>42. 2091-2092</p> <p>43. 2093-2094</p> <p>44. 2095-2096</p> <p>45. 2097-2098</p> <p>46. 2099-2100</p>	<p>1. 2009-2010</p> <p>2. 2011-2012</p> <p>3. 2013-2014</p> <p>4. 2015-2016</p> <p>5. 2017-2018</p> <p>6. 2019-2020</p> <p>7. 2021-2022</p> <p>8. 2023-2024</p> <p>9. 2025-2026</p> <p>10. 2027-2028</p> <p>11. 2029-2030</p> <p>12. 2031-2032</p> <p>13. 2033-2034</p> <p>14. 2035-2036</p> <p>15. 2037-2038</p> <p>16. 2039-2040</p> <p>17. 2041-2042</p> <p>18. 2043-2044</p> <p>19. 2045-2046</p> <p>20. 2047-2048</p> <p>21. 2049-2050</p> <p>22. 2051-2052</p> <p>23. 2053-2054</p> <p>24. 2055-2056</p> <p>25. 2057-2058</p> <p>26. 2059-2060</p> <p>27. 2061-2062</p> <p>28. 2063-2064</p> <p>29. 2065-2066</p> <p>30. 2067-2068</p> <p>31. 2069-2070</p> <p>32. 2071-2072</p> <p>33. 2073-2074</p> <p>34. 2075-2076</p> <p>35. 2077-2078</p> <p>36. 2079-2080</p> <p>37. 2081-2082</p> <p>38. 2083-2084</p> <p>39. 2085-2086</p> <p>40. 2087-2088</p> <p>41. 2089-2090</p> <p>42. 2091-2092</p> <p>43. 2093-2094</p> <p>44. 2095-2096</p> <p>45. 2097-2098</p> <p>46. 2099-2100</p>

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/01589/DEM	Determination for demolition of factory and associated buildings	NR	99

5111 Former Dairy Crest Site, Queensway, Guiseley

14/04058/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 8, 10, 12 and 14 of Planning Application 14/01373/FU	SPL	99
14/01373/FU	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 14No. dwellings	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 %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	739.71
Nearest bus stop	7412
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	153.41

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

Site Details							
Easting	418884	Northing	441960	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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

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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	254.69
Nearest bus stop	162
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	87.87

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 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	422359	Northing	439154	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-
On-site land uses		
Agriculture		
Neighbouring land uses		
Agriculture		
Dwellings		

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat and sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Poorly defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Green belt site between existing properties on Layton Road to the west and Gill Beck which forms the eastern site boundary. The site slopes downwards from the road frontage on Layton Road towards the south and south west. There is an existing belt of trees along and outside the site boundary following Gill Beck.
-------------	---

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	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?	
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	

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	

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

Development would round off the land to create a new GB boundary formed by Gill Beck which is a stronger GB boundary than existing. Together with site 3329 to the south would create a contained site. The existing area to the north west of the site boundary but within the GB would also need to be excluded from the GB, this forms part of the garden of the new property currently under construction

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

3bph, primary ed OK fails others

2

Access comments

Access onto Layton Lane OK

4

Local network comments

OK

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

10

Highways site support

Yes

Contingent on other sites

3329

Contingent on other sites

3329

Highways Agency

Impact	Network Status

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

LCC

Ecology support Not Supported

Not supported (Red) - This proposed allocation currently includes a small area of lowland mixed deciduous woodland to the north, a UK BAP priority habitat. The woodland lies adjacent to the Gill Beck, which contributes to the overall biodiversity value. Retain the broad-leaved woodland and leave

5145 Rear of Layton Wood (Layton Croft) Rawdon

a minimum stand off from the Gill Beck of 20m.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation (Amber) if Red hatched area excluded as per Drawing RM/5145. Mitigation to prevent access into the wooded corridor alongside the Gill Beck - locating the access road to form the eastern boundary would be more acceptable than having rear gardens onto the wooded corridor (which would encourage long-term garden encroachment).

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	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	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2061.69
Nearest bus stop	6089
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	95.76

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

Green Belt site adjoining the northern boundary of site 3329. Together with site 3329 this would create a contained site. Development would round off the land to create a new GB boundary formed by Gill Beck which is a stronger GB boundary than existing. The existing area to the north west of the site boundary but within the GB would also need to be excluded from the GB, this forms part of the garden of the new property currently under construction.

Site affects others?

The site abuts site 3329. The two sites could come forward as one allocation subject to highways.

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Safeguarded land (PAS)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site adjoining the northern boundary of site 3329. The two sites together would create a relatively contained site, notwithstanding the fact that the site does form part of the Green Belt gap between Rawdon and Horsforth. Potential for development in the longer term. Designation as safeguarded land considered most appropriate.

Site Details							
Easting	420335	Northing	439372	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	
Greenfield site lying to the south of properties on Springwood Road with narrow access from Apperley Lane. The site is bordered by existing planting within Cragg Wood Conservation Area and to north of a listed building and a landmark building identified in the Cragg Wood Conservation Area Appraisal.	

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	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	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?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	No
Character Conclusion	Significant 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

Whilst there are existing properties located in proximity to the site which lie within the Green Belt boundary, development of the site would create
--

an irregular Green Belt boundary potentially leading to further urban sprawl and narrowing the gap between Leeds and Bradford.

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	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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	3202.18
Nearest bus stop	3643
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	127.50

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 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

A Green Belt site located within Cragg Wood Conservation Area. Whilst there are existing properties located in proximity to the site which lie within the Green Belt boundary, development of the site would create an irregular Green Belt boundary potentially leading to further urban sprawl and narrowing the gap between Leeds and Bradford.

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

A Green Belt site located within Cragg Wood Conservation Area. Whilst there are existing properties located in proximity to the site which lie within the Green Belt boundary, development of the site would create an irregular Green Belt boundary potentially leading to further urban sprawl and narrowing the gap between Leeds and Bradford.

Site Details

Easting	420230	Northing	439173	Site area ha	3.1	SP7	Other Rural Extension
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield	-
On-site land uses		
Other		
Neighbouring land uses		
Agriculture		
Dwellings		

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Greenfield site with parkland character providing the setting and access to Holmehurst. Significant number of mature trees and planting. Within Cragg Wood Conservation Area.
-------------	---

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	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	

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?	No
Character Conclusion	Significant 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

Whilst the site lies adjacent to existing properties within the Green Belt, designating the site would create a site separated from the existing built up area and create an irregular Green Belt boundary leading to further potential urban sprawl and narrowing the gap between Leeds and Bradford.

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 - this proposed allocation includes an area of lowland mixed deciduous woodland adjacent to the A658. This is a UK BAP priority habitat and should be retained. The site also supports a number of open grown parkland trees which should be retained within any scheme.	
Ecology boundary	
Amber - Supported with mitigation - if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/5152. The site also supports a number of open grown parkland trees which should be retained within any scheme.	

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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	3335.42
Nearest bus stop	619
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	158.33

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 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

A Green Belt site located within Cragg Wood Conservation Area. Whilst the site lies adjacent to existing properties within the Green Belt, designating the site would create a site separated from the existing built up area and create an irregular Green Belt boundary leading to further potential urban sprawl and narrowing the gap between Leeds and Bradford.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

A Green Belt site located within Cragg Wood Conservation Area. Whilst the site lies adjacent to existing properties within the Green Belt, designating the site would create a site separated from the existing built up area and create an irregular Green Belt boundary leading to further potential urban sprawl and narrowing the gap between Leeds and Bradford.

Site Details							
Easting	420714	Northing	439940	Site area ha	0	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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
09/02739/FU	Change of use of ground floor offices to coffee/sandwich shop		100

HLA27003 26-28 New Road Side Horsforth

11/00456/EXT	Extension of time period for planning application 07/07682/FU for change of use of offices including 3 storey extension to 3 two bedroom flats and 2 one bedroom flats	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	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	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2934.23
Nearest bus stop	4420
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	47.01

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 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	420240	Northing	441717	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Otley and Yeadon	

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
13/9/00156/MOD	Extension of time period for planning permission 08/01291/FU part two part, three storey block of 9 two bedroom flats, with 11 car parking spaces NON MATERIAL	M01	100

AMENDMENT TO 12/00409/EXT: Change to the approved roof form and configuration to simplify construction and overall aesthetic			
12/00409/EXT	Extension of time period for planning permission 08/01291/FU part two part, three storey block of 9 two bedroom flats, with 11 car parking spaces	A	100
14/02181/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 7 and 23 of Planning Application 12/00409/EXT	SPL	100

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	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		

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.31
Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1467.56
Nearest bus stop	12344
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	21.55
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

Site Details							
Easting	419403	Northing	442345	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Major Settlement Infill
HMCA	Aireborough				Ward	Guiseley and Rawdon	

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
12/02799/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 11, 12 and 13 for Planning Application 11/04061/FU	SPL	100

HLA28024 The Drop Inn 29 Town Street Guiseley

12/01115/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9 of Planning Application 11/04061/FU	A	100
13/04189/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 13 of Planning Application 11/04061/FU	A	100
11/03641/FU	Retrospective application for boundary fence and vehicular access gates to public house	R	100
11/04061/FU	Demolition of public house and erection of 6 houses and garages with new access, parking and landscaping	A	100
11/04059/CA	Conservation Area application for demolition of public house	A	100
12/01677/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 10, 14 of Planning Application 11/04061/FU	A	100
12/01982/ADV	Two temporary non illuminated hoardings	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	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 %	0.90
Nearest train station	Guiseley
Nearest train station distance (m)	559.57
Nearest bus stop	3328
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	131.27
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 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