

Site Details

Easting	428155	Northing	436801	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Vacant land	
Neighbouring land uses	
Wholesale distribution	

Other land uses - None

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

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

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/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)
test data	4

Access comments	
test data	3

Local network comments	
test data	2

Mitigation measures	Total score
test data	9

Highways site support	

Contingent on other sites	

Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

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
14/02545/EXT	Extension of time period for planning permission 11/01460/EXT for change of use involving alterations of house to 4 flats, 2 houses and erection of extension to rear to form 3 flats		100
11/01460/EXT	Extension of time period for planning application 26/665/04/FU for change of use involving alterations of house to 4 flats, 2 houses and erection of extension to rear to form 3 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		

☐

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension		

☒

Regeneration Areas

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

3 Monk Bridge Road (3) LS6

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	1643.38
Nearest bus stop	5933
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	67.01

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	427387	Northing	435754	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Headingley	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

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 ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short ( $\leq 5$  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
09/00134/FU	Demolition of existing care home buildings and erection of replacement part 2 part 3 storey building, comprising 14 one bedroom and 34 two bedroom flats with communal facilities	W	98

6 Kirkstall Lane, Victoria Home LS6

	to provide extra care facilities/complex for the elderly		
12/01959/ADV	Four non illuminated signs	A	98
12/01039/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 16 and 17 of Planning Application 09/05353/FU	A	98
12/04125/FU	Variation of conditions 2 and 5 of previous approval 09/05353/FU for demolition of existing care home buildings and erection of replacement part 2, part 3 and part 4 storey building, comprising 50 flats with communal facilities to provide extra care facilities/complex for the elderly relating to approved plans and hard landscaping mat	A	98
11/03904/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22 and 24 of Planning Application 09/05353/FU	SPL	98
11/03129/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 7, 12, 13, 18 and 19 of Planning Application 09/05353/FU	A	98
11/05038/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 5 of Planning Application 09/05353/FU	A	98
13/01579/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 13 of Planning Application 12/04125/FU	A	98
12/04696/ADV	One non illuminated sign to front wall	A	98
13/01597/COND	Consent, agreement or approval of conditin 15 of Planning Application 12/04125/FU		98
09/05353/FU	Demolition of existing care home buildings and erection of replacement part 2, part 3 and part 4 storey building, comprising 50 flats with communal facilities to provide extra care facilities/complex for the elderly	A	98
12/01948/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 10 and 23 of Planning Application 09/05353/FU	A	98
11/9/00177/MOD	Demolition of existing care home buildings and erection of replacement part 2, part 3 and part 4 storey building, comprising 50 flats with communal facilities to provide extra care facilities/complex for the elderlyNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 09/05353/FU : Increase in height of buildings in order to accommodate additional services required to satisfy planning condition no. 11 and relocated cycle and refuse stores.	M01	98

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	588.96
Nearest bus stop	8607
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	60.67

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	426993	Northing	437550	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Public Transport Core Strategy standards met schools/health/local services but distant from rail service	5
Access comments	
Potential difficulties due to shared access with hotel or direct would be spacing/vis?	2
Local network comments	
Local congestion but only 12 units proposed	4
Mitigation measures	Total score
None	11
Highways site support	
yes	
Contingent on other sites	
no	
Contingent on other sites	
no	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
n/a			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

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
14/01497/LI	Listed Building Application for change of use and alterations of former training centre to 6No. apartments; construction of 1No. detached dwelling and 7No. terraced houses, with associated boundary treatment, landscaping and car parking; part demolition of former creche to rear	W	94
14/01496/FU	Change of use of former training centre to 6No. apartments; construction of 1No. detached dwelling and 7No. terraced houses, with associated boundary treatment, landscaping and car parking; part demolition of former creche to rear	W	94

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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

8 Otley Road, Spenfield House LS16

LCC ownership %	0.60
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1732.49
Nearest bus stop	13846
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	81.55

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation  
Identified housing site

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

Site Details

Easting	430953	Northing	439111	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Mixed brownfield/greenfield site off Sandhill Lane, Moor Allerton. The surrounding area is residential.
---

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: Medium (6-10yrs)

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Good accessibility

5

Access comments

Limited site frontage with San Hill Lane, should provide visibility.

5

Local network comments

Spare capacity but some cumulative issues.

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

14

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 Knostrop

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

## Environment Agency

Constraints

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

## LCC

Ecology support Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/00528/FU	5 bedroom detached house with attached double garage to site of existing house	A	100
09/03083/FU	Two storey rear extension, double garage with link extension to side and rear and 0.9m high railings over existing wall to front.	A	100
09/01853/FU	Two storey rear extension, double garage with link extension to side and 1.36m high railings to front	R	100
10/03101/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 3 of Planning Application 10/00528/FU	A	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

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

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	4978.93
Nearest bus stop	247
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	93.36
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

Mixed brownfield/greenfield site within urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development.

## Site affects others?

Could have design impacts on 1032, 1274 and 2155

## Sustainability summary

Minor negative - part greenfield/ brownfield. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Significant positive - access to education and health facilities and greenspace and flood risk.

## Summary of reps

## 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.

217m from the core network. 5 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

## Pro

Site suitable for housing – but a new private house has just been built in the centre of the plot.

## Comments on phasing

## DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

## DPP Allocation Conclusion

Mixed brownfield/greenfield site within urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development.

## 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 (=&lt;5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=&lt;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		Core Strategy	
N32 Greenbelt	0.01	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	<div>Regeneration Areas</div>	
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	Inner South RA	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	LB Corridor RA	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	EASEL RA	0.00
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aire Valley RA	0.00
Sch. Ancient Mon.	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	425983	Northing	436734	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Kirkstall	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Storage
---------

Car Parks
-----------

Office
--------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Transport tracks and ways
---------------------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Brownfield site off Vesper Road, Kirkstall. The area is predominantly residential. The site is currently being used for storage.

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: Medium (6-10yrs)

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## LCC Highways Comments

## Public transport accessibility comments

Public transport Core Strategy standards met. Schools/health, some local services nearby. Poor accessibility to railway line.

Rank (1-5)

5

## Access comments

Should be ok, bus stop on frontage to relocate?

4

## Local network comments

Local congestion but suitable for 15 houses.

5

## Mitigation measures

None

Total score

14

## Highways site support

yes with mitigation (bus stop)

## Contingent on other sites

no

## Contingent on other sites

no

## Highways Agency

Impact No material impact

Network Status

No objection

n/a

## Network Rail

General asset protection issues

## Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

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

## Environment Agency

## Constraints

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

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Site susceptible to surface water flooding.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	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	100.00	% 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	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1221.73
Nearest bus stop	923
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	61.01

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 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 within urban area, suitable for residential development in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - employment and economic growth. Significant positive - access to greenspace, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health facilities, brownfield and local distinctiveness (unattractive BF site).

Summary of reps

METRO  
'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.  
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.) 64m to the core network. 6 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site within urban area, suitable for residential development in principle.

Site Details

Easting	424894	Northing	438399	Site area ha	1.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	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/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 (=&lt;5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=&lt;5yrs)

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

## Network Rail

--

## Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

## Environment Agency

Constraints	

## LCC

Ecology support	

## Ecology boundary

--

## Education comments

--

## Flood Risk

--

## Utilities

Gas	

## Electric

--

## Fire and Rescue

--

## Telecoms

--

## Other

English Heritage	

## Natural England

--

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/02795/EXT	Extension of time for planning application 08/04075/OT for outline application to layout access road and erect residential development	A	91

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.10	% 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	0.10	
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	99.90	% 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)	879.30
Nearest bus stop	7889
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	71.64

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

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



Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps  
METRO  
No comment linked?

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	431318	Northing	438958	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

Site Characteristics

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

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Greenfield site off High Moor Avenue, Moor Allerton. The area is predominantly residential.
-------------	---

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: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Uncertain

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## LCC Highways Comments

## Public transport accessibility comments

Good accessibility.

Rank (1-5)

5

## Access comments

Access can be achieved onto High Moor Avenue

5

## Local network comments

Possible cumulative impact.

4

## Mitigation measures

Total score

14

## 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 Knostrop

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

## Environment Agency

## Constraints

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

## LCC

Ecology support Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Site susceptible to surface water flooding. Surface water sewer and culverted watercourse cross the site. Small number of local flooding incidents adjacent to 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	42.16	
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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	5096.78
Nearest bus stop	6625
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	225.16

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

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

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

**Conclusions**

## Issues and Options Summary

Within the urban area. The eastern half of the site is designated as greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See greenspace section, page 35, question G7. Otherwise, residential use is acceptable in principle.

## Site affects others?

## Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health facilities, greenspace and flood risk.

## Summary of reps

## METRO

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these 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.

Pro - site is suitable and in a good location

Anti - not connected to built up area/greenspace/this site has pp for Morrisons

## Comments on phasing

## DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

## DPP Allocation Conclusion

Within the urban area. Residential use is acceptable in principle. Half the site to remain as green space.

Site Details

Easting	430704	Northing	438701	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Dwellings	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Shops	
Car Parks	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	
The site currently contains 8 detached dwellings. The site is bordered by housing to the south and the west and by retail to the north and the east.	

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

## North Leeds

82 Moor Allerton Gardens (1,2,3,4,5,6,8), Moor Allerton

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

--

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Uncertain

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Good accessibility

5

Access comments

Access achievable from Moor Allerton Gardens

5

Local network comments

Capacity issues

3

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 Knostrop

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

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

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



North Leeds

82 Moor Allerton Gardens (1,2,3,4,5,6,8), Moor Allerton

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	4503.14
Nearest bus stop	5296
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	75.07

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 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

Given proximity of the site to the town centre the site could be appropriate for retail and other town centre uses as well as residential. Residential use is acceptable on upper floors in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, flood risk and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health facilities, leisure, greenspace and transport network.

Summary of reps

METRO  
'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.  
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. 73m from the core network. 12 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and secondary schools and healthcare  
  
Anti - This site is a private housing estate with none of the owners aware of why it would have been submitted.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site in existing residential use - fully developed

Site Details

Easting	433820	Northing	437524	Site area ha	20.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Education
-----------

Other
-------

Outdoor amenity and open space
--------------------------------

Outdoor sport facility
------------------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Outdoor amenity and open space
--------------------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Includes the site of the former Braim Wood School, a camping site and a number of buildings to the west of Elmete Lane all set in spacious grounds and washed over by the Green Belt.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

--

## SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=&lt;5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=&lt;5yrs)

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## LCC Highways Comments

## Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

A new school is currently being built on part of this site. 50% 2buses per hour, 50% primary, 10% secondary, 80% health

2

## Access comments

site abuts a crossroads junction, any improvement will require land from development site opposite

3

## Local network comments

local congestion issues

3

## Mitigation measures

Signals at Wetherby Road/Elmete Lane crossroads. Capacity improvements at Wetherby Road/Oakwood Lane and Wetherby Road/Easterly Road signals

Total score

8

## Highways site support

NO - A NEW PRIMARY SCHOOL IS CURRENTLY BEING BUILT AT THE SITE IN CONNECTION WITH A RECENT PLANNING PERMISSION

## Contingent on other sites

no

## Contingent on other sites

no

## Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

n/a

## Network Rail

## Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

## Environment Agency

Constraints

## LCC

Ecology support Not supported

Not supported (RED). Roundhay Woods LNA covers part of this site, based on woodland UK BAP Priority Habitat. Open grassland and scrub provides a wildlife corridor function to east and north-east of Roundhay lake. Red parts of this site need to be assessed

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary substantially amended as per drawing RM/84. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent woodland/scrub habitat are addressed. Parts of the site are potential Loca

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	65.22	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	96.76
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3942.75
Nearest bus stop	1653
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	385.25

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. A new school lies to the southern end of the site. The site plays an important role in providing an attractive setting to Roundhay Park. Residential development is likely to have a negative impact on the park.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

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

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. A new school lies to the southern end of the site. The site plays an important role in providing an attractive setting to Roundhay Park. Residential development is likely to have a negative impact on the park.



Site Details

Easting	430778	Northing	439129	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Unmanaged Forest
------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Brownfield site located in Moortown. Two semi's in large gardens on land between Ring Road and Scott Hall Road roundabouts. Site east of Harrogate road and north of Sand Hill Lane.

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 (= &lt;5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable physical

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## LCC Highways Comments

## Public transport accessibility comments

Good accessibility, district centre within 800m.

Rank (1-5)

5

## Access comments

Somewhat limited frontage, bus access achievable for small development.

4

## Local network comments

Existing housing and small scale - no local impact.

5

## Mitigation measures

None.

Total score

14

## Highways site support

Yes

## Contingent on other sites

No

## Contingent on other sites

No

## Highways Agency

Impact No material impact

Network Status

No objection

n/a

## Network Rail

## Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

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

## Environment Agency

## Constraints

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

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
11/02196/OT	Outline application for 2 new houses and new access road	A	66
13/00415/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 15, 17, 19 and 23 of Planning Application 12/03734/FU	SPL	66
13/03336/FU	New double garage	A	68
09/05008/OT	Outline Application to layout access and erect 5 houses	AP	100
12/03734/FU	Two detached houses and new access road	A	66

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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				
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00		Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
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 type="checkbox"/>				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00				

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	4888.23
Nearest bus stop	9205
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	87.41
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 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

Has planning permission granted 5th November 2012 for undeveloped section (two units). Work has begun on site.

## Site affects others?

## Sustainability summary

Minor negative - part greenfield/brownfield. Significant positive - access to greenspace, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health facilities and flood risk.

## Summary of reps

## METRO

'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.

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. 67m to the core network. 4 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

Neutral - There is an existing planning permission on the site for the construction of two dwellings. The Council confirm that construction of the dwellings has begun

## Comments on phasing

## DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

## DPP Allocation Conclusion

Northern part of site has permission for 2 detached houses (12/03734/FU). The rest of the site is too small to allocate.

Site Details

Easting	428692	Northing	437110	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Other	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Shops	
Manufacturing and Wholesale	
Other land uses	
Working Mens Club	

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

Description

Brownfield site off Meanwood Road. The site is surrounded by retail (to the south and east) and housing (to the north and west).

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: Medium (6-10yrs)

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Good accessibility

5

Access comments

Visibility is probably achievable within site frontage with Stonegate Road

5

Local network comments

Capacity issues

3

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 Knostrop

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

## Environment Agency

Constraints

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

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/01534/FU	Use of rear car park to form hand car wash with associated office unit	R	100

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	2088.62
Nearest bus stop	5694
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	74.02

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

Town centre location - potential for mixed use or residential on upper floors acceptable in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant positive - access to greenspace, greenhouse emissions, flood risk and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health and leisure facilities and transport network.

Summary of reps

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

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing with mixed uses (no employment)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

A mixed use development would be appropriate given the sites town centre location. Potential for residential on upper floors.

## Site Details

Easting	431062	Northing	436135	Site area ha	1.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Chapel Allerton	

## Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

## Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

## 1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

## 2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

## 3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

## 4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

--

## SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

## Network Rail

--

## Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

## Environment Agency

Constraints	

## LCC

Ecology support	

## Ecology boundary

--

## Education comments

--

## Flood Risk

--

## Utilities

Gas	

## Electric

--

## Fire and Rescue

--

## Telecoms

--

## Other

English Heritage	

## Natural England

--

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/01426/EXT	Extension of time for planning application 08/04668/FU - Outline application to erect 3 storey 80 bed nursing home and 3 detached three storey assisted living blocks and car	A	100

parking "Phase 2" AND Reserved Matters relating to laying out of access and erection of 3 storey building, comprising health centre, pharmacy, with 14 flats and car parking "Phase 1".

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	99.66	
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	100.00	% 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	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	3247.23
Nearest bus stop	1878
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	144.42

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	429017	Northing	440576	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Alwoodley	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Mixed brownfield/greenfield site off The View, Alwoodley. The site contains two properties. Site within residential area.
---

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

## SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

Suitability: Unsuitable

Achievability: Uncertain

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

3 buses per hour. Good access to primary / secondary education and health services.

3

Access comments

Access achievable from The View.

5

Local network comments

Existing housing and small scale - no local impact.

5

Mitigation measures

None.

Total score

13

Highways site support

Yes

Contingent on other sites

No

Contingent on other sites

No

## Highways Agency

Impact No material impact

Network Status

No objection

n/a

## Network Rail

## Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Knostrop

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

## Environment Agency

Constraints

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

## LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported



Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Site susceptible to surface water flooding.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	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	100.00	% 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)	4815.17
Nearest bus stop	11410
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	201.71

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 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/greenfield site within the main urban area. The site has two properties on site currently. Residential use acceptable in principle.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

Minor negative - part greenfield/brownfield. Significant positive - access to greenspace. Minor positive - access to education and health facilities, flood risk and transport network.

### Summary of reps

#### METRO

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

#### Anti

The site is too small for 6 houses/topography is not suitable/garden grabbing should not be allowed/previously had pp refused.

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield/greenfield site within the main urban area. The site has two properties on site currently. Residential use acceptable in principle.

Site Details

Easting	430435	Northing	437144	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Chapel Allerton	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Vacant building
-----------------

Vacant land
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Restaurants and Cafes
-----------------------

Financial and professional services
-------------------------------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Former Yorkshire Bank site - building on Harrogate Road frontage cleared and in use as car park; Allerton House to rear is vacant. Shops and restaurants to the south and east, with private housing beyond and on the other aspects.

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	

## North Leeds

120 Harrogate Road (55), Chapel Allerton LS7 3RU

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

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unavailable

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy accessibility standards fully met.

Rank (1-5)

5

##### Access comments

Site within busy local centre. Currently served by a substandard junction that should be closed off & replaced by an up to date access.

4

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Access reinstatement, bus stop relocation, alterations to on-street parking bays/carriageway markings, possible pedestrian crossing on Harrogate Road.

Total score

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	Knostrap
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

**North Leeds****120 Harrogate Road (55), Chapel Allerton LS7 3RU****LCC**

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

**Ecology boundary****Education comments****Flood Risk**

Flood Zone 1

**Utilities****Gas****Electric****Fire and Rescue****Telecoms****Other****English Heritage**

This site adjoins the boundary of the Chapel Allerton Conservation Area in Bradford District. 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
13/00694/FU	Demolition of existing building and erection of a foodstore (to the front of the site) with associated access, car parking, servicing and landscaping	<b>A</b>	99
12/00823/CA	Conservation Area application to demolish vacant former bank premises	<b>R</b>	99
13/00695/CA	Conservation Area application to demolish vacant former bank premises	<b>A</b>	99
14/00467/FU	Electrical sub-station to proposed foodstore	<b>A</b>	99
12/05297/CA	Conservation Area application to demolish vacant former bank premises	<b>W</b>	99
14/00873/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 15 of Planning Application 13/00694/FU	<b>A</b>	99
12/05296/FU	Demolition of existing building and erection of a foodstore (to the rear of the site) with associated access, car parking, servicing and landscaping	<b>R</b>	99

120 Harrogate Road (55), Chapel Allerton LS7 3RU

14/9/00034/MOD	Demolition of existing building and erection of a foodstore (to the front of the site) with associated access, car parking, servicing and landscapingNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT of 13/00694/FU for Stone piers in order to enclose the structural steel columns, increase existing width of the external entrance ramp, from 2000mm to additional 500mm	M01	99
14/00755/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 22, 24 and 28 of Planning Application 13/00694/FU		99
12/00822/FU	Demolition of existing building and erection of a foodstore with associated access, car parking, servicing and landscaping	R	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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	3208.04
Nearest bus stop	5269
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	48.72

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"/>

North Leeds

120 Harrogate Road (55), Chapel Allerton LS7 3RU

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



**Conclusions**

## Issues and Options Summary

Appropriate for retail and/or offices as within Chapel Allerton town centre. Current application for Morrisons foodstore on site. Residential would be suitable on upper floors in principle but primary use should be retail.

## Site affects others?

## Sustainability summary

Minor negative - employment and economic growth. Significant positive - access to greenspace, greenhouse emissions, flood risk and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities and transport network.

## Summary of reps

## 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.

## PRO

Site is in a good location for facilities and transport and should be used for elderly care home.

## ANTI

This site has already been approved for a Morrisons supermarket.

## Comments on phasing

## DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

## DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site now bought by Morrisons. Very unlikely to come forward for housing. Retail or other town centre uses appropriate.

Site Details

Easting	433181	Northing	437420	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/03252/CA	Conservation Area Application for part demolition of house	A	100

124 Park Avenue (1) - Beech Lodge, Roundhay

10/9/00271/MOD	Part demolition of house and addition of 3 storey extension, to form 9 flats, and new block of 4 four bedroom housesNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Include condition to list all approved drawings relating to the approval	M01	100
10/01667/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16, 20 and 22 of Planning Application 09/03251/FU	A	100
10/9/00028/MOD	Part demolition of house and addition of 3 storey extension, to form 9 flats, and new block of 4 four bedroom housesNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Alterations to position of windows and type of rooflights to East and North elevations, removal of chimney to west elevation to apartments. Alterations to rear West elevation on houses, replacing large ground floor opening with double doors and windows.	M01	100
10/00208/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 18 of Planning Application 09/03251/FU	A	100
09/03251/FU	Part demolition of house and addition of 3 storey extension, to form 9 flats, and new block of 4 four bedroom houses	A	100
10/05510/FU	Variation of condition 1, Plans List of non material amendment 10/9/00271/MOD (previous approval 09/03251/FU) relating to extension to apartment 5	A	100
10/9/00161/MOD	Part demolition of house and addition of 3 storey extension, to form 9 flats, and new block of 4 four bedroom housesNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Top of lift shaft to project through infill roof, 4 no. of outer windows increased in size, chimney added on party wall between houses 1 and 2, 3 and 4.	M01	100
10/04783/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 23 of Planning Application 09/03251/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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	4297.66
Nearest bus stop	5420
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	273.48

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps  
Anti - General objection

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	427857	Northing	436771	Site area ha	2.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Mix 50:50
On-site land uses	
Residential institution	
Outdoor amenity and open space	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

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

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

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from 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: Short (=&lt;5yrs)

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## LCC Highways Comments

## Public transport accessibility comments

Public transport Core Strategy standards met for schools/health/local services but not for rail service.

Rank (1-5)

5

## Access comments

Small amount of development from Burton Crescent, mitigation required for main access off Moor Road for parking bays and Traffic Regulation Orders.

4

## Local network comments

Local congestion issues but brownfield site with mitigation measures available.

4

## Mitigation measures

Alterations to Moor Road including kerb alignment for parking bays and Traffic Regulation Orders.

Total score

13

## Highways site support

yes with mitigation

## Contingent on other sites

no

## Contingent on other sites

no

## Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

n/a

## Network Rail

## Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

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

## Environment Agency

## Constraints

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

## LCC

Ecology support Supported

Supported



Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Small area of susceptibility to surface water flooding. There is a culvert located in the SE corner of the site, which appears to be the head of the system.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

This site lies within the Far Headingley Conservation Area.  
The NPPF makes it clear that the loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the significance of a Conservation Area should be regarded as resulting in substantial harm to that area. Consequently, if the buildings on the site make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, they should be retained.  
If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the character of this part of the Conservation Area are not harmed.

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/03370/CA	Conservation area application to demolish former student halls of residence and 11 and 13 Heathfield Terrace	A	77
11/03234/FU	Redevelopment of former halls of residence site comprising 4 storey residential care home, 3 blocks of 54 flats, 2 blocks of 14 townhouses, conversion of stables to detached house, with landscaping and public open space	A	77

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

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

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	2.77
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1414.61
Nearest bus stop	14224
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	208.23

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

The site has permission for redevelopment of the former halls of residence, granted 2nd August, 2012 for a total 114 units comprising 4 storey residential care home, 3 blocks of 54 flats, 2 blocks of 14 townhouses, conversion of stables to detached house, with landscaping and public open space.

## Site affects others?

## Sustainability summary

Minor negative - part greenfield/brownfield. Significant positive - access to greenspace, greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities, flood risk and transport network.

## Summary of reps

Pro  
Site has current planning permission, Creating self contained communities with mixed use including residential care home

Anti  
Conservation/ Heritage

Metro  
Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network  
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. This site is 229m to the core network and is accessible to Primary Schools, Secondary Schools and Primary Health Care with 27 buses an hour

## 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	426736	Northing	439972	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Mixed brownfield/greenfield site off Broomfield, Adel. The site contains two houses and associated gardens. The site is surrounded by housing.

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 ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

Suitability: Unsuitable

Achievability: Uncertain

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## LCC Highways Comments

## Public transport accessibility comments

Good accessibility all round.

Rank (1-5)

5

## Access comments

Good frontage with adopted highway, existing houses may need demolishing to provide 5 houses.

5

## Local network comments

Small development easily accommodated.

5

## Mitigation measures

Total score

15

## Highways site support

yes

## 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 Knostrop

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

## Environment Agency

## Constraints

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

## LCC

Ecology support Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Small area of susceptibility to surface water flooding in NW corner of 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
12/02863/FU	One detached dwelling with detached double garage	W	50
14/9/00105/MOD	Alterations including two storey and single storey extension with Juliet balcony and new pitched roof to existing extension to rear; new pitched roof to existing flat roof extension to side; conversion of attached garage to a habitable room; extend existing driveway to front and patio area to rear NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 14/01286/FU: Additional window at 1st floor level; retention of some existing windows that approval was given for their removal; minor alterations to window sizes; internal alterations allowing changes to room layouts/room purposes.	M01	50
14/01286/FU	Alterations including two storey and single storey extension with Juliet balcony and new pitched roof to existing extension to rear; new pitched roof to existing flat roof extension to side; conversion of attached garage to a habitable room; extend existing driveway to front and patio area to rear	A	50
12/04631/FU	One detached dwelling with detached double garage	R	50

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

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

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2460.34
Nearest bus stop	6239
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	148.66

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

Permission has been granted for demolition of number 54 Broomfield and replacement with two dwellings. Suitable in principle for residential development.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

Minor negative - part greenfield/brownfield. Significant positive - access to greenfield, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health facilities and flood risk.

### Summary of reps

#### Pro

Has current planning permission for the demolition of an existing dwelling and the construction of two units.

#### Pro

Suitable in principle for residential development

#### Anti

Lack of infrastructure, traffic congestion, Pressure on services, local schools full

#### Metro

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

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. This site is 127m from the core network with 6 buses an hour and accessible for Primary Schools, Secondary Schools and Healthcare

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Part of site (54 Broomfield) has permission for two dwellings. The rest of site is too small to allocate.



Site Details

Easting	423773	Northing	437162	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield						
On-site land uses	Office						
Neighbouring land uses	Dwellings						
Residential institution							

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Mixed brownfield/greenfield site off Clarence Road, Horsforth. The site lies within residential area.
-------------	---

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

## North Leeds

235 Clarence Road (land at) - Horsforth LS18 4LB

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Public transport Core Strategy accessibility standards met for schools/health/local services but not for rail service.

Rank (1-5)

5

##### Access comments

Clarence Road narrow/heavily parked max 5 houses replace existing?

3

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

#### LCC

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

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

This site lies within the Newlay Conservation Area. The NPPF makes it clear that the loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the significance of a Conservation Area should be regarded as resulting in substantial harm to that area. Consequently, if the buildings on the site make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, they should be retained. If allocated, development proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the character of this part of the Conservation Area are not harmed.

Natural England

Housing sites 4056, 4057, 235, 4021, 1062, 3014, 2049 are all within 2km of Leeds-Liverpool Canal SSSI. The cumulative effects of these allocations on the interest features of the SSSI should be examined.

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
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	100.00	% 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)	2081.08
Nearest bus stop	6173
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	203.97

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

Site within the urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - employment and economic growth. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, flood risk and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities and greenspace, brownfield and transport network.

Summary of reps

Pro  
Most suitable for future mixed use housing including elderly housing and traveller site. Only part should be green

Anti  
Conservation/ Heritage for trees, wildlife, Building. Overdevelopment, lack of infrastructure and pressure on amenities. Traffic congestion

METRO  
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. This site is 200m from the core network and has 8 buses an hour. Accessible for Primary Schools, Secondary Schools and Healthcare

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site within the urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development.

Site Details

Easting	429434	Northing	439193	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Alwoodley	

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:** Unknown

**Suitability:** Suitable

**Achievability:** Uncertain

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

## Network Rail

**Yorkshire Water**

Treatment Works	

## Environment Agency

Constraints	

## LCC

Ecology support	

## Ecology boundary

## Education comments

## Flood Risk

\_\_\_\_\_

## Utilities

Gas	

## Electric

## Fire and Rescue

\_\_\_\_\_

## Telecoms

## Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
12/03719/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 5, 6, 8 and 16 of Planning Application 12/00584/FU	<b>A</b>	100

253 Cranmer Gardens - Moorhaven Residential Home LS17

10/04376/LA	Outline Application to layout access and erect residential development	A	100
13/05409/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 15 and 16 of Planning Application 13/01708/FU	A	100
09/01520/FU	Laying out of access road and erection of 2 storey primary care medical centre building with pharmacy and part 1 and part 3 storey 45 bedroom new care home, with basement, with car parking provision.	R	99
13/01708/FU	Amendment to previous approval 12/00584/FU for substitution of house types to plots 1 to 14 with modifications to car parking arrangements for plots 6 to 10 inclusive	A	100
12/04117/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 10 of Planning Application 12/00584/FU	A	100
12/04471/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 9 and 15 of Planning Application 12/00584/FU	A	100
12/00584/FU	Erection of 14 houses and access road	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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	100.00
-----------------	--------

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	4272.13
Nearest bus stop	14184
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	72.85

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 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	425505	Northing	438306	Site area ha	24.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Mineral works and quarries
----------------------------

Vacant land
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Manufacturing and Wholesale
-----------------------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Former quarry with cleared building as access to ring road.
---

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	13.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	24.49	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	5.58	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	82.37	
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	87.00	% 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 %	14.27
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1367.31
Nearest bus stop	13728
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	307.67

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site has planning permission for residential and office development.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Woodside quarry is allocated through the UDP.  
General support - more suitable than other sites.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site with mixed uses

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Suitable site for residential and employment uses. Site has outline planning permission from 2010 for mixed use development with 485 dwellings and offices (4950sqm)

Site Details

Easting	424780	Northing	436673	Site area ha	17.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds, Outer West				Ward	Kirkstall	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Derelict
----------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Site of former steel forge on south side of Kirkstall Road, bounded by the River Aire to the south.
---

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency			
Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail			

Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works			

Environment Agency			
Constraints			

LCC			
Ecology support			

Ecology boundary			

Education comments			

Flood Risk			

Utilities			
Gas			

Electric			

Fire and Rescue			

Telecoms			

Other			
English Heritage			

Natural England			

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/02638/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5 and 6 of Planning Application 11/01400/EXT	SPL	99



626 Abbey Road - Kirkstall Forge LS5

11/01400/EXT	Extension of Time period permission for application 24/96/05/OT for mixed use development comprising residential, offices, leisure, hotel, retail & bar/restaurants including access, site remediation, construction of bridges and river works, car parking and landscaping	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	29.03	
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	100.00	% 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 %	0.27
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2191.88
Nearest bus stop	1282
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	289.83

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site has planning permission for residential development with mixed use, including offices and a small amount of retail.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro  
Support but address traffic issues.  
Should be developed with a train station

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site with mixed uses

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site has planning permission for mixed use residential scheme.

Site Details							
Easting	428174	Northing	439630	Site area ha	5.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Residential institution	
Unmanaged Forest	
Dwellings	
Neighbouring land uses	
Agriculture	
Dwellings	
Unmanaged Forest	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
PT CS Standards not met primary school and health ok but little else	1

Access comments	
Access from road in to Young Offenders site, designed for this purpose	5

Local network comments	
Local congestion issues	3

Mitigation measures	Total score
	9

Highways site support	
Yes	

Contingent on other sites	

Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

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

LCC

Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (Red) - This proposed site lies adjacent to Meanwood Valley SEGI an important mixed habitat site of woodland and species rich grassland. Provide a minimum biodiversity buffer zone of 10m from the SEGI and plant with locally native species to protect the integrity of the SEGI. The SEGI is also a Local Nature Reserve. This proposed site includes areas of lowland mixed deciduous woodland. These add value to the	

neighbouring Meanwood Valley wildlife corridor. Retain all areas of woodland and ensure that they remain connected to the Meanwood Valley SEGI. Bats are highly likely within the site - undertake appropriate surveys and provide mitigation as required under any license. Protect woodland edge from increased levels of light.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/685. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent woodland habitat are addressed.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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 %	29.77
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3785.13
Nearest bus stop	4384
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	309.24

Agricultural classification	Non-agricultural
-----------------------------	------------------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input checked="" 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

History of residential approvals over parts of the site. Other potential sites on opposite side of Tile Lane (2052). All of site is existing housing allocation.

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	427835	Northing	438853	Site area ha	2.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

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: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

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

App Number Proposal Decision % of site


Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	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	100.00	% 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	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	3196.73
Nearest bus stop	5791
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	191.35

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 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  
Adel is a small community with schools and health provision stretched to capacity. The traffic currently on Adel Lane and Long Causeway is already horrendous at peak times with cars flying down at 40-60mph utilising these secondary roads.  
What is the justifications for the type of housing given the national need and those of Leeds?

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	424872	Northing	438670	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

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: Medium (6-10yrs)                      Suitability: LDF to determine                      Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Meets Accesibility Standards	5
Access comments	
Access from Silk Mill Drive ok	5
Local network comments	
Site too small to be a concern	4
Mitigation measures	Total score
	14
Highways site support	
Yes	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

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

LCC

Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (Red) - This whole site forms a section of a large block of Lowland mixed deciduous woodland which runs up the Oil Mill Beck. This is all UK BAP priority habitat.	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	

North Leeds

688      Silk Mill Drive   LS16

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	33.70	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	33.70	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	99.66	
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	66.30	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship	
LCC ownership %	100.00
Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	651.01
Nearest bus stop	7028
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	197.38
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 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	425408	Northing	438925	Site area ha	7.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

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 (=&lt;5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=&lt;5yrs)

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

## Network Rail

--

## Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

## Environment Agency

Constraints	

## LCC

Ecology support	

## Ecology boundary

--

## Education comments

--

## Flood Risk

--

## Utilities

Gas	

## Electric

--

## Fire and Rescue

--

## Telecoms

--

## Other

English Heritage	

## Natural England

--

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/03507/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17, 23, 25, 28, 31, 33, 39 and 40 of Planning Application 11/03324/FU		82

10/9/00083/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 129 houses and 40 flats, with car parking and landscapingNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Addition of condition	M04	70
11/03324/FU	Residential development of 143 houses and 12 flats; restoration of The Lodge to form 1 house; alterations and extensions to hospital building to form residential care home comprising 20 apartments and 35 bedspaces (C2 use); alterations and extensions to former Ida Wing building to form 56 'extra care' housing units (C3 use)	A	82
10/03460/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 27 and 28 of Planning Application 26/577/00/OT	W	78
10/03452/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 4, 11 and 15 of Planning Application 07/05064/RM	W	70
14/02904/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, 16, 17, 19, 23, 25, 31, 32, 33 and 41 of Planning Application 11/03324/FU		82
10/01658/FU	Variation of condition 20 of approval 07/05064/RM (Laying out of access roads and erection of 129 houses and 40 flats, with car parking and landscaping)		70

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	12.18	
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	100.00	% 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)	1009.82
Nearest bus stop	14222
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	167.27

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro  
Support but address traffic issues on ring road.

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	423684	Northing	439178	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				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 - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		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	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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 %	4.09
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	737.40
Nearest bus stop	1284
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	131.87

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

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	423575	Northing	439218	Site area ha	2.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				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 - 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: Medium (6-10yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Poor	1
Access comments	
Access via Trinity Close	4
Local network comments	
If access can only be taken onto Westbrook Lane, this would be a concern, car parking on street, one way route.	3
Mitigation measures	Total score
	8
Highways site support	
Yes	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

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

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

North Leeds

721 Westbrook Lane, Horsforth

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	0.01	% 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	0.16	
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	99.99	% 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 %	0.87
Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	849.12
Nearest bus stop	6001
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	95.60
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

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	423090	Northing	437354	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				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 - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Meets Accesibility Standards	5
Access comments	
Access from existing spur road from Victoria Mount	4
Local network comments	
Site too small to be a concern	4
Mitigation measures	Total score
	13
Highways site support	
Yes	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

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

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--



North Leeds

731 Victoria Avenue, Horsforth

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
13/02965/OT	Outline application for residential development of 6 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	99.66	% 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)	2227.07
Nearest bus stop	8147
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	233.03
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

Anti  
Develop green sites in horsforth should be developed instead.  
Increase local traffic and this does not take into account the number of cars that use the Victoria estate as a cut around to avoid queues on New Road Side coming out on Victoria Mount and closer to the Horsforth roundabout. The junction of Calverley Lane and New Road Side is already extremely congested.  
Newlaithes fields are an important recreational space.  
Will effectively surround the cemetery with housing.

Read that permission has already been granted for 15 houses to be built on site 731. When was this permission granted? And why haven't local residents been informed of this decision

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	431451	Northing	437738	Site area ha	1.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

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

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	77.70	
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 type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	4377.96
Nearest bus stop	8034
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	211.60

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 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	428605	Northing	438167	Site area ha	1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

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 (=<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	0.00	% 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	100.00	% 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 %	0.06
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	2953.35
Nearest bus stop	3667
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	339.16

Agricultural classification	Non-agricultural
-----------------------------	------------------

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation  
Identified housing site

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

Site Details

Easting	431049	Northing	436678	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Chapel Allerton	

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

**North Leeds****845**      **Mansion Gate Drive - Mansion House LS7****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
10/02167/EXT	Extension of time for planning application 07/02970/LI for Listed building application for part demolition and extensions to offices to form 15 flats and erection of part two and part	A	100

three storey block of 22 flats			
13/03145/EXT	Extension of time period for planning permission 10/02142/EXT for Change of use part demolition and extensions to offices to form 15 flats and erection of part two and part three storey block of 22 flats with car parking	A	100
10/02142/EXT	Extension of time for planning application 07/02971/FU for Change of use part demolition and extensions to offices to form 15 flats and erection of part two and part three storey block of 22 flats with car parking	A	100
13/03164/EXT	Extension of time period for listed building consent 10/02167/EXT for part demolition and extensions to offices to form 15 flats and erection of part two and part three storey block of 22 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	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	3487.65
Nearest bus stop	7558
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	179.75

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site 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	423067	Northing	437737	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Greenfield site off Fraser Avenue, Horsforth. Open grazing land with informal recreational use.

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

## North Leeds

1014 Fraser Avenue (land at), Horsforth

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Public transport Core Strategy standards met for schools/health/local services but not for rail service.

5

Access comments

Access very difficult to achieve would need major mitigation, highway widening to provide ghost island on A65 but 45 houses may be viable.

2

Local network comments

Unsuitable local network, mitigation not possible for only 45 houses.

1

Mitigation measures

Total score

8

Highways site support

Yes with significant mitigation.

Contingent on other sites

No

Contingent on other sites

No

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

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

#### LCC

Ecology support	Uknown
-----------------	--------

Unknown Impact. Historic evidence of semi-improved grasslands - needs botanical survey.

Ecology boundary

Site assessment needed. ???

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Site susceptible to surface water flooding. There is a public surface water sewer running through the site east to west and also 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	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	99.99	
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	100.00	% 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)	1949.33
Nearest bus stop	8844
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	70.66

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 type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 30, question G9. Highway concerns re achieving a suitable access.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Anti  
There is a public right of way at one side.  
Am I wrong to suggest that the council expect more complaints from Fraser Avenue than site 1016 Calverley Lane and thats why the difference. Nobody wants new housing of course but Fraser Avenue is clearley the best location.  
Traffic congestion at main road site horsforth roundabout and dangerous local traffic around the Hall Park Side roads.  
Should remain as designated as proposed green space (N5) on the UDP I do not see how safe access could be provided to this site from a highway.

Pro  
Fraser Avenue was not identified as being in green space use in the Open Space Audit and has clearly not been delivered through Policy N5. The Council should therefore delete the green space allocation and, given the site's sustainable location, release the land for housing 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
93	6	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5). Highway concerns in regard to achieving a suitable access.

Site Details

Easting	423252	Northing	438723	Site area ha	29.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

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

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

Description	Green Belt site off West End Lane, Horsforth. Housing to the north and south and fields to the east and 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	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?	Possibly
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

## North Leeds

1015 Lee Lane West (land south of), Horsforth

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

Well connected to urban area and contained by existing defined boundaries. The site has an important function in providing access to the countryside and views across the site to open countryside beyond. Designated Local Nature Area within the site.

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  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 access to public transport and health. Access to education is suitable..

2

##### Access comments

Frontage available for suitable access but highway needs widening.

1

##### Local network comments

Local network unsuitable for additional development, needs improvement beyond control of site.

1

##### Mitigation measures

Nothing deliverable

Total score

4

##### 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	Knostrap
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation if wooded areas (which includes parts of Hunger Hills LNA) are retained and wide buffers alongside the wooded areas are provided i.e. along all boundaries of the Hunger Hills LNA 20 metre linear strips left undeveloped and planted with meadow, shrubs and small trees to add to the woodland edge habitat and control access into the woodland.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

A high pressure pipeline crosses the site at the north end. 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.

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	99.60	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.01	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.40	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	



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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.14
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1240.28
Nearest bus stop	384
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	604.50

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 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 has an important function in providing access to the countryside and views across the site to open countryside beyond. It is highly visible, with landscape value and a designated Local Nature Area within the site. The site performs poorly in highways and accessibility terms.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield. Minor negative - access to leisure, community cohesion and local distinctiveness (site out of scale with settlement), ecology (mitigation), greenhouse emissions, transport network, accessibility and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to education facilities and greenspace.

Summary of reps

Anti  
The closure of Rodley Primary School will add pressure for school places.  
There is an increase in traffic, including heavy goods vehicles, becoming a rat run from Bayton Lane and Rawdon due to traffic trying to avoid the A65. Numerous serious accidents take place at the junction of Bayton Lane, West End Lane, Layton Road and Brownberrie Lane.  
There is no horsforth circular bus service, so to actually get around within the town is not possible by public transport.  
There is a large gas main running through these fields.  
This part of Horsforth is situated on shale and clay there are also sandy pockets and it is on the edge of a coalfield, the coal was mined in this area using bell pits, the location of these pits is no known as there were so many. This could be a hazard to builders and residents one such pit had to be filled in off West End Lane.  
Believe that Hunger Hills is common land. There is public access to it. The woods surrounding the land are common land and this land belongs to the people of Horsforth, not the council.  
Land serves community, walkers, schools, people exercising etc. Lots of flora / fauna and wildlife.  
Rather than developing smaller pockets of land which would make the roads a complete nightmare, would suggest using land which is currently underdeveloped, involving one very large housing development.

Pro  
If necessary the land could be considered as three separate parcels. Parcel 1, to the west of the site, is circa 17.0 hectares, parcel 2 to the north of the entire site, is circa 8.5 hectares and, parcel 3, south east of parcel 1, is circa 3.7 hectares.  
It is considered that this site does not add to the Green Belt or comply with the 5 purposes identified in the NPPF for identifying land to be designated as Green Belt. Development of the site would make Horsforth a more accessible settlement in Leeds, linking Leeds Trinity University and other local services and facilities with existing residents in a more suitable manner. The site is not valuable countryside and the majority of the land is only Grade 4 agricultural land.  
There is also the need to safeguard land for future development. It is vital that the council provides sufficient land for long term development to ensure long term endurance of the Green Belt boundaries and provide a reserve of potential sites for longer term development needs beyond the plan period. This is in line with Policy SP10 of the Core Strategy. If the Council can not support the future development of all our clients land for development during this plan period, we would urge that all of the relevant sites above be removed from the Green Belt for short – medium term development or, safeguarded for future development post plan period.

Metro				
Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
711	7	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site has an important function in providing access to the countryside and views across the site to open countryside beyond. It is highly visible, with landscape value and a designated Local Nature Area within the site. The site performs poorly in highways and accessibility terms.

Site Details

Easting	423001	Northing	437583	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

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

Other land uses - None

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

Description	
Greenfield site off Broadway and Calverley Lane, Horsforth. The surrounding area is predominantly residential.	

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	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

In green belt but has strong links to urban area. Well contained site eliminating potential for further sprawl.
---

## North Leeds

1016 Broadway and Calverley Lane, Horsforth

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Public transport Core Strategy standards met for schools/health/local services but not for rail service.

Rank (1-5)

5

##### Access comments

Access from Calverley Lane only.

5

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues but not for 13 houses.

4

##### Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage.

Total score

14

##### Highways site support

Yes

##### Contingent on other sites

No

##### Contingent on other sites

No

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

#### LCC

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

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Parts of site highly susceptible to surface water flooding

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.71	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	83.83	
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	0.29	% 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 %	19.07
-----------------	-------

1016      Broadway and Calverley Lane, Horsforth

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2106.79
Nearest bus stop	3819
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	31.71

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site, adjoining the main urban area with strong links to Horsforth. A main road borders the site to the west, residential development to the east and the education site to the south, so the site is well contained and development would not set a precedent for further sprawl.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health facilities and greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

**Anti**  
Horsforth Roundabout is already congested at rush hour times and can take 10-15 minutes to get across - part of the site may be needed for improvements to the A65 junction with Broadway (Ring Road).  
Calverley lane from Victoria Mount congested.  
Parking on the road is an issue currently as the road has resident parking bays for the residents on Calverley lane but as most residents have 2 or + cars now, they tend to park at the end of the street in front of the grave yard.  
The land proposed for development (site 1016) is a natural habitat for GreCrested Newts / Frogs / Bats.  
Underground springs run through the site.  
The development plan identifies a lack of allotments in the Horsforth area, and it would be in greater keeping with the needs of the Development Plan, local area and its community to assign this land as green space for recreation and allotments, instead of additional housing.

**Pro**  
Based on the size of the site and on an average density of 30 dwellings per hectare, our client would not be looking to bring the site forward for more than 13 dwellings.  
The site is flat in topography and is considered wholly developable.  
The site boundary is well defined and is surrounded by predominantly established residential development.  
The site is within a Conservation Area and this would be taken into consideration with regard to any future development  
It is considered that this site does not add to the Green Belt or comply with the 5 purposes identified in the NPPF for identifying land to be designated as Green Belt.  
Site is available for short to medium term development.  
If the Council can not support the land for development during this plan period, would urge that all of the relevant sites above be removed from the Green Belt for short – medium term development or, safeguarded for future development post plan period.

**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
65	6	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site, adjoining the main urban area with strong links to Horsforth. A main road borders the site to the west, residential development to the east and the education site to the south, so the site is well contained and development would not set a precedent for further sprawl.

Site Details

Easting	431129	Northing	437304	Site area ha	2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Chapel Allerton	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Allotment and city farm
-------------------------

Outdoor amenity and open space
--------------------------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Outdoor amenity and open space
--------------------------------

Unmanaged Forest
------------------

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Poorly defined	Road front	Yes

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

Greenfield site to the west of Gledhow Valley Road. Residential to the south and west, allotments to the north, and woods to the east. Contains a number of mature trees.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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



**North Leeds****1019 Gledhow Valley Road (land off), Chapel Allerton, LS7 4ND****Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence**

--

**SHLAA conclusions****Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  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 access to public transport. Good access to health services and primary / secondary education.

**2**

Access comments

Visibility should be achievable within site frontage of Gledhow Lane.

**5**

Local network comments

Spare capacity

**5**

Mitigation measures

**Total score****12**

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

**Highways Agency**

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

n/a

**Network Rail****Yorkshire Water**

Treatment Works Knostrop

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

**Environment Agency**

Constraints

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

North Leeds

1019 Gledhow Valley Road (land off), Chapel Allerton, LS7 4ND

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wooded wildlife corridor of Gledhow Valley Wood LNA i.e. retain the scrub and trees alongside Gledhow Valley Road within this site.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Parts of site highly susceptible to surface water flooding. A number of combined public sewers within the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	24.99	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	26.22	
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	100.00	% 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 %	2.82
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	3866.08
Nearest bus stop	2289
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	227.81

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

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

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

**Conclusions**

## Issues and Options Summary

Part of site is unused allotments and designated as allotments (N1A) on the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 35, question G9. Significant tree cover on a large part of the site as part of wider Gledhow Valley Woods.

## Site affects others?

## Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenspace (loss of allotments), greenfield and flood risk. Minor negative - ecology (mitigation), greenhouse emissions, accessibility, landscape and historic environment. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities.

## Summary of reps

Pro: Great accessibility to City Centre. The submitters have consistently advised LCC that the existing UDPR designation was erroneous and has never been used as allotments. This is assumed to be a drafting error in the UDP to be properly corrected as part of the preparation of the Site Allocations Plan. Agree with the proposal to amend the boundary of the greenspace allocation to exclude the site.

## Statutory consultee:

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

525m to core network, 4 buses per hour, yes has access to primary schools, secondary schools, primary health

## Comments on phasing

## DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

## DPP Allocation Conclusion

Part of wider Gledhow Valley Woods. Significant tree cover.

Site Details

Easting	427481	Northing	434404	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Kirkstall	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Indoor sport facility
-----------------------

Other
-------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Storage
---------

Refuse disposal
-----------------

Other
-------

Other land uses
-----------------

Night club / cinema
---------------------

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

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

Various commercial premises fronting Evanston Avenue which is part of the Cardigan Fields Complex.
--

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	

## North Leeds

1026 Kirkstall Road, Cardigan Fields LS4

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

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early)

Suitability: Unsuitable

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Public transport Core Strategy standards met for schools/health/local services and rail.

5

Access comments

Adequate frontage.

5

Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage.

Total score

13

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

#### Highways Agency

Impact No material impact

Network Status

No objection

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

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

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ2 & FZ 3 - to south east of site, Note that Kirkstall Rd in FZ 3a (ii). See comments in main text of our response.

North Leeds

1026 Kirkstall Road, Cardigan Fields LS4

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 3A. Surface water sewer crosses middle of site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	879.83
Nearest bus stop	9463
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	167.37

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

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

Half of the site is covered by a recent planning approval for an Aldi supermarket. Adjacent to waste transfer station.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - pollution. Minor negative - employment and economic growth, flood risk and waste (within 100m of waste site). Significant positive - access to greenspace, greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor positive - access to health and leisure facilities, brownfield, transport network .

Summary of reps

Under construction for Aldi for retail.				
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
157	8	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

A nightclub and an ALDI occupy the site. The site is not available.

Site Details

Easting	427086	Northing	439042	Site area ha	4.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

General
---------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Outdoor amenity and open space
--------------------------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Flat site currently occupied by a number of buildings housing DEFRA. There is limited tree coverage, and existing access is from Adel Lane.
---

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

--

## North Leeds

1033 Otley Road, Government Buildings LS16 5PU

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Public transport Core Strategy standards met for schools/health/local services but not for rail service.

Rank (1-5)

5

##### Access comments

Mitigation works would be required including traffic calming on Adel Lane and possible pedestrian crossings on Otley Road.

4

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage

Total score

12

##### Highways site support

Yes with mitigation

##### Contingent on other sites

No

##### Contingent on other sites

No

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

#### LCC

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

Supported

North Leeds

1033 Otley Road, Government Buildings LS16 5PU

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Some areas within site are susceptible to surface water flooding. Some public sewers within the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/04944/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 12 and 13 of Planning Application 13/04008/OT	SPL	99
13/04008/OT	Outline planning application for demolition of existing buildings and erect residential development including means of access	A	99
14/03605/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 18, 19, 21 and 27 of Planning Application 13/04008/OT	SPL	99
14/04948/COND	Outline planning application for demolition of existing buildings and erect residential development including means of access.Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 12 and 13 of planning application 13/04008/OT.		99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

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

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2666.67
Nearest bus stop	5222
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	205.27

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is in an established residential area. Residential development acceptable in principle. The southern boundary is treed offering a substantial buffer to the open amenity space to the south.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - employment and economic growth. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, flood risk and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities and greenspace, brownfield and transport network.

Summary of reps

Pro-development

A number of respondents support developing the government buildings because;

- it is a brownfield site
- it can provide much needed housing for Adel's elderly population who are looking to downsize but want to stay in the area.

A lot of people will only support development if;

- access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway
- encourage use of Otley Road bus services
- only residences are built on this site (ie no hotel or car showroom etc)

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
179	6	Yes	Yes	Yes
-				

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

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

Site Details

Easting	424432	Northing	436969	Site area ha	3.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

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

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Greenfield site off New Road Side, Horsforth. The surrounding area is predominantly residential.
-------------	--

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 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 openness and permanence

Relates well to urban area. Contained site reducing potential for further sprawl.
---

## North Leeds

1062 Horsforth (former waste water treatment work)

### 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

Public transport Core Strategy standards met schools/health but not for from rail service, just outside 800m mark for Horsforth New Road Side.

Rank (1-5)

4

##### Access comments

Stone walls and trees across frontage will need to be removed for visibility, only one location possible for access and difficult to achieve.

2

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage

Total score

9

##### Highways site support

yes with mitigation

##### Contingent on other sites

maybe

##### Contingent on other sites

maybe

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrup
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

Part FZ2 and 3. Main River (River Aire) runs through site. See comments in main text of our response

#### LCC

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

Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but a range of valuable habitats including scrub and young woodland that connect Hawksworth Wood LNA to the River Aire. The location immediately adjacent to the River Aire and Cow Beck and Outwood LNA woodland area provides a valuable wildlife corridor function.



Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary substantially amended as per drawing RM/1062. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on wildlife corridor function are addressed i.e. minimum 10 metres buffer along south and south-east boundary planted with native shrubs and small trees. Otters and bats to consider

Education comments

Flood Risk

Lower parts of site in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Kirkstall Forge Goit running west to east across bottom of site. There are a number of combined public sewers located in the upper part of the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

This site lies within the Newlay 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

Housing sites 4056, 4057, 235, 4021, 1062, 3014, 2049 are all within 2km of Leeds-Liverpool Canal SSSI. The cumulative effects of these allocations on the interest features of the SSSI should be examined.

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

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

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2170.84
Nearest bus stop	12448
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	118.91

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is contained by a main road to the north, the river to the south, residential to the west and the Kirkstall Forge site to the east, so relates well to the urban area and development would be well contained and not set a precedent for further Green Belt sprawl. The site is being considered as a possible future school site. We are consulting Education on all sites and any comments received will be considered before making final decisions on sites.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield and ecology objection. Minor negative - flood risk and pollution. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities and greenspace, greenhouse emissions and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Anti  
NCS is particularly concerned over one site located in the Newlay Conservation Area, and referred to in the 2008 Newlay Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan. For site 1062 Delap former water works, NCS is unable to accept this as an amber (or green site), and would see the site coded red, in line with the sense of protection offered by the 2008 inclusion in the NCA Appraisal and Management plan.

Suppoprt for housing development:  
Brownfield Site

English Heritage  
Needs to be some assessment of what contribution this plot of land makes to the character of the Conservation Area.

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
123	8	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is contained by a main road to the north, the river to the south, residential to the west and the Kirkstall Forge site to the east, so relates well to the urban area and development would be well contained and not set a precedent for further Green Belt sprawl.

Site Details

Easting	427687	Northing	439958	Site area ha	3.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Outdoor sport facility
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Site fronting onto Long Causeway, with tree coverage along parts of this frontage. There is an area of more substantial tree coverage along the field boundary. Site is generally flat with a slight slope to the north. Northern boundary is made up of agricultural land, with recreational uses to the west and the south.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	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?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	Yes
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

## North Leeds

1079 Long Causeway, Adel LS16 8DU

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

Well contained site limiting potential for sprawl. Links well to settlement. Overlaps conservation 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

Public transport Core Strategy Standards not met, apart from access to schools.

Rank (1-5)

1

##### Access comments

Access only possible off Long Causeway midway between Sir George Martin Drive and East Causeway, will require widening of Long Causeway to provide footway and visibility splays which will require removal of stone. wall and trees over full site frontage.

3

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage

Total score

7

##### Highways site support

yes with mitigation

##### Contingent on other sites

no

##### Contingent on other sites

no

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

North Leeds

1079 Long Causeway, Adel LS16 8DU

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance wildlife corridor function across the site - open-grown trees and hedgerows of particular importance. Bats to consider.	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/03713/TR	Trees to be removed: Taken from Arboricultural Safety Report - T5, T11, T16, T21, T24, T39, T44, T66, T71, T73, T76, T102, T104 - all to be replaced with same type of tree; taken from Sonic Decay Detection Test - T77, T80, T81, T82, T91, T92 - all trees to be replaced with same type of tree. The following trees are to be pruned as detailed in appendix 1 of Arboricultural Report - T1, T4, T13, T15, T18, T19, T20, T25, T26, T27, T30, T43, T53, T72, T74, T79, T80, T83, T105.	SPL	100
14/01495/TR	Various pruning work and removal of several Trees.	SPL	87

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

N32 Greenbelt	99.94	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	99.94	
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	0.06	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3367.04
Nearest bus stop	4384
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	281.97

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

Green Belt site. In conjunction with sites 1243 and 1246 development could be seen to effectively 'round off' the settlement form. Highway concerns regarding accessibility and access.

Site affects others?

Will provide access for 1246, but being brought forward as a combined site with 1246, 1243 would benefit design and deliverability

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield, greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor negative - ecology (mitigation) and transport network. Minor positive - access to health and leisure facilities and greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Generally against development due to site being Greenbelt land, in conservation area and has bad access.

**HIGHWAYS**  
Access to the Otley Road/Ring Road is already caotic at peak periods,and is about to get worse with the Centurian Field development.

Access road (Long Causeway)is very narrow.

The roads are not adequate for the additional volume of traffic.

The road on Tile Lane too narrow to accommodate the volume of traffic.

Access would not be allowed from the houses Middle Causeway House, Far Causeway House, The Cottage or The Stables, this is a private drive which is very narrow and surrounded by very large old trees all of which have Tree Preservation Orders on them.

The local public transport system is poor particulalry the No 28 bus service.

The site's only access is across the ancient causeway on Long Causeway or through 1243. The access through 1243 would be onto a dangerous corner and would overlook the nationally acclaimed garden at York Gate.

. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development.

**ENVIRONMENT**

The stone pavement on Long Causeway is pmt of the historical legacy and character of Adel and should be preserved. This is one of the special aspects of Adel which should be protected. the site( together with Site Refs 1243 and 1246) lie within the Adel St John's Conservation Area.

Site is located in the Adel St John's Conservation area.

Wildlife in the area: deer, hedgehogs, bats, woodpeckers, Jays, Wood Pigeons, pheasants, squirrels, rabbits and foxes.

The significant harm that would be caused to the setting of the Church of St John the Baptist (a Grade 1 listed building)

**OTHER**  
No needs assessment.

Population growth lower than expected.

What will be done to address poor road and transport infrastructure. The tram proposals etc will not do so. Eu submitted information.

Road infrastructure cannot cope.

The difficulties that are inherent in considering the possibility of mitigation measures to address the disadvantages of the sites in terms of their relationships with public transport services and other key facilities.

Two representantion in support of development:  
Long Causeway, Adel is a well contained site which limits the potential for sprawl and links well with the settlement. The site has the potential to round off the settlement form, and therefore it should be removed from the Green Belt.

Leeds City Council have state in their assessment that this site does not meet the public transport accessibility standards. The standard is that sites should be within a 5 min walk (400m) to a bus stop offering a 15 min service frequency. The bus stops on Sir George Martin Drive are only a 300m walk away from the site and the 28 bus is every 20 minutes. Other bus stops and bus services can be found 700m away from the site (under a 10 minute walk) on Otley Road are at a frequency of every 7-8 minutes. Therefor we consider the site to have excellent accessibility to bus services especially into Leeds City Centre.

**Metro**  
Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements



1079 Long Causeway, Adel LS16 8DU

should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
687	9	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Local preference for other sites to come forward for housing over this one.

Site Details

Easting	427084	Northing	435431	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Kirkstall	

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/00635/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 11 of Planning Application 09/03799/FU	A	90

## North Leeds

1092 St Ann's Lane - former Boston Exchange Diner), Leeds LS4 2SE

10/04895/FU	Alterations to access and erect 12 houses, with landscaping	<b>A</b>	90
12/02930/FU	Removal of condition 12 of permission 09/03799/FU for 12 houses (The dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied by any full time students, except students living with parents in the parental home or mature students living with a non student partner)	<b>A</b>	90
13/01602/EXT	Extension of time period for planning permission 09/03799/FU (Alterations to access and erect 12 houses, with landscaping)	<b>A</b>	90
10/9/00167/MOD	Alterations to access and erect 12 houses, with landscaping NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Amendment to approved four dwellings (semi detached) fronting St Anne's Rise and St Anne's Close to form 4, detached dwellings.	<b>M04</b>	90
13/00042/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 7, 9, 12, 21, 24 and 26 of Planning Application 10/04895/FU	<b>A</b>	90
13/00041/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 7, 9, 13, 22, 25 and 27 of Planning Application 09/03799/FU	<b>A</b>	90
13/00634/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 10 of Planning Application 10/04895/FU	<b>A</b>	90
12/02929/FU	Removal of condition 11 of permission 10/04895/FU for 12 houses (The dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied by any full time students, except students living with parents in the parental home or mature students living with a non student partner)	<b>A</b>	90
09/03799/FU	Alterations to access and erect 12 houses, with landscaping	<b>A</b>	90

## 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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

## Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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 %	13.00
Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	486.28
Nearest bus stop	13065
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	71.11
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 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	428206	Northing	435886	Site area ha	2.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Headingley	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Places of worship	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Greenfield site off Headingley Lane, Headingley. Attractive site with a combination of grassed and wooded areas.
-------------	--

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

## North Leeds

1120 Headingley Lane (land at), Headingley

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Public transport Core Strategy standards met for schools/health/local services and rail.

Rank (1-5)

5

##### Access comments

New Generation Transport alignment will leave very little developable land, access to development would be problematic for New Generation Transport.

2

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Total score

10

##### Highways site support

no

##### Contingent on other sites

no

##### Contingent on other sites

no

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

#### LCC

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

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance wildlife corridor function across the site - protecting existing woodland cover. Bats and Badgers to consider.



North Leeds

1120      Headingley Lane (land at), Headingley

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

This site lies within the Headingley Conservation 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 currently undeveloped area makes to the character of this part 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
13/04318/TWA	New Generation Transport routes		70

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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	772.10
Nearest bus stop	14221
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	105.15

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

Previous approvals for residential. Site includes NGT (New Generation Transport) route off A660 making access difficult and significantly reducing the developable area.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield. Minor negative - ecology (mitigation). Significant positive - greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities and greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

HIGHWAYS  
A660 is already congested with traffic.

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.

ENVIRONMENT  
Site last remaining proper greenspace in Headignly.

Site in conservation area.

It is a site with a long and interesting history, and there is a divers fauna including bats.

OTHER  
The site forms part of the currently protected New Generation Transport alignment, having previously been approved at a Public Inquiry in 1998 (1997 Supertram Extension Order) for a rapid transit bypass of Headingley Centre.  
As part of the Transport & Works Act Order, to be submitted in September, there will be a requirement to acquire the land required for NGT purposes through this site. Any promotion by Leeds City Council of this site as a housing allocation would significantly increase its value and add to NGT scheme costs.]

The previous planning consents granted on the site and the ownership by Chartford Homes, whom are actively promoting the Site demonstrate that the site is deliverable and is suitable, achievable and available. The only restriction highlighted by the Council is the weight being given to the proposed NGT route. As this is not an approved scheme the Council should disregard it until a successful application has been granted consent.

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
78	30	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Land safeguarded for proposed NGT route.

Site Details

Easting	434023	Northing	437495	Site area ha	2.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Office
--------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Office
--------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Agricultural site located between Roundhay and Seacroft. Elmete Lane runs along the site 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?	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?	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?	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	Significant effect on the setting and special character of historic features
----------------------	--

## North Leeds

1138 Elmete Lane - land adj to Beechwood, Roundhay LS8

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

TPOs and Listed Building need to be considered, development would effect character of area. Site doesn't relate well to urban area. Well contained by trees reducing potential for sprawl.

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short (=≤5 yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

No accessible public transport. Good access to primary education. No footway outside site on Elmete Lane.

2

##### Access comments

Elmete Lane has substandard carriageway width and no nearside footway. Substandard crossroads junction at Elmete Lane/Wetherby Road.

2

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

2

##### Mitigation measures

Carriageway/footway improvements to Elmete Lane. Traffic signals at Elmete Lane/Wetherby Road.

Total score

6

##### Highways site support

no

##### Contingent on other sites

yes

##### Contingent on other sites

yes

#### Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. Site abuts historic landfill. See comments in main text of our response.

North Leeds

1138 Elmete Lane - land adj to Beechwood, Roundhay LS8

LCC

Ecology support

Not supported

Not supported (RED). No designated sites but half of the site is woodlandand and other areas are semi-improved grassland and valuable parkland habitat.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

Spatial relationships

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

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3795.98
Nearest bus stop	7537
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	413.33

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. By itself the site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern. The site includes a number of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) and a listed building to the east. Significant highway concerns relating to access, accessibility and suitability of local network.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

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

The Site is capable of offering a natural extension to the urban area to help meet future housing land needs.

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
556	12	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site includes a number of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) and a listed building. Local preference for sites to the east of Roundhay Park (1190, 1138, 3315A, 3315B, 4013, 2063) to remain undeveloped and for Wetherby Road to act as a natural buffer.



Site Details

Easting	424992	Northing	441049	Site area ha	1.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

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

Greenfield site located on the edge of Cookridge. The site is located next to a cricket pitch and residential development. Access to the site can be found through Cookridge Lane to the north and Smithy Lane to the south.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

## North Leeds

1151 Cookridge Lane , Cookridge LS16

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

Links well to settlement, however, no defensible boundary to site which could create precedent for further sprawl.

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Meets Core Strategy standards but lacks local facilities, remote from rail and health services.

Rank (1-5)

4

##### Access comments

Would require widening of Smithy Lane along site frontage with loss of hedgerow.

2

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage.

Total score

9

##### Highways site support

yes

##### Contingent on other sites

no

##### Contingent on other sites

no

#### Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
n/a			

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

North Leeds

1151Cookridge Lane , Cookridge LS16

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Bottom corner shown to be susceptible to surface water flooding

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	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	0.01	% 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)	1993.18
Nearest bus stop	13896
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	365.93

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 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 adjoining the main urban area bordered by residential development to the east and a cricket pitch to the south, so relates relatively well to the existing settlement. However, there is no existing defensible boundary to the west, which could set a precedent for further sprawl.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Majority of responses are against development of the site.

Greenbelt Land

Brownfield First.

Recreational facilities on site need to be retained.

The site has poor access: If access is from Cookridge Lane it will be near a ridge which creates a blind spot. Also Cookridge Lane is narrow at this point, with no footpath. Access from Smithy Lane would be very narrow.

The site has no defensible boundary and would constitute and encourage sprawl.

The site is a habitat for wildlife including deers, squirrels, bats and owls which have been spotted.

LCC did not provide a Needs Assessment for the site.

The predicted population increase in Leeds is not materialising therefore building more huses is unnecessary.

The site floods and is inaccessible when it is snowing: Cookridge is one of the highest points in lee

Current infrastructure cannot cope with additional developments.

No public transport on this road.

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
325	6	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. There is no existing defensible boundary to the west. Development could set a precedent for further sprawl.

Site Details

Easting	428192	Northing	437166	Site area ha	1	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Outdoor sport facility	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Allotment and city farm	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	
The site comprises N1 protected cricket pitch (now unused) to the north of Meanwood. The site is within the Green Belt and Urban Green Corridor.	

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?	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	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

Strong links to urban area. Site is well contained by natural boundaries with a low potential for further sprawl.
---

## North Leeds

1170 Highbury Cricket Ground, Meanwood, North East Hollins Drive

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: Unsuitable

Achievability: Uncertain

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Good accessibility

Rank (1-5)

5

##### Access comments

No means of access.

1

##### Local network comments

Local roads are very narrow and not suited to intensification.

2

##### Mitigation measures

Total score

8

##### Highways site support

No

##### Contingent on other sites

##### Contingent on other sites

#### Highways Agency

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

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

FZ 2 & FZ 3. Meanwood Beck (main river) runs along site boundary. See comments in main text of our response

#### LCC

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

Not supported (RED). No site-based designations but this site forms a very important part of the wildlife corridor between Meanwood Valley SEGI/LNR and Woodhouse Ridge LNA. The Meanwood Beck flows down one side of the site which is a UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitat (Rivers) and a mill race flows down the other side. Both will have protected species - Otter, bats, Water Vole, White Clawed Crayfish and Kingfisher

North Leeds

1170      Highbury Cricket Ground, Meanwood, North East Hollins Drive

to consider. Probably will form part of the Leeds Habitat Network.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Site entirely within Flood Zones 2 and 3 of Meanwood Beck. Site currently provides useful flood plain storage

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	88.65	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship



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

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1928.94
Nearest bus stop	3901
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	306.91

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is well contained and relates well to the existing settlement form. The site is designated as a protected playing pitch (policy N6) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See greenspace section, page 35, question G10. There is a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on the site. Highway concerns as no existing access to site and narrow local roads.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - access to leisure facilities, loss of greenspace (N6), greenfield, ecology objection and flood risk. Minor negative - community cohesion (loss of community facility), landscape and historic environment. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health facilities.

Summary of reps

WYG expressing Gladedales intent to engage with the Council and local community to develop the site.

General support to retain site as greenspace due to its importance to community.

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
270	8	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is to be retained as greenspace.

Site Details

Easting	431017	Northing	438794	Site area ha	1.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Outdoor sport facility	
Neighbouring land uses	
Education	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

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

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

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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 (=&lt;5yrs)

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## LCC Highways Comments

## Public transport accessibility comments

Meets Core Strategy standards but outside threshold for primary health.

Rank (1-5)

4

## Access comments

Frontages onto two adopted highways.

5

## Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

## Mitigation measures

Capacity improvements at nearby signal controlled junctions.

Total score

12

## Highways site support

Yes - with possible mitigation.

## Contingent on other sites

no

## Contingent on other sites

no

## Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

n/a

## Network Rail

## Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

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

## Environment Agency

## Constraints

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

## LCC

Ecology support Supported

Supported

## North Leeds

### 1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground (former), LS17

#### Ecology boundary

#### Education comments

#### Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There is a small watercourse which runs along the Northern boundary of the site. There are existing flooding problems downstream of the site. (Note: Planning Approval granted to develop the Southern 1/3 of the site).

#### Utilities

##### Gas

##### Electric

##### Fire and Rescue

##### Telecoms

#### Other

##### English Heritage

##### Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/02718/OT	Outline application for the demolition of existing structures and erection circa 30 dwellings and an urban park (all matters reserved except partial means of access to, but not within, the site)	A	100
14/06532/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 21 of Planning Application 13/02718/OT		100
14/05326/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14 and 15 of Planning Application 13/02718/OT		100
14/01839/RM	Reserved Matters application for 29 dwellings	A	100
14/01927/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 2, 9, 10, 18, 19, 20, 23, 26 and 27 of Planning Application 13/02718/OT		100

#### Spatial relationships

##### UDP Designations

##### Core Strategy

1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground (former), LS17

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	44.98	
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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	4774.24
Nearest bus stop	13122
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	165.09

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

Designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See greenspace section, page 35, question G11. Could be suitable for residential development in principle, subject to greenspace analysis.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield. Minor negative - access to education and health facilities. Significant positive - access to greenspace. Minor positive - access to leisure facilities, greenhouse emissions, flood risk and accessibility.

Summary of reps

A lot of support for maintaining the green space designation, but also some opinion that the site would represent a logical infill

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
190	6	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

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

Site Details

Easting	428066	Northing	438802	Site area ha	7.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Agriculture
-------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Greenfield site to the south of Dunstarn Lane, Adel. Residential to north and 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	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

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

Strong links to urban area and would partially round off settlement. Boundaries to south and east poorly defined creating potential for further sprawl.
---



## North Leeds

1178A Dunstarn Lane (land south), Adel LS16

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Poor public transport access, ok for health and education.

Rank (1-5)

2

##### Access comments

No highway frontage.

1

##### Local network comments

Local congestion.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Total score

6

##### 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

Knothrop

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

#### LCC

##### Ecology support

North Leeds

1178A Dunstarn Lane (land south), Adel LS16

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. A number of combined public sewers cross 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			Core Strategy		
N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00		Major Settlement	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00		Minor Settlement	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00		Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
N1A Allotments	0.00				
N5 Open Space	0.00				
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00				
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00				% overlap
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00		Inner South RA	0.00	
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

1178A      Dunstarn Lane (land south), Adel LS16

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	3231.26
Nearest bus stop	11157
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	276.49

Agricultural classification	Non-agricultural
-----------------------------	------------------

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site has been split into 2. Site A is south of the main residential area of Adel, sloping towards the ring road. Development of the site could be considered to 'round off' the existing built up area. Access would need to be through adjacent site 687 which is a housing allocation on the existing UDP, without planning permission.

Site affects others?

Site should be considered alongside 2052, as both act as a rounding off extension to the existing settlement

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield, greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor negative - ecology (mitigation) and transport network. Significant positive - access to greenspace. Minor positive - access to health facilities and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti

Contrary to NPPF and Core Strategy polices on Green Belt / Housing provision.

Would destroy the openness of the Green Belt at that site and would have a negative impact on the purposes of the Green Belt. There are no very special circumstances in this case.

Green Belt against other green spaces - for example, despite having a score of 15 and 13 respectively out of 15 from the Highways review, together with greater scope for affordable housing (an LCC priority) and no biodiversity impacts, sites 2058 (Allerton Grange High) and 1299B (Bodington Hall) have been classed as "RED" due to their historical designation from the existing UDP of N6 — Protected Playing Pitch.

Site 1178A against other Green Belt sites — for example, despite having comparable or lesser potential Green Belt negative impacts, together with higher Highways review scores, than site 1178A (ie site -1178A-objectively appears to be less appropriate for building allocation), other sites have been classed as Amber (1172 Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, 2035B Alwoodley Lane, 3315 Elmete Lane) or Red (1310 Outwood Lane, 3327 Layton Road, 3330 West End Lane, 3381 Brownberrie Farm)) despite their being objectively more appropriate for building allocation I, and several of my fellow Adel residents, are deeply troubled by the fact that there is no clear defensible reason why LCC regards Green Belt site 1178A as suitable for development.

It is not a brownfield or regeneration site

It will not encourage the reuse of existing land or buildings

Key facilities such as primary schools and local shops are not located within walking distance

As set out in LCC's own site survey, transport and services are poor.

Destruction of the landscape is not conserving and enhancing the natural environment and green space it will destroy the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood.

Is in no way a sustainable development, negative for biodiversity / wildlife and environment.

Only large homes would be in keeping with the adjoining area and thus it is likely there will be in excess of an average of one car per household.

Access is proposed from Dunstarn Lane. The exit from Dunstarn Lane is on a narrow bend on Long Causeway which is potentially dangerous. Proposed site entrance onto Long Causeway would then use Dunstarn Drive instead, already congested since Centurion Fields has been built to get out of the junction of Church Lane and St Helens Lane.

Highways score is also lower than many sites rated red. It would seem therefore that this site has been wrongly rated.

Also relevant to bear in mind the case of Britton v SOS, the courts concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8 (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights (as incorporated into English law under the Human Rights Act 1998).

No needs assessment has been carried out to date regarding the necessary infrastructure for the development. Such an assessment is needed urgently before any plans are finalised for future development.

The population of Leeds is not increasing the project rate.

15,500 empty properties across Leeds - use these first.

Pro

Should be classified as green but only if access to and from development is via the ring road.

This site should only be used for sheltered housing for the elderly as there is insufficient mix of this type of development in the area.

Metro				
Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies: particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless. The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access 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
720	6	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

1178A      Dunstarn Lane (land south), Adel LS16

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development of the site could be considered to 'round off' the existing built up area. Access would need to be through adjacent site 687 which is a housing allocation on the existing UDP. Suitable in principle for residential.

North Leeds

1178B Dunstarn Lane (land south), Adel LS16

Site Details

Easting	428083	Northing	438639	Site area ha	5.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

Other land uses - None

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

Description	
Greenfield site to the south of Dunstarn Lane, Adel. Residential to north and west	

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

## North Leeds

1178B Dunstarn Lane (land south), Adel LS16

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

Relates poorly to settlement. No access, poor boundary to east creates potential for further sprawl.

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short (= <5 yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Poor accessibility.

Rank (1-5)

1

##### Access comments

No highway frontage.

1

##### Local network comments

Local congestion.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Total score

5

##### 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

Knostrop

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

North Leeds

1178B Dunstarn Lane (land south), Adel LS16

LCC

Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. A number of combined public sewers cross the site. There are a number of surface drainage channels within the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

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

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



Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	3088.89
Nearest bus stop	11157
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	135.22

Agricultural classification	Non-agricultural
-----------------------------	------------------

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site has been split into 2. Site B slopes more steeply to the ring road and provides a buffer between the road and development and is more removed from the existing residential area.

Site affects others?

Site would provide strong defensible boundary and green buffer area for any development to the north (1178a & 2062)

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site has been split into 2. Site B slopes more steeply to the ring road and provides a buffer between the road and development and is more removed from the existing residential area.

Site Details

Easting	434154	Northing	437150	Site area ha	6.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Agriculture
-------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Large agricultural site located in the south east of Roundhay. Wetherby Road runs along the south of the site and the A58 runs along the east.
--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

Strong links to urban area. Well contained site limiting potential for further sprawl.
--

## SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= &lt;5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## LCC Highways Comments

## Public transport accessibility comments

Bus route has 4 buses per hour. 75% of the site has access to primary education, 40% of the site to secondary education using Core Strategy accessibility standards. 75% of the site has access to health services within walking distance.

Rank (1-5)

4

## Access comments

Long frontage with Wetherby Road. Site abuts a crossroads junction with Elmete Lane that may require land from development site opposite for improvement.

4

## Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

## Mitigation measures

Signals at Wetherby Road/Elmete Lane crossroads. Capacity improvements at Wetherby Road/Oakwood Lane and Wetherby Road/Easterly Road signals.

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	Knostrup
-----------------	----------

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

## Environment Agency

## Constraints

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

## LCC

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

Not supported (RED). No site-based designations but the eastern parts of the site contain a beck and woodland which forms part of the Wyke Beck Valley wildlife corridor.

1190 Wetherby Road/Elmete Lane (land adjoining), Roundhay LS8

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/1190. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the adjacent Wyke Beck Valley and trees along the north boundary i.e. a buffer of 20 metres p

Education comments

2063+4013+3315+1190= 1619 houses generates 405 primary and 162 secondary children. New 2FE primary school would be required.

Flood Risk

Largely Flood Zone 1 but parts of the site may be susceptible to flooding from watercourse along Eastern boundary. There are a number of combined public sewers and a large CSO located in the SW corner of the site. Culvert under Wetherby Road may be a constriction to flows in watercourse.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

This site lies within the Roundhay 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 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	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3442.09
Nearest bus stop	13854
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	113.75

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

Green Belt site. The site borders the main urban area to the south and is well contained, with trees to the north, and roads along the remaining three sides.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Anti

Lack of consistency within the assessment of sites as some sites that have been identified as amber appear to have similar constraints as sites that have been identified as red.

Although the site is located within proximity to the existing built up area, it does not relate well to it, and could not be considered to ‘round off’ the settlement. Maintains the purposes of Green Belt land.

There has been a recent planning application for a foodstore on the site that does not include any provision for housing. The site is therefore identified for retail use and should be removed from consideration for residential allocation.

Currently designated as greenspace within the UDP.

The topography of the site is very steep and rises from the south of the site to the north. Any residential development at the site will be very visible.

Important part of the setting for the Grade II listed Beechwood.

Errors and omissions in the green belt assessment - assessed as not being within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature. Given that it is within the Roundhay Conservation Area and in close proximity to Beechwood and the listed buildings and features around Roundhay St John this is patently incorrect.

Forms a buffer between Roundhay and Whinmoor.

Part of the rural/agricultural landscape that typified Roundhay until the mid 20th Century.

Poor vehicular access to and from these sites and will impact on an already congested area of the Ring Road.

Pro

Site is wholly appropriate for development given its proximity to the main urban area, good public transport links and access to services and facilities including high quality open space.

No policy issues which would preclude the allocation of this land - site does not perform a material green belt purpose, its development will not impact on the green corridor function or impact on the Roundhay Conservation Area and the site does not flood.

There are no technical issues which would preclude the beneficial development of the site. Furthermore the site is available for development and lies within a high market area and as such the allocation of the land for residential development in an early phase of the plan period would deliver much needed new houses.

English Heritage

Needs to be some assessment of what contribution this plot of land makes to the character of the Conservation Area.

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
187	12	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Local preference for sites to the east of Roundhay Park (1190, 1138, 3315A, 3315B, 4013, 2063) to remain undeveloped and for Wetherby Road to act as a natural buffer.

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.	

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](http://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

N32 Greenbelt	12.97	% overlap
N34 PAS	87.03	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.04	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	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	423069	Northing	437110	Site area ha	7.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Education
-----------

Managed Forest
----------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Collection of agricultural fields to the south west of Horsforth. Railway line to the south and housing to the north.
---

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	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

## North Leeds

1202 Victoria Avenue (land off), Horsforth LS18

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

Strong links to urban area. Site is well contained reducing potential for further sprawl.

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Public transport Core Strategy standards met for portion of site fairly close to New Road Side.

Rank (1-5)

3

##### Access comments

Access should be a loop through site 731 off Victoria Avenue, emerging onto Victoria Crescent to realise full capacity of both sites.

3

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Traffic Management measures?

Total score

9

##### Highways site support

yes with mitigation

##### Contingent on other sites

731

##### Contingent on other sites

731

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

Culvert + General asset protection issues

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

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

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

North Leeds

1202 Victoria Avenue (land off), Horsforth LS18

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation provided that the wildlife corridor function of the beck along the eastern boundary, and Swaine Wood along the southern and western boundary, is protected and enhanced i.e. minimum buffer of 20 metres planted with native shrubs and small trees along eastern, southern and western boundaries. Also, hedgerow network to be protected and enhanced.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

1202=185 houses generates 88 primary and 35 secondary children. Already pressure for places in Horsforth. Land potentially needed to facilitate expansion of an existing school by 0.5FE. Secondary pressure in the area – expansion by 0.5FE required.

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1, although there is a small watercourse 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			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	0.38		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	100.00				% overlap
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00		Inner South RA	0.00	
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 %	0.29
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2438.47
Nearest bus stop	10405
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	452.48

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is well related to the existing urban area being contained by the college to the west, existing residential to the east and the river to the south, so reducing the potential for further sprawl. Highway concerns re access - development could be accessed through the existing UDP housing allocation in the north east corner. Capacity has been reduced so this site and the housing allocation total 200, the maximum amount of units acceptable due to Highway concerns.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield. Minor negative - ecology (mitigation). Minor positive - access to greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti  
Site has been considered twice before, in 1974 and 1982, both times being rejected on various grounds but mainly on access and traffic generation.  
Traffic problems at the roundabout where New Road Side meets the Ring Road have been getting worse.  
Car parking in this area for the Cemetery and the overspill from the College is also an issue.  
The nearby Newlaithes School has only just been extended and is already full put more strain on the A65 and the ring road, which already struggle to cope with rush hour traffic. Also, access to this site would be a problem; unless a filter road from the ring road is built, access would have to be via the Victoria's, an estate which already sees a heavy volume of traffic, particularly at school pick up/drop off times.  
Area used by a verity of people from dogs walkers, children playing, for exercise, enjoying the wildlife, picnics etc.  
Cumulative impact from homes built at the Clariant site and a large developement at the Kirkstal Forge.  
Will effectively surround the cemetery with housing.  
Rather than building on this green field site build on Leeds city college site adjacent when the college vacates the site in the next two years.

Pro  
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.

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

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
431	8	Yes	Yes	Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Local preference for the site to remain undeveloped and for the site immediately to the west (Horsforth Campus, 5009) to come forward instead.

Site Details

Easting	425151	Northing	438082	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

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

Other land uses - None

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

Description	
The site is an open grassland space to the east of Horsforth with a beck running along the northern edge and housing and commercial uses on 2 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?	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	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

## North Leeds

1238 Oakford Terrace (land to rear of), Low Lane, Horsforth LS18

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

Strong links to settlement. Well contained site reducing potential for further sprawl.

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short (= <5 yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Public transport Core Strategy standards met for schools/health, small amount of local services but not for rail service.

Rank (1-5)

4

##### Access comments

No highway frontage, requires adjacent site for development.

2

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage.

Total score

9

##### Highways site support

No highway frontage additional land required.

##### Contingent on other sites

No

##### Contingent on other sites

No

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

FZ2 & FZ3 - 3/4 of site to east. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the Oil Mill Beck that flows down the north of the site, which is a locally important willdife corridor. Provide a 20 metre buffer from the beck. Bats, White-clawed Crayfish and Otters to consider.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Large parts of site in Flood Zones 2 and 3 of Old Mill Beck. There is a public surface water sewer crossing the site and which outfalls into the beck.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.58	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.01	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	99.75	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	99.99	
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	0.42	% 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)	1284.74
Nearest bus stop	1776
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	67.21

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

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

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

**Conclusions****Issues and Options Summary**

Green Belt site. The site does not relate well to the existing settlement form but projects out to the east of Low Lane into Green Belt and is steeply sloping. Development of the site would not constitute rounding off of the settlement. The site is also designated as proposed greenspace by policy N5 of the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 35, question G12. Highway concerns as no road frontage to provide access.

**Site affects others?****Sustainability summary**

Significant negative - greenfield, flood risk. Minor negative - loss of greenspace (N5) and ecology (mitigation). Minor positive - access to education and health facilities, greenhouse emissions and accessibility.

**Summary of reps**

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).

It is recognised that the site is located with Flood Zone 3i. However the allocation would represent a redevelopment opportunity of previously developed land and therefore there are no reasonably available alternatives as the opportunity is site specific. The site is located within the Green Belt. However its allocation would not harm any of the five purposes of Green Belt set out in paragraph 80.

Our client is proposing to provide a residential scheme comprising of between 10 to 15 dwellings based on SHLAA methodology. This would consist of a mix of dwelling types and tenures with an emphasis on family houses. The housing mix would reflect the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2011). The proposal would also provide an element of affordable housing.

**Comments on phasing****DPP Allocation**

Not proposed as housing allocation

**DPP Allocation Conclusion**

Green Belt site. The site does not relate well to the existing settlement form but projects out to the east of Low Lane into Green Belt and is steeply sloping. Development of the site would not constitute rounding off of the settlement. The site is also designated as proposed greenspace. Highway concerns as no road frontage to provide access.

Site Details

Easting	428597	Northing	437386	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	
Places of worship	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Greenfield site off Church Lane, Meanwood. The site is surrounded by residential.
-------------	---

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



## North Leeds

1242 Church Lane - Paddock, Meanwood LS6

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Medium (6-10yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Medium (6-10yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Good accessibility.

Rank (1-5)

5

##### Access comments

Site frontage with Church lane should provide visibility.

5

##### Local network comments

Spare capacity.

5

##### Mitigation measures

Total score

15

##### Highways site support

Yes

##### Contingent on other sites

##### Contingent on other sites

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

#### LCC

Ecology support	Unknown
-----------------	---------

Unknown Impact - grassland needs a botanical survey in the summer

North Leeds

1242 Church Lane - Paddock, Meanwood LS6

Ecology boundary

Site assessment needed. ???

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Parts of site are susceptible to surface water flooding. There is a culvert running across the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

The Church of the Holy Trinity 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, before allocating this area, there would need to be some assesment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the signficance of this building and what effect its loss and subsequent development might have upon the significance of this asset.  
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
14/01822/TR	Various works.	A	95

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	2315.62
Nearest bus stop	7439
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	78.06

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site is within the urban area, and surrounded by residential uses, so residential development is acceptable in principle. Parts of the site are sloping.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significcant negative - greenfield. Significant positive - access to greenspace, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities and flood risk. Query ecology (site visit?)

Summary of reps

General objection to site due to access, safety and environmental concerns.

HIGHWAYS

Access very difficult to site.

Traffic access is difficult to visualise for the proposed site.Church Lane climbs a steep hill with a blind bend at the top.It is a busy road for cars and the 51 bus  
The entrance to the church and parochial hall car park lies behind a wall at the lower part of the site which is a continuation of the church cemetery. At the top of the site is a wooden fence and below that (partly crossing the site) are fences to the two diocesan houses' gardens whose foundations were (the builders told me)in 12 foot of water when they were built.  
The land which is proposed to hold 25 houses is boggy. I believe a spring line is involved. Access to the site for cars, delivery vehicles, emergency vehicles and wheelchair users would be difficult.

There is no practical access to the site due to the ground and road levels and surrounding properties.

Safety concerns, traffic speeding

ENVIRONMENT

The site itself has drainage problems as a watercourse runs through it.

It is waterlogged most of the year and freezes over in winter

Some 30 years ago it was planned to build a school there but the building did not take place because the ground was water-logged by underground spring

Birds and wildlife in the paddock

- Blue tit
- Great tit
- Coal tit
- Long tailed tit
- Goldfinch
- Greenfinch
- Chaffinch
- Bullfinch
- Nuthatch
- Siskin
- Dunnock
- Sparrow
- Black cap
- Goldcrest
- Wren
- Robin
- Blackbird
- Crow
- Jay
- Magpie
- Thrush
- Redwing
- Sparrow hawk
- Starling
- Wood pigeon
- Collared dove
- Greater spotted woodpecker
- Swallows
- Swifts
- Tawny owl

Barn owl  
Red Kite  
Mallard  
Dragonfly  
Damselfly  
Peacock butterfly  
Browning butterfly  
Cabbage white butterfly  
Red admiral butterfly  
Monarch butterfly  
Painted lady butterfly  
Foxes  
Bats

PRO-DEVELOPMENT

Our client is proposing to provide a residential scheme comprising of 25 dwellings based on SHLAA methodology. However, we consider that site would be more suitable for a lower density scheme, which would be more in keeping with its surroundings. This would consist of a mix of dwelling types and tenures with an emphasis on family houses. The housing mix would reflect the findings of the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (20

METRO

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

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.

English Heritage - The Church of the Holy Trinity is a Grade II Listed Building. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special interest" 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 assessment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the significance of this building and what effect its loss and subsequent development might have upon the significance of this asset. 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.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is within the urban area and surrounded by residential. Housing development is acceptable in principle.

Site Details

Easting	427677	Northing	440175	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Agriculture
-------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Small paddock on junction of Back Church Lane and Long Causeway, which both have a road frontage with the site. Site slopes down towards the junction. Trees straddle the site boundary.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

## North Leeds

1243 Back Church Lane - former Rectory Paddock, Adel LS16

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

Relates well to settlement. Well defined boundaries reduce potential for further sprawl. Overlaps conservation area.

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Public transport Core Strategy standards not met, distance to schools ok but little else.

Rank (1-5)

1

##### Access comments

Can only be accessed through 1079.

3

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage.

Total score

7

##### Highways site support

Yes with mitigation.

##### Contingent on other sites

1079

##### Contingent on other sites

1079

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

North Leeds

1243 Back Church Lane - former Rectory Paddock, Adel LS16

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

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

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



Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3416.56
Nearest bus stop	4384
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	458.56

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

Green Belt site. In conjunction with sites 1079 and 1246 development could be seen to effectively 'round off' the settlement form. Highway concerns regarding accessibility and can only be accessed via site 1079.

### Site affects others?

Site could be brought forward alongside adjacent sites to enable sharing of utilities access etc

### Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield, greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor negative - transport network. Minor positive - access to health facilities and greenspace and flood risk.

### Summary of reps

Access to the site is very difficult.

There are rare Jays, owls and hedgehogs living in the trees of the proposed sites.

The road on Tile Lane too narrow to accommodate the volume of traffic. Transport services are poor.

There has not been any 'needs assessment' carried out to date by Leeds City Council,

Any development of this land will alter the natural drainage of the land, which absorbs and holds rainwater and spring-water, thus assisting flood prevention elsewhere.

The stone pavement on Long Causeway is pmt of the historical legacy and character of Adel and should be preserved. The site lies within the Adel St John's Conservation Area. The Conservation Area is an area of special architectural/historic interest and the designation as a Conservation Area formally recognises the need to preserve or enhance the area.

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. This site was considered alongside 1079. Without 1079, 1243 is only partially connected to the built up area. Local preference for other sites to be developed for housing and for 1079 and 1243 to remain as Green Belt.

Site Details

Easting	427557	Northing	440096	Site area ha	2.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Outdoor sport facility
------------------------

Places of worship
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Paddock to the north of recreational land. Established tree cover on the eastern boundary of the site. Site has no road frontage and would need to be accessed from neighbouring sites; 1243 or 1079. 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?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	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?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

## North Leeds

1246 Back Church Lane - former Rectory Paddock north of Memorial Rec Ground, Adel L

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

Site links to settlement aren't as strong as adjacent sites (would need to be developed with these). Well contained reducing potential for sprawl. Overlaps conservation area.

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=≤5 yrs)

Suitability: Unsuitable

Achievability: Uncertain

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Poor accessibility all road.

Rank (1-5)

1

##### Access comments

No highway frontage, poor network unsuitable for large additional development, would need access through 1079.

2

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

##### Mitigation measures

unknown

Total score

6

##### Highways site support

no

##### Contingent on other sites

1079

##### Contingent on other sites

1079

#### Highways Agency

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

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

North Leeds

1246 Back Church Lane - former Rectory Paddock north of Memorial Rec Ground, Adel L

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Parts of the site towards the western boundary are shown to be susceptible to surface water flooding.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	1.00	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3279.31
Nearest bus stop	4384
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	470.48

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input 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. In conjunction with sites 1079 and 1243 development could be seen to effectively 'round off' the settlement form. Highway concerns regarding accessibility and can only be accessed via site 1079 which may limit housing numbers.

### Site affects others?

Would need access from neighbouring sites, 1079 or 1243.

### Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield, greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor negative - access to education and health facilities, transport network and historic environment. Minor positive - access to greenspace and transport network.

### Summary of reps

Restricted vehicle access on back church lane and long causeway

Limited capacity of the feeder road ( church lane) at peak times

History and heritage.

The roads and facilities would simply not be able to cope with any more development.

The roads around these areas are very narrow, e.g. Back Church Lane, Stairfoot Lane and Long Causeway.

There are serious access issues to both of these field as Back Church Lane is very narrow.

York Gate Gardens - an important feature of Adel which attracts thousands of visitors each year.

I object strongly, therefore, to any building being undertaken on any of these proposed sites which are presently (or potentially could be) food producing.

The harm that allocations would cause in terms of the purposes of the Green Belt, and to its key characteristics of openness and permanence.

the significant harm that would be caused to the setting of the Church of St John the Baptist (a Grade 1 listed building) and the interruption of key views of the church from within the Conservation Area;

The Council needs to carry out a thorough and urgent review of the infrastructure needs of the area and present a robust analysis and action plan setting out how it will resolve these issues in both the short and longer terms..

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..

There are rare Jays, owls and hedgehogs living in the trees of the proposed sites.

The road on Tile Lane too narrow to accommodate the volume of traffic. Transport services are poor.

The public transport within walking distance is limited to one bus service

The fundamental need for more housing is undermined by the fact that the population growth of Leeds is lower than expected. Apparently there are other sites with planning permission that have not commenced building and whilst Leeds continues to have such a high number of homes standing empty and boarded up (approximately 15,500 homes according to recent reports).

A needs assesment is needed for the site area.

Any development here would also have a detrimental effect on Y orkgate a nationally renowned garden which brings visitors to the area.

The stone pavement on Long Causeway is pmt of the historical legacy and character of Adel and should be preserved.

Greenbelt land.

Current infrastructure cannot accommodate anymore housing in the area.

The population of Leeds is not currently growing at the rate expected and therefore the need to build on green belt is reduced.

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

North Leeds

1246      Back Church Lane - former Rectory Paddock north of Memorial Rec Ground, Adel   L

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site would need to come forward alongside site 1079 in order to connect to the built up area. 1079 to remain as Green Belt.



North Leeds

1299A Otley Road - Bodington Hall, Lawnswood LS16

Site Details

Easting	427158	Northing	438808	Site area ha	9.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Residential institution
-------------------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Outdoor sport facility
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other
-------

Other land uses
-----------------

Government Buildings
----------------------

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

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

--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

## North Leeds

1299A Otley Road - Bodington Hall, Lawnswood LS16

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: Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Public transport Core Strategy standards met for schools/health/local services but not for rail service.

5

Access comments

Existing accesses suitable, Adel Lane access needs improved visibility

5

Local network comments

Local congestion concern over Adel Lane traffic use.

3

Mitigation measures

Traffic calming on Adel Lane and footway improvements, crossing and cycle link on A661

Total score

13

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

Knostrop

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

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

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

## North Leeds

### 1299A Otley Road - Bodington Hall, Lawnswood LS16

#### LCC

Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

#### Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There is a small watercourse within the site, which is partly in culvert 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 are not harmed.

#### Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

#### Other

English Heritage

There is a mural relief by Hubert Dalwood on Boddingtons Hall. This is Listed Grade II. There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/05065/OT	Outline Application for residential development including means of access and demolition of existing buildings	R	81
13/03308/RM	Substitution of house type to plot 2 (previous application 13/01100/RM) for addition of orangery	A	81
13/00351/FU	Demolition of existing buildings	A	75
13/01100/RM	Demolition of existing buildings, laying out of access roads and erect 106 houses	A	81
12/02071/OT	Outline Application for residential development including partial means of access (to but not within the site) and demolition of existing buildings	A	81
14/01749/FU	Erection of two feature entrance walls and railings	A	81
13/03187/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23 and 24 of Planning Application 12/02071/OT	A	81

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	5.03	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	29.88	
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	100.00	% 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)	2757.19
Nearest bus stop	13334
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	64.85

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input 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

The site has outline planning permission (20th September, 2012 - estimated 160 units) for residential development.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - employment and economic growth and part greenfield/brownfield. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor positive - flood risk and transport network.

Summary of reps

Generally pro development but highways issues will need to be identified particularly in terms of Access, Traffic Congestion and Provision of public transport.

The lack of and/or inadequate infrastructure in the area would also need to be addressed.

Local services cannot support more housing growth though development is supported in principle.

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

North Leeds

1299B      Otley Road - Bodington Hall, Lawnswood   LS16

Site Details

Easting	426973	Northing	438489	Site area ha	17.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Outdoor sport facility
------------------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Transport tracks and ways
---------------------------

Residential institution
-------------------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

University playing fields opposite Lawnswood Cemetery. A660 adjacent to the West and A6120 ring road adjacent to the east 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	

## North Leeds

1299B Otley Road - Bodington Hall, Lawnswood LS16

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: Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Public transport Core Strategy standards met for schools/health/local services but not for rail service.

5

Access comments

Portion of site to be protected for New Generation Transport park and ride, mitigation works required for partial development of site.

4

Local network comments

Local congestion issues

4

Mitigation measures

Partial development only, pedestrian crossings Otley Road and traffic calming Asdel Lane.

Total score

13

Highways site support

No

Contingent on other sites

No

Contingent on other sites

No

#### Highways Agency

Impact

Network Status

No objection

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Knostrop

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

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

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

North Leeds

1299B      Otley Road - Bodington Hall, Lawnswood   LS16

LCC

Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Minor field drain in NW corner

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
10/03580/ADV	5no. freestanding monolith directional signs	A	100
13/04318/TWA	New Generation Transport routes		60

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	0.20	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	99.96	
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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

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



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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2633.99
Nearest bus stop	4416
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	180.44

Agricultural classification	Non-agricultural
-----------------------------	------------------

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

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

**Conclusions**

## Issues and Options Summary

The site is currently designated as Protected Playing Pitch (N6) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See greenspace section, page 35, question G13. The site is also a proposed park and ride site on the existing UDP.

## Site affects others?

## Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of playing pitches, greenfield. Minor negative - community cohesion (loss of playing pitches). Significant positive - greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor positive - flood risk and transport network.

## Summary of reps

## PRO DEVELOPMENT:

General support for development on the site but affordable housing, social housing or housing for the elderly.

The site is generally supported for residential development in principle because it is not greenbelt however; access and highways issues need to be addressed to make it suitable.

There are suggestions that access should be from Otley Road so as to prevent traffic pressure on Adel Lane and Long Causeway and also encourage use of Otley Road bus services.

Protected Playing Pitch (N6) and greenspace should neither be prioritised over legitimate preservation of Green Belt land in line with LCC's legal obligations

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development.

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

## ANTI-DEVELOPMENT

Weetwood and Adel are identified as having a local deficiency in outdoor sport, something this site could help rectify.

The type of housing that should be constructed on this site should be in keeping with those of the neighbourhood i.e. expensive detached properties. Hence, this housing will not be of the types that provide affordable and social housing.

access to and from the sites from and to Adel Lane due to the existing traffic problems on the local roads at peak times, they are not designed for high traffic volumes and any upgrade would adversely affect the nature of the area

## Comments on phasing

## DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

## DPP Allocation Conclusion

Local preference for the site to be carried forward as proposed greenspace (there is also a possibility for park and ride on the site).

North Leeds

1310      Outwood Lane (land at) , Horsforth, LS18

Site Details

Easting	424708	Northing	437543	Site area ha	3.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Outdoor amenity and open space	
Neighbouring land uses	
Allotment and city farm	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	The site is currently used as a donkey field and is an open grassed space. Housing borders the site to the north and south, whilst woodland borders the site to the east and west.
-------------	--

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	

## North Leeds

1310 Outwood Lane (land at) , Horsforth, LS18

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: Uncertain

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Public transport Core Strategy Standards not met, schools ok but little else.

1

Access comments

Highway frontage but trees and stone wall prevent suitable access and visibility.

2

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

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

North Leeds

1310      Outwood Lane (land at) , Horsforth, LS18

LCC

Ecology support

Not supported

Not supported (RED). Cragg Wood LNA covers a large proportion of this site, based largely on the presence of semi-improved grassland. Recent botanical surveys (2012) have revealed that the semi-improved grassland area outside the LNA designation is also equally valuable. The land also provides an important ecological link between woodland areas to the north-west and south-east. Needs to be assessed against Local Wildlife Site (SEGI) criteria.

Ecology boundary

Potential Local Wildlife Site - needs to be assessed.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There is a small length of culvert shown in the centre of the site. There are public combined sewers in the SE corner of the site.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
12/01963/FU	Erection of 34 houses and associated landscaping, access roads and public open space	R	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	0.01	
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		

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

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

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.45
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1622.23
Nearest bus stop	10200
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	275.25

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

Part of the site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP, linking to greenspace to the north west, north east and south of the site. See also greenspace section, page 35, question G14. A planning application for residential development was previously refused due to loss of greenspace, conservation reasons, and access issues. Highway concerns regarding access as the site has no road frontage and accessibility.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenspace (loss of N5), greenfield, ecology objection, greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor negative - transport network. Minor positive - access to education and health facilities and flood risk.

### Summary of reps

#### HIGHWAYS

Access to site main concern.

Since the last Highways assessment (1999) the traffic flow along Outwood Lane has drastically increased.

Outwood Lane is too narrow.

'The highway' Outwood Lane is unsuitable for access from the site – on a dangerous bend.

Very limited access, On one occasion, the Fire Services were unable to get down the lane due to the congestion of parked cars, and just a couple of weeks ago the waste collection van was blocked.

#### ENVIRONMENT

The site is covered by a tree preservation order. The following is a sample of the fauna that exists in the fields and allotments on Outwood Lane.

Serlin  
Blackbird  
Foxes  
Bullfinch  
woodpeckers  
owls  
cockcrows.

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site not supported by highways.

Site Details

Easting	422162	Northing	437341	Site area ha	18.8	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

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
13/9/00115/MOD	331 dwellings including internal highways, landscaping and 2 retail units NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 12/04929/RM: Parking arrangements for the apartment	M01	81

## North Leeds

### 1339 Calverley Lane, Horsforth - Clariant UK Ltd LS18 4RP

	plots 294-302 including location of substation and handing of plot 318		
13/03593/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 17 of Planning Application 10/04068/OT	A	81
13/03588/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 12 of Planning Application 10/04068/OT	A	81
13/00408/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 11 of Planning Application 10/04068/OT	A	81
13/9/00173/MOD	331 dwellings including internal highways, landscaping and 2 retail units NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 12/04929/RM: Elements to plots 1 and 332 and 317	M01	81
13/04187/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 2 of Planning Application 12/04929/RM	A	81
12/04929/RM	331 dwellings including internal highways, landscaping and 2 retail units	A	81
13/03346/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 10, 19, 25 and 26 required by Planning Application 12/04929/RM	A	81
13/03123/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 8, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 27 of Planning Application 12/04929/RM	SPL	81
13/03121/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 6 of Planning Application 12/04929/RM	A	81
13/02977/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 9 of Planning Application 12/04929/RM	A	81
13/03122/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 of Planning Application 12/04929/RM	A	81
10/04068/OT	Outline Application including means of access to erect residential development for up to 400 dwellings with associated public open space, parking landscaping, ancillary retail unit, allotments, retention of sports ground with pavilion and associated off-site highway works	R	81
14/00631/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 10 of Planning Application 10/04068/OT	A	81
13/9/00200/MOD	331 dwellings including internal highways, landscaping and 2 retail units NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 12/04929/RM: Handing of Plot 17 (T19 Type) and associated garages	M01	81
13/03269/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 7 and 24 of Planning Application 12/04929/RM	SPL	81

## Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

N32 Greenbelt	32.92	% 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	13.36	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2887.48
Nearest bus stop	11733
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	439.93

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input 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

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

1189, 1326, 1339, 1017, 1254, 1186: All these sites are filtered, so are currently outside of housing development. 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.

Brownfields First sites in our area have already been identified and not as yet been developed- Clariant, Kirkstall Forge and Woodside Quarry.

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	424143	Northing	439444	Site area ha	14.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

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	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

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

Laid out as agricultural land, the site includes a number of smaller field boundaries. It lies within the Green Belt on the suburban edge of Horsforth. The Harrogate railway line forms the eastern boundary with Mosely Beck and residential properties beyond. Existing residential properties lie to the south and west. Fields extend to the north.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	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	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	Yes
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

## North Leeds

2046 Brownberrie Gardens - North Ives Farm, Horsforth LS18

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

Relates well to urban area. Low potential for further sprawl, however, site does provide access to countryside and performs an important safeguarding role.

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Small portion of site ok for education/health accessibility. Some local facilities including rail ok.

Rank (1-5)

3

##### Access comments

Highway frontage but adequate access not achievable for the amount of dwellings proposed.

2

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage.

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

Horsforth Station improvements, general asset protection issues

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

FZ3 adjoins site and very slightly into east side of site. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (RED). No site designations but large parts of the site have semi-improved grassland small fields, and numerous hedgerows.	

Ecology boundary	
Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/2046. Mitigation will still be required to ensure adjacent habitats are protected and enhanced.	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1. There are a number of field drains within the site. We have incidents of local flooding due to blockages on these systems. Parts of site are susceptible to surface water flooding.	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.53	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	98.17	
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	0.47	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.67
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	412.02
Nearest bus stop	1799
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	360.12

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

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

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



## Conclusions

### Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site performs a role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, but is relatively well contained with residential development to three sides, except the north. The site is also designated as proposed open space (N5) on the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 35, question G15. The site also lies within the airport public safety zone where development is not permitted and there are Highways concerns regarding access and local network constraints.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenspace (loss of N5), greenfield and ecology objection. Minor negative - landscape and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - flood risk.

### Summary of reps

#### Highways Concerns

Scotland Lane is a narrow road which cannot sustain the amount of traffic which would be required.

Due to speed cameras being installed on the A65 Rawdon Road traffic now cuts through Scotland Lane onto Brownberrie Lane to find a short cut through Horsforth. The traffic calming measures that are in place on Scotland Lane have not reduced the volume of traffic.

Access to the site would present problems both onto Scotland Lane and Station Road. The area would also be on a direct line of access to Runway 32 at Leeds/Bradford International Airport.

Although there is a bus route on the A65, this is hardly fit for purpose now, with journey times into and out of Leeds at peak travel time taking 1 hr, which is ridiculous for a 5 mile journey.

Site is within the airport Public Safety Zone then it should not be built on.

Generally Scotland Lane/Brownberrie Lane/Old Ball Roundabout and Station Road are congested already with local traffic, passing traffic, airport traffic, the Plymouth Breveran Church and Trinity College traffic as well as all the traffic using this area as a short cut from surrounding towns to Leeds.

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site lies within the airport public safety zone and is not supported by Highways.

Site Details

Easting	426291	Northing	437514	Site area ha	2.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Education
-----------

Outdoor amenity and open space
--------------------------------

Car Parks
-----------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Outdoor sport facility
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Former West Park Centre off Spen Lane, West Park. Brownfield site within residential area.
--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

## North Leeds

2049 West Park Centre LS16

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)

Public transport Core Strategy standards met for schools/health/local services but not for rail service.

5

Access comments

Bus stop and pedestrian crossing to consider in proximity of access but should be achievable.

5

Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage

Total score

13

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

#### Highways Agency

Impact No material impact

Network Status

No objection

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

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

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

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

North Leeds

2049 West Park Centre LS16

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing sites 4056, 4057, 235, 4021, 1062, 3014, 2049 are all within 2km of Leeds-Liverpool Canal SSSI. The cumulative effects of these allocations on the interest features of the SSSI should be examined.

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/04313/DEM	Determination for demolition of centre	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	12.50	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	12.50	
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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	100.00
-----------------	--------

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1761.63
Nearest bus stop	9535
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	86.21

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

Former West Park Centre, within the urban area. Residential development acceptable in principle as this is a brownfield site within a residential area. Existing buildings on site formerly in community use.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - part greenfield/brownfield. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor positive - access to health facilities and greenspace, flood risk and transport network.

Summary of reps

General Support for development of the site:

Easy access from main Otley Road.

WEST PARK CENTREThis site would fit in to the present residential areas and access is mainly already there with access to the Ring Road and other major roads

Public Transport Access.

Those opposing development it is maily because of the site being of community value.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Former West Park Centre. Residential development acceptable in principle as this is a brownfield site within a residential area.

North Leeds

2051A King Lane, Alwoodley LS17

Site Details

Easting	428922	Northing	441359	Site area ha	116.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds, Outer North West				Ward	Alwoodley	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Dwellings
-----------

Outdoor sport facility (golf)
-------------------------------

Other land uses
-----------------

Utilities - water storage (reservoir)
---------------------------------------

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

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

Extensive sprawling site to the rear of properties on Alwoodley Lane extending to the boundary of Eccup reservoir to the north and to Eccup Lane, Eccup Moor Road and King Lane. The site is in agricultural use.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

## North Leeds

2051A King Lane, Alwoodley LS17

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

Development of the site would lead to a significant incursion into the Green Belt creating unrestricted 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

Entire site outside accessibility standards. Small percentage within walking distance of primary health and education.

Rank (1-5)

2

##### Access comments

Scale of development would require multiple accesses to be provided, difficult to see how this requirement could be met given the limited road frontages available.

2

##### Local network comments

King Lane in vicinity of site has significant deficiencies.

1

##### Mitigation measures

Unknown. Site has only a small frontage onto King Lane, so extensive mitigation works would not appear possible.

Total score

5

##### Highways site support

No

##### Contingent on other sites

##### Contingent on other sites

#### Highways Agency

##### Impact

##### Network Status

Major impact - Likely to require significant physical mitigation

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

##### Treatment Works

Knostrop High Level

Large surface water sewers within south and east of site and raw water main in east.

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

FZ 2 & 3

FZ1 over 1 ha. Small encroachment by FZ3 next to Eccup Reservoir. See comments in main text of our response.

#### LCC

##### Ecology support

Not supported

Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but Eccup Reservoir Site of Special Scientific Interest is nationally designated based on its wintering and migrating wildfowl – these birds generally use the open water at night for protection and feed on surrounding grassland by day.



North Leeds

2051A King Lane, Alwoodley LS17

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Minor watercourse runs through site and discharges into Eccup Reservoir

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	99.99	% overlap	Main Urban Area	0.01	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00		Major Settlement	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00		Minor Settlement	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00		Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
N1A Allotments	0.00				
N5 Open Space	0.00				
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00				
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00				
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00				
UDP City Centre	0.00				
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00				
Proposed Local Centre	0.00				
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00				

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.26
-----------------	-------

2051A      King Lane, Alwoodley LS17

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	5018.41
Nearest bus stop	172
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	583.44

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

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

## Conclusions

### Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Development of the site would lead to a significant incursion into the Green Belt creating unrestricted sprawl. Highways concerns re. poor accessibility, access and local network capacity.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

Significant negative- community cohesion and local distinctiveness (size of site relative to settlement), greenfield, ecology objection, landscape and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor negative - access to education and leisure facilities, community participation (poor access), greenspace, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - flood risk.

### Summary of reps

#### Disagree

Important recreation area for local residents.  
Isolated from current housing.  
No building of any more houses.  
Less disruption to people's lives.  
Site unsuitable and object to any proposal to build here.  
Strongly favour this site keeping its protected status.  
Site considered a 'protected area.' (UDP, Vol, 2, p.67)  
Insufficient road infrastructure would be adversely affected by development.  
Development there would represent a major isolated new settlement completely lacking in any facilities.

#### Agree

Local network capacity inadequate.  
Large site but is contained within defensible boundaries which will contain it and prevent sprawl.  
Good transport infrastructure.  
Site has clearly defined boundaries.  
Closeness to Leeds.  
Localised smaller scale developments at the head of Lakeland Drive and at the open fork in Windemere Drive should be possible without invoking sprawl or access issues.  
Well supplied with good traffic arteries  
Would not have a dramatic effect on traffic patterns or solid structures.

#### Statutory

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

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development of the site would lead to a significant incursion into the Green Belt creating unrestricted sprawl. Highways concerns re. poor accessibility, access and local network capacity.

North Leeds

2051B King Lane, Alwoodley LS17

Site Details

Easting	428415	Northing	440640	Site area ha	20.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds, Outer North West				Ward	Alwoodley	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Outdoor sport facility
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Managed Forest
----------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Land to the west of King Lane bordering Headingley Golf Course in agricultural use.
---

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	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

## North Leeds

2051B King Lane, Alwoodley LS17

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

Unrelated to the existing settlement pattern. Well contained site reducing potential for further sprawl.

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Medium (6-10yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Entire site outside accessibility standards, small percentage within walking distance of primary health and education.

Rank (1-5)

2

##### Access comments

Scale of development would require multiple accesses to be provided, difficult to see how this requirement could be met given the limited road frontages available.

2

##### Local network comments

King Lane in vicinity of site has significant deficiencies.

1

##### Mitigation measures

Unknown. Site has only a small frontage onto King Lane, so extensive mitigation works would not appear possible.

Total score

5

##### Highways site support

No

##### Contingent on other sites

##### Contingent on other sites

#### Highways Agency

##### Impact

##### Network Status

Major impact - Likely to require significant physical mitigation

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

##### Treatment Works

Knostrop High Level

Sewers and water mains in access road through centre.

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

FZ1 over1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

#### LCC

##### Ecology support

Not supported

Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but Eccup Reservoir SSSI is nationally designated based on its wintering and migrating wildfowl – these birds generally use the open water at night for protection and feed on surrounding grassland by day.

North Leeds

2051B King Lane, Alwoodley LS17

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations			Core Strategy		
N32 Greenbelt	99.99	% overlap	Main Urban Area	0.01	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00		Major Settlement	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00		Minor Settlement	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00		Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
N1A Allotments	0.00				
N5 Open Space	0.00				
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00				
N8 Urban Green Corridor	26.87				
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00				
UDP City Centre	0.00				
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00				
Proposed Local Centre	0.00				
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00				

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.49
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	4266.64
Nearest bus stop	7075
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	255.86

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input checked="" 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

The site has no defensible Green Belt boundary, but the potential sprawl is contained by the golf course, road and woodland.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

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

### Summary of reps

Disagree

Isolated from current housing  
Poor local network capacity  
unsuitable and object to any proposal to build here  
The width of king Lane between The Crescent and Alwoodley Lane is inadequate for current vehicular traffic.  
Would severely impact the area of Adel.  
Substandard road network

Agree

Located relatively close to centre of Leeds.  
Contained within defensible boundaries to prevent urban sprawl.  
Relatively good transport links.  
far better transport infrastructure to support housing development

Statutory

Given the poor accessibility, we agree that this site would not be suitable for housing development. (Metro)

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development of the site would lead to a significant incursion into the Green Belt creating unrestricted sprawl. Highways concerns re. poor accessibility, access and local network capacity.



Site Details

Easting	428319	Northing	439393	Site area ha	17.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Greenbelt site East of Adel off Tile Lane, currently in agricultural use.
---

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	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

Relates well to settlement. No defensible boundary to south.
--

## North Leeds

2052 Tile Lane, Adel LS16

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Public Transport Core Strategy Standards not met, primary school and health ok but little else.

Rank (1-5)

1

##### Access comments

Requires widening of Tile Lane outside site (Leeds City Council land) to extend adopted highway. Limit capacity to 200 unless combined with site 685 and a loop road created through this site to Sir George Martin Road, possible bus link.

2

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage

Total score

6

##### Highways site support

Yes with mitigation

##### Contingent on other sites

685

##### Contingent on other sites

685

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

FZ3 adjoins site and very slightly into east side of site. See comments in main text of our response.

#### LCC

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

Not supported (RED). Meanwood Valley SEGI forms part of the site and Meanwood Beck runs along part of the eastern boundary.

North Leeds

2052 Tile Lane, Adel LS16

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/2052. Mitigation will still be required to ensure the adjacent Meanwood Valley LNR is protected and enhanced. Otter and White-clawed Crayfish to cons

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Nort East corner of site potentially at risk of flooding from Adel Beck. There is a field drain running across 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	98.52	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	57.15	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	98.52	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	1.48	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.99
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	3873.85
Nearest bus stop	11321
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	495.23

Agricultural classification	Non-agricultural
-----------------------------	------------------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input checked="" 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

Green Belt site. Development would be contained by residential development to the west and north (once the existing centre is redeveloped), and by woodland on the eastern boundary. However, no existing defensible boundary exists to the south. Highway concerns regarding poor accessibility and the narrow width of the estate road linking to the site.

Site affects others?

Bringing site forward alongside neighbouring sites would enable shared delivery of utilities but most importantly access

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield, ecology objection, greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor negative - transport network. Significant positive - greenspace access. Minor positive - access to health and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Disagree

Inadequate transport and road infrastructure.  
Roads too narrow and not adequate for the additional volume of traffic.  
Significant peak hour traffic problems on surrounding roads  
housing development would be totally inappropriate in this location  
Not suitable for development.  
No defensible boundary to south of the site  
Housing need?

Agree

Statutory

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

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Part of urban green corridor with no defensible boundary to the south.

North Leeds

2053A Alwoodley Lane, Alwoodley LS17

Site Details

Easting	430461	Northing	441059	Site area ha	5.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Alwoodley	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	
Agriculture	
Outdoor sport facility	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	
Greenfield site to the north of Alwoodley Lane, Alwoodley. No road frontage.	

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

Relates poorly to settlement, slightly disconnected. Well defined boundaries reduce potential for further sprawl, well contained site.
--

## North Leeds

2053A Alwoodley Lane, Alwoodley LS17

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

40% of site within walking distance of 4 buses per hour. 25% of site has access to primary education within walking distance as set out in Core Strategy transport assessment. 30% of the site has access to health services within the distance.

Rank (1-5)

3

##### Access comments

Access achievable onto Alwoodley Lane, but no footway along frontage.

4

##### Local network comments

Cumulative issues.

4

##### Mitigation measures

Footway along frontage, capacity improvements at Alwoodley Lane/Harrogate Road signals.

Total score

11

##### Highways site support

Yes with mitigation

##### Contingent on other sites

No

##### Contingent on other sites

No

#### Highways Agency

##### Impact

##### Network Status

No objection

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

##### Treatment Works

Knostrop

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

#### LCC

##### Ecology support

North Leeds

2053A Alwoodley Lane, Alwoodley LS17

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 %100.00



Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	6337.78
Nearest bus stop	5513
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	391.39

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 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 into 2 sites. Site A is unrelated to the existing settlement, is nearer to Eccup Reservoir and would create an incursion into Green Belt that could set a precedent for further sprawl.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Disagree

Agree

Road infrastructure.  
Better amenities.  
Transport/road network.  
Local amenities.  
Close to schools.  
Little environmental impact.

Statutory

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

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Site A is unrelated to the existing settlement, is nearer to Eccup Reservoir and would create an incursion into Green Belt that could set a precedent for further sprawl.

North Leeds

2053B Alwoodley Lane, Alwoodley LS17

Site Details

Easting	430815	Northing	440892	Site area ha	13.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds, Outer North West				Ward	Alwoodley	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Dwellings
-----------

Outdoor sport facility
------------------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Greenfield site off Alwoodley Lane, Alwoodley. Connected to housing on two 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?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	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

## North Leeds

2053B Alwoodley Lane, Alwoodley LS17

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

Relates well to urban area. Well contained reducing impact for further sprawl.

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short (= <5 yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

40% of site within walking distance of 4 buses per hour. 25% of site has access to primary education within walking distance as set out in Core Strategy transport assessment. 30% of the site has access to health services within the distance.

Rank (1-5)

3

##### Access comments

Access achievable onto Alwoodley Lane, but no footway along frontage.

4

##### Local network comments

Cumulative issues.

4

##### Mitigation measures

Footway along frontage, capacity improvements at Alwoodley Lane/Harrogate Road signals.

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

No objection

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

North Leeds

2053B Alwoodley Lane, Alwoodley LS17

LCC

Ecology support

Not supported

Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but Eccup Reservoir SSSI is nationally designated based on its wintering and migrating wildfowl – these birds generally use the open water at night for protection and feed on surrounding grassland by day.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

2053B=353 houses generates 88 primary and 35 secondary children. Land potentially needed for primary school expansion by 0.5FE.

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Eastern boundary and NE corner of site at possible flood risk from Wigton Knowle beck and tributary.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing site 2053B is close to Eccup Reservoir SSSI. This site is important for wintering wildfowl (an identified interest feature), consequently increased recreational disturbance as a result of this allocation is a primary concern. A copy of the SSSI citation can be found at [www.sssi.naturalengland.org/citation/citation\\_photo/1003837.pdf](http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org/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

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.76	% 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	0.24	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	100.00
-----------------	--------

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	6415.13
Nearest bus stop	2790
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	138.87

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

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

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

## Conclusions

### Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site has been split into 2 sites. Development of site B would constitute 'rounding off' of the existing settlement and is well related to the existing urban area. Concerns about local ecology impact.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

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

### Summary of reps

#### For Development

Clearly defined boundaries.  
minimal invasion on green space.  
Logical area joining up residential areas to the north of Alwoodley Lane  
Little environmental impact.  
Good access to schools.  
Transport infrastructure.  
Good transport links.  
Not isolated from nearby housing.  
Greater selection of schools, shops doctors.  
Schools convenient with space to accommodate more pupils.  
Site harmonises with the current housing settlement.  
This location will allow the appropriate road improvements to be made to accommodate additional traffic and pedestrian safety.

#### Against Development

Potential delivery issues.  
Site does not relate well to the existing built up area.  
Wrong type of housing.  
The width of king Lane between The Crescent and Alwoodley Lane is inadequate for current vehicular traffic.

#### Statutory

Metro - "The site falls outside 400m of the current core bus network.  
Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.  
We agree that this sites would not be suitable for housing development."

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

#### Preferred housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development of site B would constitute 'rounding off' of the existing settlement and is well related to the existing urban area.

Site Details							
Easting	429456	Northing	437876	Site area ha	4.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Mix 70:30
On-site land uses	
Allotment and city farm	
Dwellings	
Unmanaged Forest	
Neighbouring land uses	
Education	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Greenfield/brownfield (predominantly greenfield) site off Stonegate Road, Meanwood. Part of the site is occupied by Carr Manor house (Grade II listed). The surrounding area is mostly residential.
-------------	---

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	



## North Leeds

2055 Carr Manor, Meanwood LS6

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)

Core Strategy accessibility standards met, Meanwood local centre approx 1300m away.

4

Access comments

Extensive frontage with Stonegate Road but sections of this are sterilised by presence of adopted junctions opposite and pelican crossing.

5

Local network comments

Relatively small scale development unlikely to adversely effect operation of local network.

5

Mitigation measures

Total score

14

Highways site support

Yes

Contingent on other sites

No

Contingent on other sites

No

#### Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

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

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

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

North Leeds

2055 Carr Manor, Meanwood LS6

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1. Large open pond area within centre of site.	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	There are a number of Grade II Listed Buildings at around Carr Manor House. 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 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
------------------	---------------

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	8.58	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.03	
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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	100.00
-----------------	--------

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	3114.62
Nearest bus stop	1939
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	84.00

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site includes designated allotments (N1A) on existing UDP, and listed building. See also greenspace section, page 36, question G16. Conversion of listed building to residential is a possibility, but would need to maintain character of Carr Manor. Capacity revised down from 37 to 15 to reflect this. Conversion only would allow retention of allotments.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of greenspace (allotments). Minor negative - employment, economic growth, part greenfield/brownfield, landscape and historic environment. Minor positive - access to education and health, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Generally there is support to retain the site as greenspace for use as allotments.

The site is currently in community use as allotments and there is a high demand for them in the area.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site includes designated allotments (N1A) on existing UDP, and listed building. Conversion of listed building to residential is a possibility, but would need to maintain character of Carr Manor. Capacity revised down to 15 to reflect this.

Site Details

Easting	431325	Northing	438400	Site area ha	2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Outdoor sport facility	
Neighbouring land uses	
Education	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	The site is currently used as playing fields as part of the Allerton Grange High School complex. The school borders the site to the east and housing borders on all 3 other sides.
-------------	--

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	

## North Leeds

2058 Talbot Avenue - Allerton Grange High, Moor Allerton LS17

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

--

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Good accessibility.

5

Access comments

The site has limited frontage

5

Local network comments

Spare capacity.

5

Mitigation measures

Total score

15

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	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

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

North Leeds

2058 Talbot Avenue - Allerton Grange High, Moor Allerton LS17

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1. Public sewers and a culvert located within the site boundary.	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/04117/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 8, 9 and 10 of Planning Application 06/07127/LA	SPL	99
10/04115/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 15, 18, 26, 27, 31, 32, 36, 40 and 41 of Planning Application 30/367/05/OT	SPL	100
09/03523/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 of Planning Application 06/07127/LA	SPL	99
09/03525/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 and 49 of Planning Application 30/367/05/OT	SPL	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	99.99	
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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.99
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	4702.95
Nearest bus stop	4388
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	135.98

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

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

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



## Conclusions

### Issues and Options Summary

Site adjoins school and is designated as N6 - Protected Playing Pitch on the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 36, question G17. We are consulting Education on all sites and any comments received will be considered before making final decisions on sites.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of leisure and greenspace (N6), greenfield. Minor negative - community cohesion (loss of leisure facility). Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health facilities and flood risk.

### Summary of reps

#### For Development

Release for housing

#### Against Development

#### Retain as greenspace

The school children need sports facilities.

Sports fields for the use of the community is vital and must be protected

Site 2058 should not be considered for gypsy and traveller site

Not suitable for allocation for future housing development. Remain as green space.

#### Statutory

Sport England, "We would oppose its N6 allocation deletion as this would fail to recognise the site former use and current land use as playing fields/sport and recreation facilities."

Metro - "From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required

but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)."

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is managed and maintained by Leeds City Council Parks and Countryside as a public green open space. Local preference for the site to be retained as greenspace.

Site Details							
Easting	434276	Northing	438167	Site area ha	19	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

Site Characteristics			
Site type	Greenfield		
On-site land uses	Agriculture		
Neighbouring land uses	Outdoor sport facility		
Dwellings	Agriculture		
Other land uses	One wind turbine on site		
Topography	Undulating	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

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

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	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 encroachment

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

## North Leeds

2063 Cobble Hall, Roundhay LS8

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

Well contained site, with golf course and highway acting as a strong defensible boundary to the north. Would need to be developed with neighbouring site to connect well to settlement. Overlaps conservation area.

### 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 fails all accessibility standards and it is unlikely that a service would divert into the site.

1

##### Access comments

Access would have to be via a new signalised junction on the Ring Road (this potentially offers access to the allocated sites opposite)

3

##### Local network comments

Local congestion issues on the Ring Road.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Widening of Ring Road to enable signalised access, capacity improvements at Ring Road / A58 roundabout.

Total score

7

##### Highways site support

No

##### Contingent on other sites

Access solution could combine with the allocated housing and employment Red Hall sites.

##### Contingent on other sites

Access solution could combine with the allocated housing and employment Red Hall sites.

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

North Leeds

2063 Cobble Hall, Roundhay LS8

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildlife corridor function of the Wyke Beck Valley - any existing semi-improved grassland areas to be retained with emphasis on species-rich grassland and hedgerows to be provided along the western side	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	
2063+4013+3315+1190= 1619 houses generates 405 primary and 162 secondary children. New 2FE primary school would be required.	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	
<p>This site lies within the Roundhay 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It also lies opposite the boundary of the Grade II Registered Park and Garden at Roundhay Park and the site includes the range of farm buildings east of Cobble Hall which are Grade II Listed. 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 also need to be some assesment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the significance of these assets and what effect its loss and subsequent development might have upon their significance.</p>	

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	99.85	% 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	99.85	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.91
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	4228.05
Nearest bus stop	5012
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	246.39

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 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. Contingent on site 3315 coming forward to better relate to the urban area, and for access. Well contained site, with golf course and highway acting as a strong defensible boundary to the north. Wind turbine in centre of site. Highway concerns regarding poor accessibility and impact on the Ring Road.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

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

### Summary of reps

Pro

Anti - The site should not be assessed as amber for the following reasons:

- A listed building is located within the site;
- Public rights of way run through the site;
- The Green Belt assessment confirms that development of the site would not constitute 'rounding off' and that the site currently provides access to the countryside;
- Development of the site is not supported by the Council's highway authority.
- The site can only come forward in conjunction with site 3315, which in turn can only come forward in conjunction with site 1190. They are potential third party ownership issues that could prevent it coming forward. For example, the Council have stated that the capacity of site 3315 is 886 despite the fact that the highways authority have stated that the capacity of the site should be limited to 300 due to access constraints. As the site is dependent on site 1190 coming forward it is considered that this site cannot be considered to be achievable and as such should be removed entirely, however if the Council continue to consider the site for allocation its capacity must be reduced to 300. This in turn means that sites 4013 and 2063 will not be achievable as only the southern half of site 3315 could be developed due to the limited capacity and as such sites 4013 and 2063 would have no physical attachment to the site and would therefore constitute isolated development and would be unsuitable.

No clear justification is provided as to why sites with similar constraints have been assessed in different categories.

Statutory - English Heritage - This site lies within the Roundhay Conservation Area. There will need to be some assessment of what contribution this plot of land makes to the character of the Conservation Area.

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 779m from the core network. 6 buses an hour. Not accessible for primary school. Accessible to secondary and healthcare.

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Local preference to not bring forward sites to the east of Roundhay Park (1190, 1138, 3315A, 3315B, 4013, 2063) and for Wetherby Road to remain as a natural buffer.

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		Rank (1-5)
Public transport accessibility comments		
Accessibility to Public Transport not in line with Core Strategy standards for majority of site.		2
Access comments		Rank (1-5)
Highway frontage but adequate access can not be achieved for level of development proposed.		
Local network comments		Rank (1-5)
Local congestion issues.		
Mitigation measures		Total score
Unknown at this stage.		
Highways site support		Rank (1-5)
no		
Contingent on other sites		Rank (1-5)
no		
Contingent on other sites		Rank (1-5)
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	433850	Northing	437478	Site area ha	2.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

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

Other land uses - None

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

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

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	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	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 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

Relates poorly to settlement. Well contained by natural boundaries reducing potential for further sprawl. Overlaps conservation area.
---

## North Leeds

### 3008 Change of use of former caravan site to public open space

#### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Longterm (+11yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

#### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

##### LCC Highways Comments

###### Public transport accessibility comments

No Public Transport or local services within walking distance.

Rank (1-5)

1

###### Access comments

Elmete Lane has substandard carriageway width in vicinity of site. Substandard crossroads junction at Elmete Lane/Wetherby Road

2

###### Local network comments

Local congestion issues.

2

###### Mitigation measures

Carriageway/footway improvements to Elmete Lane. Traffic signals at Elmete Lane/Wetherby Road

Total score

5

###### Highways site support

no

###### Contingent on other sites

###### Contingent on other sites

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha. On top of an historic landfill. See comments in main text of our response.

#### LCC

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

Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but there are significant areas of scrub and some semi-improved grassland areas which together contribute to the Wyke Beck Valley corridor (potential Leeds Habitat Network).

3008 Change of use of former caravan site to public open space

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/04250/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13 and 15 of Planning Application 11/04113/LA	A	83
11/04113/LA	Proposed cemetery with associated amenities	A	83

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	10.20	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.99
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3888.00
Nearest bus stop	1653
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	353.63

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 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. New school on southern part of site. The rest of the site is heavily treed and provides an important setting for Roundhay Park. Development of the site would negatively impact on the park.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield, ecology objection, greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor negative - access to education, health and leisure facilities, community participation (poor access), transport network and historic environment. Minor positive - greenspace and transport network.

### Summary of reps

Metro - 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development. 619m from the core network. 12 buses an hour. No access to primary, secondary schools or healthcare.

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Isolated site. Development would represent an island of development within Green Belt, unrelated to the existing urban area. Not supported by Highways.



Site Details							
Easting	425998	Northing	439899	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

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

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown                      Suitability: Suitable                      Achievability: Uncertain

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--	--	--	--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works			

Environment Agency

Constraints			

LCC

Ecology support			

Ecology boundary

--	--	--	--

Education comments

--	--	--	--

Flood Risk

--	--	--	--

Utilities

Gas			

Electric

--	--	--	--

Fire and Rescue

--	--	--	--

Telecoms

--	--	--	--

Other

English Heritage			

Natural England

--	--	--	--

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/02226/LA	Outline application for residential development comprising of C2 (residential institutions)	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	18.26	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	18.26	
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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	100.00
-----------------	--------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1750.57
Nearest bus stop	2414
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	93.10

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input 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	425905	Northing	439849	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Vacant land	
Neighbouring land uses	
Indoor sport facility	
Education	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Greenfield site off Farrar Lane, Holt Park. The site is bounded by Ralph Thoresby School and Holt Park Active. The area is predominantly residential, with housing directly to the south.
-------------	---

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown                      Suitability: Suitable                      Achievability: Uncertain

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

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

Environment Agency

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

LCC

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

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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	79.31	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	80.35	
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	100.00	% 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 %	98.97
Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1645.72
Nearest bus stop	7962
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	148.36
Agricultural classification	Grade 3
Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is part of the Holt Park design brief and has been identified as having potential for residential development. The site is contained by Ralph Thoresby School and Holt Park Active.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is part of the Holt Park design brief and has been identified as having potential for residential development. The site is contained by Ralph Thoresby School and Holt Park Active.



Site Details							
Easting	426445	Northing	435546	Site area ha	3.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Kirkstall	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Vacant land	
Shops	
Restaurants and Cafes	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Indoor sport facility	
Outdoor amenity and open space	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Site overlooking busy junction between Kirkstall Lane, Kirkstall Hill, Beecroft Road and Commercial Road. Partly located within Kirkstall Town Centre. Site currently split over varied levels, though much of site has been vacated.
-------------	---

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	

## North Leeds

3014 Kirkstall District Centre

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)

Public Transport Core Strategy standards met schools/health/rail, some local services.

5

Access comments

Mitigation works would be required for signalised junctions at Commercial Road and Kirkstall Hill.

4

Local network comments

Local congestion issues mitigation required.

3

Mitigation measures

Signalised junction required.

Total score

12

Highways site support

Yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

#### Highways Agency

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

n/a

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

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

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1. There are a number of public sewers within the site boundary.	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	
Sandford Road School 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, redevelopment proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.	

Natural England	
Housing sites 4056, 4057, 235, 4021, 1062, 3014, 2049 are all within 2km of Leeds-Liverpool Canal SSSI. The cumulative effects of these allocations on the interest features of the SSSI should be examined.	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
12/04200/FU	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of A1 foodstore, five retail units (A1, A2, A3, A4 or A5), a new club building for the Leeds Postal Sports Association Club, a community centre, improved public realm, and associated car parking, servicing landscaping and access improvements		89
11/04253/FU	Demolition of existing buildings and erect retail A1 foodstore, with 3 level covered car parking areas, 7 retail units (Use Classes A1, A2, A4, A4 and A5), a community centre and replacement Post Office Workers Club, with public realm, associated servicing, landscaping and access improvements.	W	89

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

3014 Kirkstall District Centre

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	

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	60.61
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	455.14
Nearest bus stop	9232
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	83.07

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 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

Pending Tesco application on site. A mix of residential and commercial retail would be appropriate given town centre location. Amber as preferred retail use, residential could be in place on upper floors.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

Significant negative - pollution. Significant positive - greenspace, brownfield, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to health and leisure facilities and local distinctiveness (existing unattractive BF site).

### Summary of reps

Pro  
Easy access

### Anti

English Heritage - Sandford Road School 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, redevelopment proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

### 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.

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. 83m from the core network. 9 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Preferred housing with mixed uses (no employment)

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

A mix of residential and retail would be appropriate given town centre location. Residential could be in place on upper floors.

Site Details

Easting	422205	Northing	437499	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	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

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency			
Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail			

Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works			

Environment Agency			
Constraints			

LCC			
Ecology support			

Ecology boundary			

Education comments			

Flood Risk			

Utilities			
Gas			

Electric			

Fire and Rescue			

Telecoms			

Other			
English Heritage			

Natural England			

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.99	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2757.01
Nearest bus stop	11733
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	553.30

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

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



Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Pro - General support

Anti - Lack of consultation, Traffic congestion and pressure on local services

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Sieved out as the site does not comply with the settlement hierarchy.

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	Total score
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.	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

N32 Greenbelt	99.81	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.02	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.07	
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	

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	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 trigg 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	425402	Northing	441089	Site area ha	5.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds, Outer North West				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

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

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

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

App Number                      Proposal                      Decision                      % of site




Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	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	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2182.48
Nearest bus stop	7978
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	264.31

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is not well related to the to the existing settlement form and development would represent a significant incursion into Green Belt which could set a percedent for further unrestricted sprawl.

Site Details

Easting	425533	Northing	440886	Site area ha	6.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds, Outer North West				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

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

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

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

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.62	% 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	0.38	% 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 %	2.65
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2070.67
Nearest bus stop	7978
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	230.34

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation  
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion  
Green Belt site. The site is not well related to the to the existing settlement form and development would represent a significant incursion into Green Belt which could set a percedent for further unrestricted sprawl.

Site Details

Easting	430093	Northing	438731	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

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

## North Leeds

3151 Queenshill Court, Moortown

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

#### Network Rail

--

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

#### Environment Agency

Constraints	

#### LCC

Ecology support	

#### Ecology boundary

--

#### Education comments

--

#### Flood Risk

--

#### Utilities

Gas	

#### Electric

--

#### Fire and Rescue

--

#### Telecoms

--

#### Other

English Heritage	

#### Natural England

--

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/9/00283/MOD	Demolition of 37 dwellings and erection of part 2, part 3 and part 4 storey sheltered housing development, comprising 46 two bedroom flats and 16 one bedroom flats, with communal	M01	98



	facilities including lounge and staff offices and with landscaping and car parkingNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: The feature windows to the living rooms are to have two full height windows instead of one full and one half height window.		
09/04361/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 8 of Planning Application 09/00379/FU	A	98
09/00379/FU	Demolition of 37 dwellings and erection of part 2, part 3 and part 4 storey sheltered housing development, comprising 46 two bedroom flats and 16 one bedroom flats, with communal facilities including lounge and staff offices and with landscaping and car parking	A	98

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	12.87
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	4175.17
Nearest bus stop	2287
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	44.38

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 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"/>

North Leeds

3151 Queenshill Court, Moortown

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	426554	Northing	436313	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Kirkstall	

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: Unavailable                      Suitability: Suitable                      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
12/03056/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 10, 11 and 12 of Planning Application 10/04025/FU	W	100

3184      Former Dutton Arms (PH), Queenswood Drive

12/04093/COND	Consent, agreement or approval of conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18 and 20 of Planning Application 12/02701/FU	A	87
12/02701/FU	4 pairs of semi-detached houses, associated car parking and new vehicular access	A	87
13/03065/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 12 of Planning Application 12/02701/FU	A	87
10/04025/FU	4 pairs of semi-detached houses, 1 detached house, associated car parking and new vehicular accesses from Queenswood Drive and Queenswood Road	A	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	1.26	
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	100.00	% 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 %	1.33
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	544.59
Nearest bus stop	13505
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	36.41

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"/>

North Leeds

3184	Former Dutton Arms (PH), Queenswood Drive
------	---

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	427673	Northing	436106	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Headingley	

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

## North Leeds

3201 The Former Lounge Cinema, North Lane, Headingley

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

#### Network Rail

--

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

#### Environment Agency

Constraints	

#### LCC

Ecology support	

#### Ecology boundary

--

#### Education comments

--

#### Flood Risk

--

#### Utilities

Gas	

#### Electric

--

#### Fire and Rescue

--

#### Telecoms

--

#### Other

English Heritage	

#### Natural England

--

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/02864/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 19, 24, 26, 33 and 40 of Planning Application 10/03603/FU	A	100

3201      The Former Lounge Cinema, North Lane, Headingley

10/03603/FU	Part demolition of cinema and erection of mixed use development up to 4 storeys comprising, retail, restaurant, 12 two bedroom apartments and ancillary extension and smoking terrace to the existing Arc Cafe Bar and external works	A	100
10/03604/CA	Conservation area application for part demolition of cinema	A	100
11/9/00191/MOD	Part demolition of cinema and erection of mixed use development up to 4 storeys comprising, retail, restaurant, 12 two bedroom apartments and ancillary extension and smoking terrace to the existing Arc Cafe Bar and external worksNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 10/03603/FU: Alteration to rear natural slate roof to form cut back to enable installation of energy efficient air source heat pump units; realignment of windows	M01	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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 %	0.58
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	913.60
Nearest bus stop	10871
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	173.54

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"/>

North Leeds

3201      The Former Lounge Cinema, North Lane, Headingley

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	432120	Northing	439671	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Alwoodley	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

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

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

## North Leeds

3207 Rear 268-274 Shadwell Lane, LS17

### 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
10/01560/EXT	Extension of Time Period for planning application 07/03200/FU erection of 6 four bedroom terrace and 2 four bedroom detached houses	A	100

13/00999/FU	Removal of condition 21 of application 10/01560/EXT (Requirement for refuse vehicles turning head)	A	100
13/00149/FU	Substitution of house types on Plots 5 - 8 and amendments to access drive of planning approval 10/01560/EXT	A	70
13/00132/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 28 and 29 of Planning Application 10/01560/EXT	A	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.03	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.03	
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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	6164.36
Nearest bus stop	11224
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	68.91

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	433604	Northing	436799	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

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

North Leeds

3215      The Grove, North Lane, LS8

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	0.00	% 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	100.00	% 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 %	0.03
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3566.05
Nearest bus stop	7044
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	357.31

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	427896	Northing	434654	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Kirkstall	

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 (= <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
14/04354/FU	Erection of five dwellings and associated external works.	R	54

13/01780/FU	Erection of one block of 5No. two bed apartments; detached bike/bin store and associated external works.	W	55
-------------	--	---	----

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	100.00	% 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 %	4.19
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	522.83
Nearest bus stop	4951
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	148.21

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

North Leeds

3301128 Wetherby Road, Roundhay, Leeds, LS8 2JZ

Site Details

Easting	433524	Northing	437148	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

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: SuitableAchievability: 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 HistoryApplications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/00319/FU	Part demolition and alterations of 128 Wetherby Road to form 2No. dwellings; construction of 2No. new semi-detached dwellings.	A	100

North Leeds

3301128 Wetherby Road, Roundhay, Leeds, LS8 2JZ

09/04656/FU	Change of use from 2 flats to form 3 town houses including external alterations, roof extensions, bay window to side with balcony over, single storey building to rear to form 3 dwellings, 2.3m high wall and 1m high glazed balustrade with altered vehicular access and parking court	A	100
11/00813/FU	Change of use involving part demolition, extensions and part new roof of 2 flats to 5 terrace houses and new access/egress	A	100
11/00814/CA	Conservation Area Application to demolish rear extension outbuildings	A	100
14/04299/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 6, 10 and 23 of Planning Application 14/00319/FU	A	100
14/04513/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 8,11,12,17 and 22 of Planning Application 14/00319/FU		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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3862.48
Nearest bus stop	14420
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	102.71
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 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	434311	Northing	437340	Site area ha	15.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

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

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: 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	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3502.06
Nearest bus stop	7543
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	316.70

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development is contingent on site 1190 being brought forward. Local preference for sites to the east of Roundhay Park (1190, 1138, 3315A, 3315B, 4013, 2063) to remain undeveloped and for Wetherby Road to act as a natural buffer.

North Leeds

3315B Beechwood Farm (north) Elmete Lane Roundhay

Site Details

Easting	434308	Northing	437708	Site area ha	17.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

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

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: 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	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3813.13
Nearest bus stop	14302
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	380.65

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation  
Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion  
Green Belt site. Development is contingent on site 1190 being brought forward. Local preference for sites to the east of Roundhay Park (1190, 1138, 3315A, 3315B, 4013, 2063) to remain undeveloped and for Wetherby Road to act as a natural buffer.

Site Details							
Easting	422766	Northing	439425	Site area ha	2.2	SP7	
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	
Agriculture	
Outdoor sport facility	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

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

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

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

## North Leeds

3327 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

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

Well contained site by trees on the borders but relates poorly to urban area. Development would reduce separation between settlements.

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Poor employment and Public Transport accessibility. Good access to local services.

Rank (1-5)

3

##### Access comments

Access onto Layton Rise Achievable, Bayton Lane might not be due to trees/speed of road/lack of footway/width of road.

4

##### Local network comments

Local congestion in Horsforth and outer ring road.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Access works.

Total score

10

##### Highways site support

no

##### Contingent on other sites

##### Contingent on other sites

#### Highways Agency

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

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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



North Leeds

3327 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance hedgerows and trees - which occur across the centre and northern edge of this site. Bats to consider.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1679.37
Nearest bus stop	10227
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	141.57

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

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

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

## Conclusions

### Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is set to the west of Bayton Lane, relatively remote from the centre of Horsforth. The site itself is relatively contained on all sides by the road and existing residential development, but development would further reduce the Green Belt gap between residential areas. Highway concerns regarding access.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

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

### Summary of reps

Pro - more suitable than 1178A. Ecology issues can be mitigated against.

Anti - road infrastructure cannot support this development. Accident black spot/traffic congestion problem at the junction of West End Lane , Bayton Lane and Layton Road . Layton Road is a thoroughfare for commuters, making it an already dangerous road for pedestrians, especially school children walking to school, because the footpaths on Layton Road are inadequate; the speed limit is 40 MPH, which is ridiculous in a residential area and there are no pedestrian crossings. West End Lane- cars are passing one another, as a pedestrian the vehicles are very close, because this road is so narrow, so how can this road expect to take more traffic. Rat running to the airport.

Statutory - 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. Site is 924m away from the core network. 8 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is set to the west of Bayton Lane, relatively remote from the centre of Horsforth. The site itself is relatively contained on all sides by the road and existing residential development, but development would further reduce the Green Belt gap between residential areas. Highway concerns regarding access.

Site Details							
Easting	422540	Northing	439168	Site area ha	5.1	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	

Other land uses - None

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

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

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	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?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	Coalescence/merging 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?	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	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

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

Site currently separates two settlements, development here would result in merging Rawdon and Horsforth. Site is well contained by trees but performs an important role in safeguarding countryside.
--

## North Leeds

3328 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+ yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

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

Rank (1-5)

3

##### Access comments

Access onto Layton Road.

5

##### Local network comments

Local congestion in Horsforth and outer ring road.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Access works/improvements to public transport / cumulative fund for Hosforth rdt.

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

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

#### LCC

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

Not Supported (RED). No site based designations but a wooded beck corridor that runs down the western parts of this site and a species-rich hedgerow running parallel. The beck and lowland mixed deciduous woodland are UK BAP Priority habitats.

North Leeds

3328 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. However, part of site along western boundary will be at risk of flooding from Gill Beck

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

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

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	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
-----------------	------

3328 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1881.50
Nearest bus stop	6564
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	117.72

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. Development would result in the coalescence of Rawdon and Horsforth, contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belts in preventing the merging of settlements.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield, ecology objection and landscape. Minor negative - natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to education and health facilities, flood risk and transport network.

Summary of reps

Pro  
No harm to the ecology of the site.

Anti  
Congestion, road safety. Roads are already rat runs. West End Lane, Bayton Lane and Layton Road are all mentioned as being unsuitable due to their width and lack of pedestrain access. Other sites are more suitable.

Statutory  
'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. Site is 594 from the core network. 8 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Development would result in the coalescence of Rawdon and Horsforth, contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belts in preventing the merging of settlements.



Site Details							
Easting	422836	Northing	439074	Site area ha	1.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	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	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	Yes
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging 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	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	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 would reduce separation between settlements. Well contained site (tree lined boundaries) but relates poorly to settlement set to the west of main road which currently acts as a strong defensible boundary.
--

## North Leeds

3330 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Poor employment and Public Transport accessibility, average access to local services.

Rank (1-5)

2

##### Access comments

Access onto west End Lane achievable but lane is poor in width and lack of footway.

4

##### Local network comments

Local congestion in Horsforth and outer ring road.

3

##### Mitigation measures

Road width and footway works

Total score

9

##### Highways site support

no

##### Contingent on other sites

##### Contingent on other sites

#### Highways Agency

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

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

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

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

#### LCC

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

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the hedgerows and trees that occur along all boundaries of this site - a minimum 10 metres buffer to all boundaries planted with native shrubs and small trees (this 10 metre buffer not be allocated as garden space).

North Leeds

3330 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Site is clear of mains. There are gas mains running in the public highway.

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %0.00

3330 Land at Rawdon, Leeds

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1586.42
Nearest bus stop	7241
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	240.35

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

**Conclusions****Issues and Options Summary**

Green Belt Site. The site is set to the west of West End Lane which is the current boundary to Horsforth. Development here would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, encroach into the Green Belt and reduce the gap between settlements (Horsforth and Rawdon) contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belts in preventing the merging of settlements. Highway concerns regarding suitable access and accessibility.

**Site affects others?****Sustainability summary**

Significant negative - greenfield. Minor negative - ecology (mitigation), greenhouse emissions, accessibility and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - greenspace and flood risk.

**Summary of reps****Pro**

The site is more suitable than 1187A

It should be coded Amber.

**Anti**

Development here would be out of keeping. There are a lot of accidents in the area due to the unsuitable roads for the level of traffic existing and proposed and the lack of pedestrian pavements.

Statutory Metro agree that the site is not suitable. 825m to the core network. 8 buses an hour. Access to primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

Metro - Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward.

We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development. 825m to the core network. 8 buses an hour. Access to primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

**Comments on phasing****DPP Allocation**

Not proposed as housing allocation

**DPP Allocation Conclusion**

Green Belt site. The site is set to the west of West End Lane which is the current boundary to Horsforth. Development here would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, encroach into the Green Belt and reduce the gap between settlements (Horsforth and Rawdon) contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belts in preventing the merging of settlements. Highway concerns regarding suitable access and accessibility.

## North Leeds

3341 LS8 2JJ

### Site Details

Easting	433131	Northing	437423	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

### 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**

--

## North Leeds

3341 LS8 2JJ

### 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
14/03683/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 19 of Planning Application 12/03075/FU	A	100

12/03075/FU	Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of approval 11/02881/FU for MINOR MATERIAL AMENDMENT relating to 4 five bedroom terrace houses and 1 five bedroom house	A	100
13/00633/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 24, 26 and 27 of Planning Application 12/03075/FU	INT	100
11/02881/FU	4 five bedroom terrace houses and 1 five bedroom house	A	100
12/03001/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 23 of Planning Application 11/02881/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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	4335.78
Nearest bus stop	5420
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	316.22

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"/>



North Leeds

3341      LS8 2JJ

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	425898	Northing	440617	Site area ha	22.4	SP7	
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Poorly defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Site occupied by Cookridge Golf Course and buildings associated with the use of the golf course. Undulating site extends northwards from Holt Lane with highway access from Cookridge Lane.

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact	Material impact	Network Status	No objection subject to satisfactory mitigation

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

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

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

Environment Agency

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

LCC

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

Not supported (RED). Breary Marsh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) lies only 200m from this proposed allocation. The site has important wetland communities (wet woodland and fen) and lies down stream of the proposed housing site. Any development has potential impacts on water quality and quantity as well as the pattern of run-off. The current drainage associated with the golf course should not be assumed to be optimal for the SSSI. Any proposed allocation in this area will need to include measures to meet the optimal quality and quantity surface water run-off to the SSSI. Surface water attenuation basins would need to be included which should be designed to include fen and wet woodland. Seed should be of local provenance ideally from the SSSI. Measures will be needed to maintain and enhance water quality during construction and in the longer term. Some parts of the SSSI are dry (W10) woodland. The golf course currently supports the following UK BAP priority habitats: Flowing water, Lowland mixed deciduous woodland and Ponds. The ponds support a good range of wildfowl and waders including curlew and lapwing. The water course/ponds within the site have records of water vole and white clawed crayfish both UK protected species. The area also has records of harvest mouse a UK and Leeds BAP priority species which will be associated with unmanaged grassland and fen. The area also has important records for wildfowl, waders and passerine birds.

3360A Cookridge Hall Golf Course (S)

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3360 - to reflect the most valuable habitats near Breary Marsh SSSI and Breary Marsh Local Nature Reserve and habitats in the east that help provide an east-west wildlife corridor function. Breary Marsh SSSI lies only 400m (and Breary Marsh LNR only 200m) from this proposed allocation. The site has important wetland communities (wet woodland and fen) and lies down stream of the proposed housing site. Any development has potential impacts on water quality and quantity as well as the pattern of run-off. The current drainage associated with the golf course should not be assumed to be optimal for the SSSI. Any proposed allocation in this area will need to include measures to meet the optimal quality and quantity surface water run-off to the SSSI - advice needed from Natural England. Surface water attenuation basins would need to be included which should be designed to include fen and wet woodland. Seed should be of local provenance ideally from the SSSI. Measures will be needed to maintain and enhance water quality during construction and in the longer term. Some parts of the SSSI are dry (W10) woodland. The golf course currently supports the following UK BAP priority habitats: Flowing water, Lowland mixed deciduous woodland and Ponds. The ponds support a good range of wildfowl and waders including curlew and lapwing. The water course/ponds within the site have records of water vole and white clawed crayfish both UK protected species. The area also has records of harvest mouse a UK and Leeds Biodiversity Action Plan priority species which will be associated with unmanaged grassland and fen. The area also has important records for wildfowl, waders and passerine birds. Mitigation will also be required to protect and enhance the northern and eastern boundaries. Some off-site mitigation/compensation may be acceptable to enhance the area between the allocation and Breary Marsh LNR to assist it to become part of the LNR - will require transfer of ownership and commuted sum for future management.

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

3360A Cookridge Hall Golf Course (S)

N32 Greenbelt	98.56	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.01	
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	1.44	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2088.99
Nearest bus stop	4628
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	300.01

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input 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. The site is not well related to the existing settlement form and development would represent a significant incursion into Green Belt which could set a precedent for further unrestricted sprawl. Highway concerns regarding access and accessibility. Land to the east of the Chestnuts is designated as proposed N5 greenspace. Holt Lane Meadow, Cookridge is designated as Access Land. This land has been designated under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 as having access on foot for the public. This is one of six throughout Leeds with these rights.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

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

### Summary of reps

#### Pro development

It would be an opportunity to create a 'new village' with new facilities - school, shops etc. Allocate instead of Molesely Wood Gardens as a larger site like this would be able to provide the necessary infrastructure unlike Molesely Wood Gardens. 2 larger sites can accommodate all the houses needed in this area rather than more development in Adel which will be stretched with the development of Boddington, the government buildings and Centurion Way. Will prevent the spoiling of the countryside of Adel. Larger developments give opportunity to provide different size units.

#### Anti development

Site is in the Green Belt. Impact on the environment. Prioritise brownfield development first. Greenspace is important to health and wellbeing and wildlife. Issues around infrastructure. Pressure and problems for access, drainage, public transport, traffic, noise, pollution, pressure on schools. The golf course is a tourist attraction.

Adel Meadows Estate in 1995 was the provision of a Childrens Play Area, running track and & kick-about area, and the planting of 600-plus new trees.

Consultees - classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development. Distance to core network 592. 6 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. There is no defensible boundary to the proposed GB boundary which could set a precedent for further unrestricted sprawl. Highway concerns regarding access and accessibility

Site Details

Easting	426114	Northing	440801	Site area ha	36.7	SP7	
HMCA	North Leeds, Outer North West				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Poorly defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Site occupied by Cookridge Golf Course and buildings associated with the use of the golf course. Undulating site extends northwards from Holt Lane with highway access from Cookridge Lane.

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact	Material impact	Network Status	No objection subject to satisfactory mitigation

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

Environment Agency

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

LCC

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

Not supported (RED). Breary Marsh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) lies only 200m from this proposed allocation. The site has important wetland communities (wet woodland and fen) and lies down stream of the proposed housing site. Any development has potential impacts on water quality and quantity as well as the pattern of run-off. The current drainage associated with the golf course should not be assumed to be optimal for the SSSI. Any proposed allocation in this area will need to include measures to meet the optimal quality and quantity surface water run-off to the SSSI. Surface water attenuation basins would need to be included which should be designed to include fen and wet woodland. Seed should be of local provenance ideally from the SSSI. Measures will be needed to maintain and enhance water quality during construction and in the longer term. Some parts of the SSSI are dry (W10) woodland. The golf course currently supports the following UK BAP priority habitats: Flowing water, Lowland mixed deciduous woodland and Ponds. The ponds support a good range of wildfowl and waders including curlew and lapwing. The water course/ponds within the site have records of water vole and white clawed crayfish both UK protected species. The area also has records of harvest mouse a UK and Leeds BAP priority species which will be associated with unmanaged grassland and fen. The area also has important records for wildfowl, waders and passerine birds.

3360A Cookridge Hall Golf Course (S)

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3360 - to reflect the most valuable habitats near Breary Marsh SSSI and Breary Marsh Local Nature Reserve and habitats in the east that help provide an east-west wildlife corridor function. Breary Marsh SSSI lies only 400m (and Breary Marsh LNR only 200m) from this proposed allocation. The site has important wetland communities (wet woodland and fen) and lies down stream of the proposed housing site. Any development has potential impacts on water quality and quantity as well as the pattern of run-off. The current drainage associated with the golf course should not be assumed to be optimal for the SSSI. Any proposed allocation in this area will need to include measures to meet the optimal quality and quantity surface water run-off to the SSSI - advice needed from Natural England. Surface water attenuation basins would need to be included which should be designed to include fen and wet woodland. Seed should be of local provenance ideally from the SSSI. Measures will be needed to maintain and enhance water quality during construction and in the longer term. Some parts of the SSSI are dry (W10) woodland. The golf course currently supports the following UK BAP priority habitats: Flowing water, Lowland mixed deciduous woodland and Ponds. The ponds support a good range of wildfowl and waders including curlew and lapwing. The water course/ponds within the site have records of water vole and white clawed crayfish both UK protected species. The area also has records of harvest mouse a UK and Leeds Biodiversity Action Plan priority species which will be associated with unmanaged grassland and fen. The area also has important records for wildfowl, waders and passerine birds. Mitigation will also be required to protect and enhance the northern and eastern boundaries. Some off-site mitigation/compensation may be acceptable to enhance the area between the allocation and Breary Marsh LNR to assist it to become part of the LNR - will require transfer of ownership and commuted sum for future management.

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



3360A Cookridge Hall Golf Course (S)

N32 Greenbelt	99.94	% overlap	Main Urban Area		0.06	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00		Major Settlement		0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00		Minor Settlement		0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.07		Overlaps Urban Extension		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
N1A Allotments	0.00		Regeneration Areas			
N5 Open Space	15.22					
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00					
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00		Inner South RA		0.00	% overlap
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00		LB Corridor RA		0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00		EASEL RA		0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00		Aire Valley RA		0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00		West Leeds Gateway		0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00					

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	15.19
Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2372.31
Nearest bus stop	4628
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	561.45
Agricultural classification	Grade 3
Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is not well related to the existing settlement form and development would represent a significant incursion into Green Belt which could set a precedent for further unrestricted sprawl. Highway concerns regarding access and accessibility. Land to the east of the Chestnuts is designated as proposed N5 greenspace. Holt Lane Meadow, Cookridge is designated as Access Land. This land has been designated under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 as having access on foot for the public. This is one of six throughout Leeds with these rights.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Pro development

It would be an opportunity to create a 'new village' with new facilities - school, shops etc. Allocate instead of Molesely Wood Gardens as a larger site like this would be able to provide the necessary infrastructure unlike Molesely Wood Gardens. 2 larger sites can accommodate all the houses needed in this area rather than more development in Adel which will be stretched with the development of Boddington, the government buildings and Centurion Way. Will prevent the spoiling of the countryside of Adel. Larger developments give opportunity to provide different size units.

Anti development

Site is in the Green Belt. Impact on the environment. Prioritise brownfield development first. Greenspace is important to health and wellbeing and wildlife. Issues around infrastructure. Pressure and problems for access, drainage, public transport, traffic, noise, pollution, pressure on schools. The golf course is a tourist attraction.

Adel Meadows Estate in 1995 was the provision of a Childrens Play Area, running track and & kick-about area, and the planting of 600-plus new trees.

Consultees - classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development. Distance to core network 592. 6 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is not well related to the existing settlement form and development would represent a significant incursion into Green Belt which could set a precedent for further unrestricted sprawl. Highway concerns regarding access and accessibility

Site Details

Easting	427827	Northing	437482	Site area ha	4	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Greenfield site off Weetwood Avenue. The site is flat with a significant amount of treecover. Residential areas on the east, south and 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	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?	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

Strong links to main urban area. Well contained site (tree lined boundaries) reducing potential for further sprawl. Site performs important open space function.
--

**North Leeds****3376 Off Weetwood Avenue, Headingley, Leeds****SHLAA conclusions****Availability:** Longterm (+11yrs)**Suitability:** LDF to determine**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)**Summary of infrastructure provider comments****LCC Highways Comments**

## Public transport accessibility comments

**Rank (1-5)**

Poor employment and Public Transport accessibility, average access to local services.

**2**

## Access comments

Adequate frontage with adopted highway.

**5**

## Local network comments

Significant congestion issues on A660.

**2**

## Mitigation measures

Access works, possible footway works required, cumulative congestion fund possible, public transport improvements required

**Total score****9**

## Highways site support

Yes with mitigation and partial development.

## 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	Knostrap
-----------------	----------

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

**Environment Agency**

## Constraints

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

**LCC**

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

Not supported (RED). This proposed allocation includes 0.054ha of the Meanwood Valley SEGI in the north-east corner (an area of woodland linked to the wider site and wildlife corridor). The rest of the site has no site-based designations but will form part of the Leeds Habitat Network - it lies

on the Meanwood Valley wildlife corridor which runs into the heart of Leeds. The site is currently grassland on former arable land with smaller areas of plantation woodland. The open farmland and belts of woodland are considered to add to the variety of habitats in a corridor already constrained by development.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. There is a combined sewer running across the NW corner of the site. Field drainage and short section of culvert within SW corner.

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	1.07	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	71.13	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	99.98	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.02	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1946.11
Nearest bus stop	1130
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	277.79

Agricultural classification	Non-agricultural
-----------------------------	------------------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input checked="" 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. The site is relatively well related to the urban area, bounded by residential development to the west and south and trees to the north and east, but performs an important function as open space. The bulk of the site is designated as protected playing pitch (N6) on the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 36, question G18. It is also in an Urban Green Corridor and a Conservation Area.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of leisure, greenspace (N1 & N6), greenfield and ecology objection. Minor negative - community cohesion (loss of leisure facility), greenhouse emissions, accessibility, landscape and historic environment. Minor positive - flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti - site forms part of the urban green corridor

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. 570m from the core network. 4 buses an hour. No access to primary or secondary schools or healthcare.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green belt site. The site is well related to the urban area, bounded by residential development to the west and south and trees to the north and east. A large part of the site is designated as protected playing pitch (N6) on the UDP and is also in an urban green corridor and conservation area. The site is in private ownership and has not been in active playing field use for some years. Development of the site would have little or no impact on the purposes of green belt and it is separated from the major local area of green space, Meanwood Park, by a strong tree belt. In addition to meeting the housing target in North Leeds development would help fund improvements at Headingley cricket and rugby ground the importance of which is recognised in the Core Strategy (para 4.7.10)

North Leeds

3381 Brownberrie Lane

Site Details

Easting	423438	Northing	439428	Site area ha	1.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Dwellings	
Neighbouring land uses	
Education	
Places of worship	
Outdoor sport facility	

Other land uses - None

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

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

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	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	



## North Leeds

3381 Brownberrie Lane

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

Part of the site is within Green Belt (30%).

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Unavailable

**Suitability:** Unsuitable

**Achievability:** Short (=<5yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Good access to local services, poor public transport.

Rank (1-5)

3

##### Access comments

Adequate visibility may not be achievable onto adopted highway due to land frontage, may need adjcent land 3384

3

##### Local network comments

Significant congestion issues in Horsforth

2

##### Mitigation measures

Footway works required, network congestion works required, public transport improvements

Total score

8

##### Highways site support

no

##### Contingent on other sites

possible combined with 3384

##### Contingent on other sites

possible combined with 3384

#### Highways Agency

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

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

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

North Leeds

3381 Brownberrie Lane

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation. This proposed allocation overlaps with 0.5ha of Wetstone Plantation LNA but most of this area of the site appears from aerial photographs to have already be degraded by tree clearance associated with an existing property. The boundary of the LNA should be formalised through permanent fencing to reduce unauthorised access and further erosion of woodland habitat, and a minimum 20 metre buffer from the edge of the existing wood/fence-line will be required on the northern and western boundaries - to be planted with native shrubs and small trees.	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1. We have a record of a couple of flood incidents within the site boundary. There is a minor watercourse / drain along the Northern boundary of the site.	

Utilities	
Gas	
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	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

N32 Greenbelt	29.88	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	70.12	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.33
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1023.73
Nearest bus stop	60
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	118.94

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 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

Part of the site is within Green Belt (30%). Part of the site is also a Local Nature Area (LNA) on the existing UDP. The remaining area is occupied by existing dwellings. This area alone would be too small to be allocated. Highway concerns regarding access - would need to be combined with site 3384.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - landscape. Minor negative - part greenfield/brownfield, ecology (mitigation) and natural resources (agricultural land). Minor positive - access to education and health facilities and flood risk.

Summary of reps

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. 882m from the core network. 6 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and secondary schools and healthcare

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Part of the site is within Green Belt (30%). Part of the site is also a Local Nature Area (LNA). The remaining area is occupied by existing dwellings. This area alone would be too small to be allocated. Highway concerns regarding access.

Site Details							
Easting	423578	Northing	439358	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Education	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Education	
Car Parks	

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Greenfield site off Brownberrie Lane, Horsforth. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with Leeds Trinity University located to the south.
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

## North Leeds

3384 Brownberrie Lane

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)

Good access to local services, poor Public Transport.

3

Access comments

Adequate frontage with main road.

5

Local network comments

Significant congestion issues in Horsforth.

2

Mitigation measures

Footway works required, network congestion works required, public transport improvements.

Total score

10

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

possible combined with 3381

Contingent on other sites

possible combined with 3381

#### Highways Agency

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

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

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

North Leeds

3384 Brownberrie Lane

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1. There is a minor drain and a short section of culvert 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
13/9/00208/MOD	Single storey extension to form annexe NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 13/01720/FU: Regularisation of plans following detailed design to alter single storey extension. Roof pitch to match existing roof's pitch, and to replace existing lobby roof with new upgraded roof.	M01	99
13/01720/FU	Single storey extension to form annexe	A	99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

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

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	870.32
Nearest bus stop	6001
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	57.41

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 type="checkbox"/>

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



Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site within urban area. Residential use acceptable in principle. Scope for road frontage development (capacity reduced to reflect this).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor positive - access to education and health and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Metro -Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. 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.727m from the core network. 6 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and seconday schools and healthcare.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site within urban area. Residential use acceptable in principle.

Site Details

Easting	425925	Northing	438198	Site area ha	1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Office

Neighbouring land uses

Wholesale distribution

Office

Unmanaged Forest

Other land uses - None

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

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

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

**North Leeds****3402 Clayton Wood Bank****Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence****SHLAA conclusions****Availability:** Short (early)**Suitability:** Unsuitable**Achievability:** Short (=<5yrs)**Summary of infrastructure provider comments****LCC Highways Comments**

Public transport accessibility comments

**Rank (1-5)**

Good accessibility all round

**5**

Access comments

Poor access arrangements onto ring road require mitigation, future development coming forward

**4**

Local network comments

Local congestion on ring road

**3**

Mitigation measures

Access works

**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 Knostrop

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

**Environment Agency**

Constraints

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

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1. Part of site susceptible to surface water flooding.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	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	100.00	% 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)	1774.48
Nearest bus stop	1628
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	127.06

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 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

Existing employment site, surrounded by other employment uses and Clayton Wood. Therefore considered inappropriate for residential.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - employment and economic growth. Significant positive - access to greenspace, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health and brownfield site.

Summary of reps

Anti - unsuitable to have housing in a commercial estate.

Statutory - '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). 239 from the core network. 8 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Existing employment site, surrounded by other employment uses and Clayton Wood. For these reasons the site is considered inappropriate for residential.

Site Details

Easting	427354	Northing	437552	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Unmanaged Forest
------------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Water Storage and Treatment
-----------------------------

Outdoor sport facility
------------------------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Greenfield site to the west of Weetwood Court. Water treatment works to the west, school playing fields to the south and housing to the north and east.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

## North Leeds

3457 Weetwood Manor

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)

Good accessibility all round

5

Access comments

No access onto Weetwood Lane

1

Local network comments

Local congestion on A660 and Headingley

3

Mitigation measures

Access improvements

Total score

9

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	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

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

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



North Leeds

3457 Weetwood Manor

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	
<p>This site adjoins the boundary of the Meanwood Conservation Area.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	

Natural England	

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% 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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1809.85
Nearest bus stop	10632
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	181.15

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 within existing urban area where residential use is acceptable in principle. Highway concerns regarding access.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - landscape. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Statutory - 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.  
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. 283m from the core network. 24 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and secondary schooling and healthcare.

English Heritage

This site adjoins the boundary of the Meanwood 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.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site within existing urban area where residential use is acceptable in principle. Highway concerns can be mitigated through access improvements.

Site Details

Easting	425587	Northing	439954	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Water Storage and Treatment

Education

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Greenfield site off Otley Old Road and Holtdale Approach, Holt Park. Housing to the north, Ralph Thoresby High School and associated car park to the east and Tinshill BT Tower to the south.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

## North Leeds

4000 Ralph Thoresby (Site F) Holt Park, Leeds

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

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Good accessibility all round

5

Access comments

Good frontages with adopted highway, possible problems with junction spacings with other accesses

4

Local network comments

Spare local capacity

5

Mitigation measures

footway works around frontages, access improvements

Total score

14

Highways site support

yes

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 Knostrop

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

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

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

North Leeds

4000 Ralph Thoresby (Site F) Holt Park, Leeds

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/04318/TWA	New Generation Transport routes		99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	99.99	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	99.99	
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	100.00	% 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 %	97.90
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1422.64
Nearest bus stop	5067
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	56.66

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input 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 designated as greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See greenspace section, page 36, question G19. No existing facilities or features on the site. Could have some potential for residential development. Adjacent a school and residential area.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site and agricultural land. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health, leisure and greenspace and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Pro - for flats or sheltered housing due to the size of the site. A community use only.

Anti -

Statutory - metro - 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. 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. 35m from the core network. 6 buses an hour. Accessible for primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Greenfield site within residential area. Suitable in principle for residential.



Site Details

Easting	434066	Northing	437666	Site area ha	1.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mix 60:40
-----------	-----------

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Dwellings
-----------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Outdoor sport facility
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

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

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

--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	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	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?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

## North Leeds

### 4013 Land at Elmete Lane, Roundhay

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

Relates poorly to settlement. Would have to be developed alongside larger adjacent site. Overlaps conservation area.

#### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

**Suitability:** LDF to determine

**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)

#### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

##### LCC Highways Comments

###### Public transport accessibility comments

Fails all accessibility standards

Rank (1-5)

1

###### Access comments

Elmete Lane not suited to intensification of use

1

###### Local network comments

Elmete Lane not suited to intensification of use

1

###### Mitigation measures

Total score

3

###### Highways site support

no

###### Contingent on other sites

access could be taken from adjacent site

###### Contingent on other sites

access could be taken from adjacent site

##### Highways Agency

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

##### Network Rail

##### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

##### Environment Agency

###### Constraints

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

North Leeds

4013 Land at Elmete Lane, Roundhay

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	
2063+4013+3315+1190= 1619 houses generates 405 primary and 162 secondary children. New 2FE primary school would be required.	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	This site lies within the Roundhay 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. # There is a Grade II Listed Building at Beechwood (to the south). 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 also need to be some assesment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the significance of these assets and what effect its loss and subsequent development might have upon their significance.

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

4013 Land at Elmete Lane, Roundhay

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

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

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3909.54
Nearest bus stop	11538
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	585.04

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. Residential property and associated land to west, and field to east. Would only allocate alongside site 3315. If 3315 was released for development, site 4013 would round off development. Significant Highway concerns regarding access, accessibility and local network constraints.

### Site affects others?

### Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site, greenhouse emissions, transport network, accessibility and agricultural land. Minor negative - access to education and health. Minor positive - access to greenspace, and flood risk.

### Summary of reps

pro - No clear justification is provided as to why sites with similar constraints have been assessed in different categories.

Cannot access rep 607  
Limited highway capacity

statutory - 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. 678 from the core network. 6 buses an hour. No access to primary or secondary schools or healthcare. ENGLISH HERITAGE - 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.

There is a Grade II Listed Building at Beechwood (to the south). 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 also need to be some assessment of what contribution this currently undeveloped area makes to the significance of these assets and what effect its loss and subsequent development might have upon their significance.

### Comments on phasing

### DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

### DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Local preference for sites to the east of Roundhay Park (1190, 1138, 3315A, 3315B, 4013, 2063) to remain undeveloped and for Wetherby Road to act as a natural buffer.

North Leeds

4013 Land at Elmete Lane, Roundhay

Site Details

Easting	425270	Northing	437681	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses
-------------------

Storage
---------

Office
--------

Car Parks
-----------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Managed Forest
----------------

Shops
-------

Other land uses - None

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

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

Brownfield site in urban area off Low Lane, Horsforth.

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	

## North Leeds

4021 Horsforth Mills, Low Lane, Horsforth

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

--

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Public transport, employment, health and education good

5

Access comments

Access at Low Lane / Butcher Hill junction require different arrangement to current mini roundabout - difficult to achieve without third party land

2

Local network comments

Local capacity issues

3

Mitigation measures

Access junction

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

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

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

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ3. See comments in main text of our response.



North Leeds

4021      Horsforth Mills, Low Lane, Horsforth

LCC

Ecology support

Not supported

Not supported (RED). No site-based designations but the Oil Mill Beck forms the south east boundary of this proposed allocation. This is an important wildlife corridor.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4021 in order to provide a minimum 20 metre buffer to the Oil Mill Beck. Mitigation will be required to protect and enhance the excluded 20 metre buffer to the Oil Mill Beck - including planting with native small trees and shrubs.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 3A. Oil Mill Beck runs along Eastern boundary.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

The bridge over Moseley Beck 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, redevelopment proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed

Natural England

Housing sites 4056, 4057, 235, 4021, 1062, 3014, 2049 are all within 2km of Leeds-Liverpool Canal SSSI. The cumulative effects of these allocations on the interest features of the SSSI should be examined.

Planning History    Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/01523/FU	Alterations and five storey extension to mill to form 84 flats with undercroft parking, one detached  3 and 2 storey block to form 5 flats, demolition of existing buildings, associated access, car parking and landscaping	A	97

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

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	0.01	
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	99.99	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1687.80
Nearest bus stop	7138
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	74.84

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site currently on the market with vacant possession. Site is in flood zone 3 (high risk). We are consulting the Environment Agency on all sites and their comments will be taken into consideration before making a final decision on allocations.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - ecology objection and flood risk. Minor negative - employment and economic growth. Significant positive - access to greenspace, greenhouse emissions and transport network. Minor positive - access to education and health and brownfield site.

Summary of reps

Pro - support subject to the retention of the mill building and conversion to flats.

Statutory - 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.  
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 the core network 60. 9 buses an hour. Site is accessible for primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

English Heritage  
The bridge over Moseley Beck 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, redevelopment proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site in residential area. Suitable in principle for housing.

North Leeds

4055      Former Police Station, Broadway, Horsforth

Site Details

Easting	423249	Northing	437651	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses
-------------------

General
---------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Office
--------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description
-------------

--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

## North Leeds

4055 Former Police Station, Broadway, Horsforth

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

Public transport, employment, health and education good

Rank (1-5)

5

##### Access comments

Access Ok, exit only onto Broadway as current arrangement.

4

##### Local network comments

Congested area of network, concerns with Horsforth Roundabout

3

##### Mitigation measures

Funding towards ring road works

Total score

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
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knothrop
-----------------	----------

Knothrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

#### Environment Agency

##### Constraints

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

#### LCC

Ecology support	Supported
-----------------	-----------

Supported

North Leeds

4055      Former Police Station, Broadway, Horsforth

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History      Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/05048/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 14, 15, 16 and 21 of Planning Application 13/02280/FU	SPL	100
14/00203/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 3 of Planning Application 13/02280/FU	A	100
13/02280/FU	Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 12 dwellings	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	100.00	% 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)	1894.30
Nearest bus stop	10970
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	60.88

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 would be suitable for residential development in principle. However could also come forward for employment/retail use as a result of proximity to centres.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - pollution. Minor negative - employment and economic growth. Significant positive - brownfield site, greenhouse emissions, flood risk and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health, leisure and greenspace and transport network.

Summary of reps

Statutory - Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network  
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.  
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. The site is 97m from the Core Network. The site has 8 buses an hour and is accessible for Primary, secondary schools and healthcare.

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



North Leeds

4056 Church Lane, Horsforth

Site Details

Easting	423658	Northing	438343	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
General	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Outdoor sport facility	
Education	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

## North Leeds

4056 Church Lane, Horsforth

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Public transport, employment, health and education good

5

Access comments

Existing access ok, sightlines could be improved within landscaping

5

Local network comments

Ok for level of development

5

Mitigation measures

Total score

15

Highways site support

Yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

#### Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

#### Environment Agency

Constraints
-------------

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

North Leeds

4056 Church Lane, Horsforth

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing sites 4056, 4057, 235, 4021, 1062, 3014, 2049 are all within 2km of Leeds-Liverpool Canal SSSI. The cumulative effects of these allocations on the interest features of the SSSI should be examined.

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	100.00
-----------------	--------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1103.03
Nearest bus stop	11415
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	175.09

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 would be suitable for residential development in principle. May also be appropriate for offices given proximity to Town Street and New Road Side.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant positive - access to greenspace, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health and brownfield site.

Summary of reps

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
162	4	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Required for education purposes. Not available for residential development.

Site Details

Easting	424259	Northing	437259	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mix 50:50
-----------	-----------

On-site land uses
-------------------

Vacant land
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description
-------------

Brownfield/greenfield site off Outwood Lane, Horsforth. The site is within a residential area. Former care home (now demolished).
---

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

## North Leeds

4057 St Joseph's, Outwood Lane, Horsforth

### SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

**Suitability:** Suitable

**Achievability:** Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Public transport, employment, health and education good

5

Access comments

Access achievable on to Outwood Lane

5

Local network comments

Ok for level of development

5

Mitigation measures

Total score

15

Highways site support

Yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

#### Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

#### LCC

Ecology support Supported

Supported

North Leeds

4057 St Joseph's, Outwood Lane, Horsforth

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing sites 4056, 4057, 235, 4021, 1062, 3014, 2049 are all within 2km of Leeds-Liverpool Canal SSSI. The cumulative effects of these allocations on the interest features of the SSSI should be examined.

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/03666/FU	Demolition of care home and erect replacement part 3, part 4, and part 5 storey care home, with 39 self contained flats, care rooms, chapel, lounges, dining area, activity rooms and function room, with car parking and landscaping	R	100
10/04924/FU	Replacement part 2, part 3, and part 4 storey care home, with 34 self contained flats, 39 dementia/respice/nursing care rooms, chapel, lounges, dining area, activity rooms and function room, with car parking and landscaping	R	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	
N32 Greenbelt	0.00
N34 PAS	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.00
N1 Greenspace	0.00
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>

% overlap

Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

% overlap

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

% overlap



Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00
-------------------	------

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1887.70
Nearest bus stop	10892
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	64.43

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

Residential use acceptable in principle. Previous applications on site.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant positive - greenfield site, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health, leisure and greenspace.

Summary of reps

Statutory - Metro - 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.  
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. Distnace to core network 34m. 6 buses an hour. Accessible to primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Former care home (now demolished) in residential area. Acceptable in principle for housing.

Site Details

Easting	427956	Northing	435385	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Headingley	

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: 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
10/02052/EXT	Extension of permission of application 26/564/04/FU for change of use involving part demolition and 2 1/2 storey extension to side to form 14 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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	214.98
Nearest bus stop	2787
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	32.55

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation  
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	427946	Northing	435342	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Headingley	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses
-------------------

Residential institution
-------------------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Places of worship
-------------------

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat and sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description
-------------

Brownfield/greenfield site off Cardigan Road and Newport Road, Headingley. The surrounding area is predominantly residential.
---

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (= <5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		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	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	100.00
-----------------	--------

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	170.88
Nearest bus stop	9252
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	49.17

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 type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Modern residential institution which could be redeveloped. Suitable in principle for residential.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Modern residential institution which could be redeveloped. Suitable in principle for residential.

North Leeds

4092 St Ann's Mills, Kirkstall Road

Site Details

Easting	426371	Northing	435217	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Kirkstall	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Shops

Transport tracks and ways

Unmanaged Forest

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	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	

## North Leeds

4092 St Ann's Mills, Kirkstall Road

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

--

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Good access to public transport, employment, health and primary education but not secondary education.

4

Access comments

Steeply sloping access road from Kirkstall Road, lined with mature trees and adoptable access difficult to achieve

3

Local network comments

ok for level of development

3

Mitigation measures

Total score

10

Highways site support

yes with adoptable access

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

#### Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knostrop
-----------------	----------

Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WWTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

#### Environment Agency

Constraints
-------------

FZ3a (ii) as shown on LCC SFRA - recommendation that no 'more vulnerable use' be permitted in FZ3a (ii) See comments in main text of our response.

LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (RED). Lies adjacent to the River Aire and Kirkstall Mill Goit, UK BAP priority habitats. The Otter Survey and Habitat Assessment of the River Aire (2008) found an otter lying up site in a "space formed by overhanging concrete of mill complex floor". This is one of the most significant features for otters on the River Aire in Leeds city centre. Features used by European protected species such as otter, for shelter are protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.	

Ecology boundary	
Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4092 in order to provide a minimum 20 metre buffer to the River Aire and 15 metre buffer to the Kirkstall Mill Goit. Mitigation will be required to protect and enhance the excluded 20 metre and 15 metre buffers to the River Aire and Kirkstall Mill Goit - including planting with native small trees and shrubs and measures to deter public access which would disturb otters, and to minimise light spillage onto River Aire and Goit. And retain the otter lying up site or provide alternative habitat under a Natural England, European Protected Species License. Note - works to the adjacent weir are proposed for a fish pass (led by the Aire Rivers Trust and supported by LCC) and there may be a requirement for a financial contribution towards this or the maintenance of this feature.	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 3A. Part of site in Rapid Innundation Area from River Aire	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% 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	99.99	
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	

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	55.60
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	748.19
Nearest bus stop	12126
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	113.98

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input 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

Current employment site that has been highlighted as necessary to retain.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - ecology objection and flood risk. Minor negative - employment, economic growth and pollution. Significant positive - access to greenspace. Minor positive - access to health and leisure, brownfield site, greenhouse emissions and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Statutory - Metro - 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 120m. 18 buses an hour, Accesible to primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Current employment site that has been highlighted as necessary to retain.

Site Details

Easting	424274	Northing	438010	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	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/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

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5)  
Public transport. employment, health and primary education good, secondary education distant 5

Access comments 5  
planning permission on the site 4 dwellings, 2 passing bays for Salmon Crescent

Local network comments 5  
ok for level of development

Mitigation measures Total score  
15

Highways site support  
yes with passing bays on Salmon Crescent

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

LCC

Ecology support Supported  
Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

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
13/00683/FU	2No. pairs of semi-detached dwellings with associated parking and landscaping	A	100
10/04752/LA	Outline application to layout access and erect residential development	A	100
12/01639/FU	Eight houses with associated parking and landscaping including demolition of community centre	R	100
13/05870/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18 and 19 of Planning Application 13/00683/FU	SPL	100
14/01703/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 10, 11, 12, 15 and 17 of Planning Application 13/00683/FU	SPL	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	
N32 Greenbelt	0.00
N34 PAS	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.00
N1 Greenspace	0.00
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

% overlap

% overlap

% overlap

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	100.00
-----------------	--------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1139.07
Nearest bus stop	529
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	162.34

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	434115	Northing	435705	Site area ha	7.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area, North Leeds				Ward	Gipton and Harehills	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Outdoor sport facility	
Allotment and city farm	
Neighbouring land uses	
Outdoor amenity and open space	
Outdoor sport facility	
Dwellings	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

## North Leeds

4094 South of Fearnville Place

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

Mostly meets criteria

Rank (1-5)

4

Access comments

Access options to Fearnville Road

4

Local network comments

Spare capacity in local network

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

12

Highways site support

yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

#### Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

Small amount of FZ2 & FZ3, Wyke Beck runs along boundary to site. See comments in main text of our response

LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (RED). No site based designations but this site lies across the centre of the Wyke Beck Valley, a very important wildlife corridor with strong local public support. The proposed allocation includes a section of the Wyke Beck and an area of lowland mixed deciduous woodland both UK BAP priority habitats, as well as an area scrub to the north west. The Wyke Beck is one of the most important sites in Leeds for Wwhite-clawed Crayfish, a UK protected species, with records adjacent to the proposed allocation as recently at 2009. The site also supports house sparrow and song thrush two Red List Birds of Conservation Concern. Bats will also use the corridor for feeding with 6 recorded roosts within 500m.	

Ecology boundary	
Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4094 in order to provide a minimum 100 metre buffer to the Wyke Beck wildlife corridor, and retain scrub habitat to the north-west together with a connecting area to be enhanced. Mitigation will be required to protect and enhance the excluded 100 metre buffer with the Wyke Beck and northern excluded areas - through consideration to controlled public access and habitat enhancements including ponds and planting small trees and shrubs.	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	
Some parts of the site adjacent to Wyke Beck are in flood zone 3A. Remainder of the site is in Flood Zone 1. There are a number of public sewers within the site boundary.	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	82.07	
N1A Allotments	17.41	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	99.48	
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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	100.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	100.00
-----------------	--------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2507.95
Nearest bus stop	3925
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	120.22

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

Designated greenspace (N1) and allotments (N1A) on the existing UDP. Even if some of this wider green space were necessary for housing this site is poorly situated and would encroach greatly into its corridor function. Site boundary includes stretch of Wyke beck itself. See also greenspace section, page 36, question G20.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - leisure and greenspace (loss of pitches), greenfield site and ecology objection. Minor negative - community cohesion (loss of pitches) and flood risk. Minor positive - access to health, greenhouse emissions and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Anti - use empty houses first. Part of the Wyke Beck Valley

Statutory - '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). 67m from the core network. 8 buses an hour. Site has access to Primary and secondary schools and healthcare.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Designated greenspace (N1) and allotments (N1A). Even if some of this wider green space were necessary for housing this site is poorly situated and would encroach greatly into its corridor function. Site boundary includes stretch of Wyke beck itself.

Site Details

Easting	427378	Northing	439843	Site area ha	4.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses
-------------------

Outdoor sport facility
------------------------

Outdoor amenity and open space
--------------------------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Outdoor sport facility
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

School
--------

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	No

Description
-------------

Flat site set in urban area, main use as playing pitch with more pitches adjacent to the south and some to north. Section on western side less well kept with more trees separated by a tree line through the centre of the site. No access, track on eastern side leads to road, set by a primary school.

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?	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 does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	Yes
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Performs well in green belt terms.

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)  
PT CS Standards partly met schools ok 3

Access comments  
Insufficient site frontage for suitable access 1

Local network comments  
Longcausway unsuitable, narrow, no footway to north, congestion issues at Chuchr Lane / A660 1

Mitigation measures Total score  
No 5

Highways site support  
No

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------------------------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works  
Owing to the size of this site we would expect a surface water management plan (utilising SuDS as the preferred option) to be drawn up for the whole area.

Environment Agency

Constraints  
FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation. Ordinary water course(running through centre of site)

LCC

Ecology support Supported with mitigation  
Supported with mitigation (Amber) - Broad-leaved woodland belt needs retaining. A north-south line of Lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP Priority Habitat cuts this site in half. Retain the woodland and enhance through the use of locally native trees throughout the housing scheme. Badger records nearby. Location of sett unknown.

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	54.58	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	3039.92
Nearest bus stop	13508
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	406.63

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 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 represent a finger incursion into green belt. Part of the site is currently used as playing pitches and is surrounded by other pitches, sports facilities and a school.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site straddles the urban green corridor and does not relate well to the settlement pattern. The site is designated N6 greenspace.

Site Details

Easting	425258	Northing	437960	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Restaurants and Cafes
-----------------------

Outdoor sport facility
------------------------

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description
-------------

An agricultural field with mature trees along the boundaries.Site is greenbelt and in the urban green corridor.
---

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?	
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?	
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

Isolated development within the greenbelt.

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)  
CS Standards met 5

Access comments  
Only possible to access directly from Ring Road which would need to be widened significantly to safely accommodate a right turn 1

Local network comments  
Ring Road congested at peak hours, queues likely to impact on access 1

Mitigation measures Total score  
Too significant for scale of development 7

Highways site support  
No

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------------------------------

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints  
Site in FZ3. See comments in our previous I&O consultation. Ordinary watercourse (Old mill beck) runs through the site. Active Landfill within 250m south of site.

LCC

Ecology support Not supported  
Red - Poor site due to impact on Old Mill Beck/Oil Mill Beck and associated wildlife habitat network. This proposed allocation includes a significant length of the Old Mill/Oil Mill Beck, adjacent woodland and a small area of locally valuable unmanaged grassland. This is part of the connecting habitat which contributes toward the wildlife habitat network along the beck jointing Hawksworth Wood and Clayton and Daffy Woods. Avoid



development within 20m of the top of the bank or on any land liable to flooding. Also avoid any lowland mixed deciduous woodland. In avoiding these key habitat features there will be little or no scope for building.

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	7.75	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.03	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.15
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1446.59
Nearest bus stop	13882
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	101.04

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input 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

Isolated development within the Green Belt. Resist.

Site affects others?

No.

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site within the urban green corridor. The site does not border onto housing and is somewhat detached from the main residential area. The site and surrounding fields provide an attractive gateway into Horsforth from the Ring Road.

Site Details

Easting	426515	Northing	438869	Site area ha	6.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Outdoor sport facility	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Outdoor amenity and open space	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description	Adjacent to lawnswood cemetery. Good tree lined boundaries. The rugby pitch to the north west of the site is on a high plateau to the remainder 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	

## North Leeds

4172 University Land, Lawnswood

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

### SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short ( $\leq 5$  yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

### Summary of infrastructure provider comments

#### LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Meets Standards

Rank (1-5)

5

Access comments

Existing access on to A660 unsuitable for development, direct access from Otley Old Road possible, subject to tree loss and NGT

5

Local network comments

A660 corridor congested, however NGT will provide alternative travel to city centre

4

Mitigation measures

Total score

14

Highways site support

Yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

#### Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required
--------	--------------------	----------------	--------------------------------------

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

#### Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation.

#### LCC

Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
-----------------	---------------------------

Supported with mitigation (Amber) - line of mature trees along the west boundary of the site is Lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP habitat. Retain and enhance with locally native scrub and woodland edge habitat. All boundaries of this site will be used for commuting and foraging bats (associated with adjacent cemetery) - and should be protected from artificial lighting.

North Leeds

4172 University Land, Lawnswood

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/04318/TWA	New Generation Transport routes		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	99.99	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	1.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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 %	0.07
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2111.31
Nearest bus stop	5774
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	152.22

Agricultural classification	Non-agricultural
-----------------------------	------------------

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

Deficiency in outdoor sports provision in the area. Playing pitches would need to be relocated. Possibility of cemetery extension into part of site and NGT route may affect part of site.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Deficiency in outdoor sports provision in the area. Playing pitches would need to be relocated. Possibility of cemetery extension into part of site and NGT route may affect part of site.



Site Details

Easting	432765	Northing	438324	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

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

## North Leeds

4177 Park Cottages, Leeds 8

### 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
12/01600/LI	Listed building application for alterations to existing cottages to form 5 dwellings and erection of garages to rear and associated landscaping	A	100

4177 Park Cottages, Leeds 8

12/03740/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3 and 4 of Planning Application 12/01600/LI	A	100
12/03704/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 23 of Planning Application 12/01599/FU	A	100
12/01599/FU	Alterations to existing cottages to form 5 dwellings and erection of garages to rear and associated landscaping	A	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	99.98	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	99.98	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	100.00
-----------------	--------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	5236.30
Nearest bus stop	11063
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	185.43

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation  
Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion  
Site with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details

Easting	428143	Northing	436156	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Headingley	

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 (= <5 yrs)Suitability: SuitableAchievability: 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 HistoryApplications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
12/01643/FU	Change of use from vacant music school (D1) to form house (C3)	A	76

12/02755/FU	Change of use of house to form six houses, alterations including two storey extensions and dormer window	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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	1008.12
Nearest bus stop	11305
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	201.84

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 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	427174	Northing	435424	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Kirkstall	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mix 60:40
-----------	-----------

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

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
12/03361/FU	Partial demolition of existing flats and outbuildings to create 7No. 1 bed and 6No. 2 bed flats (social rent)	A	98

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	548.47
Nearest bus stop	13065
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	145.26

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	428289	Northing	436228	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Headingley	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses
-------------------

Office
--------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description
-------------

Very attractive building which has undergone a number of extensions, in particular a new modern circular office block attached to the main building by a bridge link. Conversion of the main building would be the most appropriate form of development for the site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments		
Public transport accessibility comments		Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Standards		5
Access comments		
Narrow access, widening would be detrimental to trees/wall		2
Local network comments		
OK		4
Mitigation measures		Total score
Widen access, would only be suitable for low level of development		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, no mitigation required
n/a			

Network Rail	

Yorkshire Water	
Treatment Works	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	
FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation	

LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (Red) - the site includes areas of lowland mixed deciduous woodland a UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitat. Remove areas of mature trees from the proposal area.	
Ecology boundary	
Supported with mitigation (Amber) if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4184. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed. There is potential for roosting bats in trees and existing buildings on this site - undertake full bat surveys between May and September before submitting planning application.	

North Leeds

4184 Belmont House, Wood Lane, LS6

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/01804/FU	Change of use from office (B1) to use for educational purposes	A	61
11/00275/FU	Change of use from office (B1) to non residential institute (D1)	W	61
12/04955/FU	Change of use of office and three storey extensions to form six flats	A	98

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	1119.94
Nearest bus stop	8358
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	285.28

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 constrained site by virtue of the mature trees. The site is within the Conservation Area and the existing building is worthy of retention and conversion. In current use as offices and new office block to NE within site. As such, better to not allocate. Any development to be windfall.

Site affects others?

No

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	430738	Northing	438554	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

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 (= <5 yrs)                      Suitability: Suitable                      Achievability: Short (= <5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency			
Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail			

Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works			

Environment Agency			
Constraints			

LCC			
Ecology support			

Ecology boundary			

Education comments			

Flood Risk			

Utilities			
Gas			

Electric			

Fire and Rescue			

Telecoms			

Other			
English Heritage			

Natural England			

Planning History      Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/04075/FU	Change of use and alterations including 3 storey extension to vacant casino to 17 flats	W	100

12/01407/FU	Change of use and alterations including 2 storey extension to vacant casino to 13 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	1.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	4410.89
Nearest bus stop	7377
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	50.18

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  
Info  
additional storeys being added to existing blocks-- no details available

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	425624	Northing	440370	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Existing area of designated greenspace within the Holt Park housing estate providing amenity space and setting for the existing houses. Trees are dispersed across the site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Longterm (+11yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments		Rank (1-5)
Public transport accessibility comments		
Meets Standards		5
Access comments		5
Access achievable onto Holtdale Approach		
Local network comments		4
A660 corridor congested, however Bus and NGT will provide alternative travel to city centre		
Mitigation measures		Total score
No		
		14
Highways site support		
Yes		
Contingent on other sites		
Contingent on other sites		

Highways Agency			
Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail	

Yorkshire Water	
Treatment Works	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	
FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation	

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	

North Leeds

4215 Land between Holtdale Grove/Holtdale Ave

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	98.43	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	99.99	
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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	100.00
Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1720.63
Nearest bus stop	13140
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	64.12
Agricultural classification	Grade 3



Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site performs an amenity function and setting for nearby houses within the Holt Park housing estate and is designated N1 greenspace. Redevelopment for residential use is not supported.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site performs an amenity function and setting for nearby houses within the Holt Park housing estate. Redevelopment for residential use is not supported.

Site Details

Easting	425467	Northing	440315	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses
-------------------

Vacant building
-----------------

Vacant land
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Places of worship
-------------------

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat and sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description
-------------

Former public house and car park off Holtdale Approach, Holt Park. Trees along western boundary.
--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Medium (6-10yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Meets Standards	5

Access comments	
Utilise existing access onto Holtdale Approach	5

Local network comments	
A660 corridor congested, however Bus and NGT will provide alternative travel to city centre	4

Mitigation measures	Total score
No	14

Highways site support	
Yes	

Contingent on other sites	

Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	
FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation	

LCC

Ecology support	Not supported
Red - the western part of this site supports birch woodland which forms an important link in the habitat network down Otley Old Road and Holtdale Approach - avoid development of this woodland area and enhance with locally native scrub and ground flora planting. Also areas of substantial trees along northern and some of southern boundaries.	

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation (Amber) if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4216. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent woodland habitat are addressed - native shrub planting along western boundary with wooded area.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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 %	1.94
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1574.02
Nearest bus stop	13496
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	50.65

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Good brownfield site for housing subject to consideration of tree retention.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site in residential area. Suitable in principle for housing.

Site Details

Easting	425600	Northing	439807	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses
-------------------

Other
-------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Education
-----------

Dwellings
-----------

Post and Telecom
------------------

Outdoor amenity and open space
--------------------------------

Shops
-------

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description
-------------

Existing fire station with grassed area adjacent. Located within an area of mixed land uses (Ralph Thoresby School, telecom tower, shops and housing).

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: Medium (6-10yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Meets Standards	5

Access comments	
Access on to Otley Old Road as far from traffic signals as possible	5

Local network comments	
A660 corridor congested, however Bus and NGT will provide alternative travel to city centre	4

Mitigation measures	Total score
No	14

Highways site support
Yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints
FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.59	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.59	
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	100.00	% 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 %	0.78	

4217 Cookridge Fire Station

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1355.03
Nearest bus stop	11539
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	71.44

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input 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

In the event that the fire station closes it would be a suitable brownfield housing site and is identified for housing in the draft Planning Statement for Holt Park District Centre.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site in residential area. In the the event that the fire station closes it would be suitable for housing. It has been identified for housing in the draft Planning Statement for Holt Park District Centre.

Site Details							
Easting	426960	Northing	440129	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds, Outer North West				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Public House	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Agriculture	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description	
Lawnswood Arms site - currently in use. Consists of public house and car park. Set in main urban area with road frontage.	

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

North Leeds

4232      Lawnswood Arms, Holt Lane, Adel

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown                      Suitability: Suitable                      Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	
FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation	

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

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
12/04038/FU	Single-storey extension to pub/restaurant	A	95

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	1.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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)	2724.96
Nearest bus stop	6702
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	90.10

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input 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 in main urban area. Principle for residential development acceptable (not submitted by landowner so may not come forward).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Whilst this is a brownfield site, so could be considered suitable for residential use in principle, it is in existing use as a public house and the owners have not submitted the site (rather it was suggested by the public). As such, the site is not considered available.



Site Details

Easting	426130	Northing	439912	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Adel and Wharfedale	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses
-------------------

Car Parks
-----------

Terminals and Interchanges
----------------------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Outdoor amenity and open space
--------------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Residential institution
-------------------------

Shops
-------

Indoor sport facility
-----------------------

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Existing under-utilised car park serving the Holt Park District Centre. The site is arranged in terraced areas of parking interspersed with landscaping and trees. A bus stop is located on the western boundary of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)                      Suitability: Suitable                      Achievability: Short (= <5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5)

Meets Standards

5

Access comments  
Access from Farrar Lane

5

Local network comments  
A660 corridor congested, however Bus and NGT will provide alternative travel to city centre

4

Mitigation measures

Total score  
14

Highways site support  
Yes

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	
FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation	

North Leeds

4233 Farrar Lane, Adel

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	1.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.91
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1875.46
Nearest bus stop	2414
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	53.72

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

This brownfield site is suitable for housing and is identified for housing in the draft Planning Statement for Holt Park District Centre. Not all of the site should be developed for housing, an area will need to be retained for parking spaces to serve the district centre and adjoining greenspace. The existing bus stop should also be retained.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

This brownfield site is suitable for housing and is identified for housing in the draft Planning Statement for Holt Park District Centre. Not all of the site should be developed for housing, an area will need to be retained for parking spaces to serve the district centre and adjoining greenspace. The existing bus stop should also be retained. Capacity has been reduced to reflect this.

Site Details

Easting	422588	Northing	438139	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	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	No

Description

Greenfield site, current agricultural use. The site is well contained by trees on the north and west boundaries. Residential dwellings adjoin the site to the east and south. There is a road access from the existing estate near the south east corner, but this section of the site is not within the boundary of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?		No
Would development result in an isolated development?		No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?		Yes
Would development round off the settlement?		Partial
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?		No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?		No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?		Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area		No
Does the site provide access to the countryside		No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)		No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?		No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		No
Does the site contain buildings		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?	Yes
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Adjacent to urban area, links well to the settlement and is contained by residential development and trees around the edge of the site. Performs well in GB terms.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments		Rank (1-5)
Public transport accessibility comments		
Meets Accessibility Standards		4
Access comments		1
Water Lane not wide enough for access from A65, objection on this reason.		
Local network comments		3
A65 Corridor congested		
Mitigation measures		Total score
No		
		8
Highways site support		
No		
Contingent on other sites		
Contingent on other sites		

Highways Agency			
Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required

Network Rail	

Yorkshire Water	
Treatment Works	

Environment Agency	
Constraints	
FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation. Culvert just beyond western boundary	

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	
Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	0.01	% 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)	2088.34
Nearest bus stop	1144
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	208.04

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input 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. Strong links to settlement, well contained site reducing potential for urban sprawl. Access only possible through existing estate, road access doesn't link up to edge of site, would need to create an access before development would be acceptable.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site not supported by Highways.

Site Details

Easting	422440	Northing	437789	Site area ha	34.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses
-------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Dwellings
-----------

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
-------------

Large site with agricultural use, several fields many of which are tree lined. Two residential dwellings are situated along the northern boundary which also faces onto the main road. A public access runs through the centre of the site. Site slopes north to south, is well contained by roads (north / east / south), housing development (south) and trees (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?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging 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?	Yes
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Large site and will significantly reduce the green belt buffer in the area. Set close to urban area but separated by main roads. Well contained by roads and natural boundaries.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments		Rank (1-5)
Public transport accessibility comments		
Meets Accessibility Standards		5
Access comments		4
Access to site from widened A65		
Local network comments		3
A65 / Ring Road congestion concern would require substantial works to Ring Road / A65 junction and widening of A65 along site frontage to provide right turning and public transport improvement		
Mitigation measures		Total score
Yes, major works to A65 and junction with Ring Road		
		12
Highways site support		
Yes with mitigation		
Contingent on other sites		
4255, 4246		
Contingent on other sites		
4255, 4246		

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 eastern edge of site & culvert running through north west corner	

LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
Red - there is an area of rough semi-improved grassland near the cemetery which should be excluded to strengthen the wildlife corridor provided by the Gill Beck (to the immediate west). There is also a significant tree belt and semi-improved grassland area that runs north-south along Barr Lane	

4240 South of A65 from Horsforth & Rawdon RA to crematorium

that should be excluded - and used to become part of the POS and walkway/cycleway rather than access road (which would put pressure on trees along its length). The eastern portion contains a beck and valuable hedgerows with mature trees that should be retained as part of the POS and managed to retain ecological features.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation (Amber) if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4240. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed. Appropriate ecologically sensitive design and mitigation will be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed and internal features retained and enhanced. The Gill Beck lies to the west of this proposed allocation. The proposed allocation also includes a good network of hedgerows and standard trees. The layout of the site should be designed to retain these where possible within a network of public open space across the site. Barn owl has been recently recorded feeding over these fields and there is a bat roost in the farm to the immediate south. Provide a network of hedgerows and species rich grassland within development of the site. Check any existing buildings on or adjacent to the proposed allocation for bat and barn owl roosts.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
------------	----------	----------	-----------

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

4240 South of A65 from Horsforth & Rawdon RA to crematorium

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	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)	2397.37
Nearest bus stop	10201
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	245.77
Agricultural classification	Grade 3
Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Large site would result in significant expansion to the area. The site is well contained by roads, trees and other development reducing potential for further sprawl. However, would reduce green belt gap in area and result in development on the other side of the ring road, breaching strong defensible boundary.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is well contained by roads, trees and other development reducing potential for further sprawl. Development will allow infrastructure improvements including highway improvements and the provision of a new school.

Site Details

Easting	422885	Northing	438196	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses
-------------------

Vacant land
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	No

Description
-------------

Unused land set in urban area, site is surrounded on all sides by residential development. No possible access.
--

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: Unknown                      Suitability: Suitable                      Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Meets Accessibility Standards	5
Access comments	
Access would require demolition of a property as no road frontage	4
Local network comments	
A65/ Ring Road congestion, but small site	4
Mitigation measures	Total score
Acquisition of property for access	13
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 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

North Leeds

4244 West End Lane, Horsforth

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	
----------	--

Fire and Rescue	
-----------------	--

Telecoms	
----------	--

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	
-----------------	--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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)	1802.58
Nearest bus stop	10201
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	391.28
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

Unused land set in urban area. Development not possible as there is no access to the site.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Landlocked site requiring the purchase and demolition of a neighbouring property to achieve access. The Council is not aware of a property being available.

Site Details

Easting	422016	Northing	437741	Site area ha	1.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Aireborough, North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses
-------------------

Vacant land
-------------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Manufacturing and Wholesale
-----------------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Dwellings
-----------

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description
-------------

Brownfield site with previous industrial use. Has planning permission for warehouse. Road frontage to south, some dwellings to the north and further industrial units to south east.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown                      Suitability: Suitable                      Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments		Rank (1-5)
Public transport accessibility comments		
Poor on accessibility but difficult to resist given Clariant history		2
Access comments		
Access onto Low Hall Road OK		5
Local network comments		
Junction with Ring Road/Calverley Lane congested, shared with Clariant, Ring Road congestion		3
Mitigation measures		Total score
		10
Highways site support		
Yes with mitigation		
Contingent on other sites		
4240, 4255, better to route traffic through 4240		
Contingent on other sites		
4240, 4255, better to route traffic through 4240		

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 (Gill Beck) running within western boundary of site

LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
Red - The Gill Beck and adjacent lowland mixed deciduous woodland both UK BAP priority habitats form part of this site. The former mill site has been demolished, but the function of the wildlife corridor will be threatened unless it can be made wider. A stand off of a minimum of 20m from the eastern side of the Gill Beck is appropriate, together with retention of existing woodland and scrub towards the north of this proposed allocation.	

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation (Amber) if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4246. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent woodland and beckside habitat are addressed. Otter, a European protected species has recently been recorded using the Gill Beck. There are also records of common pipistrelle bats roosting in the adjacent mill and noctule and Myotis bats feeding in the area -these are European protected species. Plant eastern and northern boundary with locally native woodland and scrub species - to restore to lowland mixed deciduous woodland. Minimise light pollution to the woodland edge bat feeding habitat.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Mostly Flood Zone 1 but Gill Beck runs through the site so a FRA is needed to establish the flood extents of this. A sequential approach should be taken to ensure development remain within FZ 1. There are surface water flood routes through the site which 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
11/03414/FU	Warehouse and ancillary office building; small industrial units; external yard areas and car parking	A	81

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2781.68
Nearest bus stop	1144
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	562.25

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>



Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Cleared brownfield site. Has planning permission for warehouse / ancillary office. Part of wider Clariant redevelopment. Not in the green belt.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Cleared brownfield site next to the Clariant redevelopment. If site 4240 were to come forward (as proposed) the site would be further connected to housing. Although the site has permission for warehouse/ancillary offices this has not been implemented. Not in the Green Belt.

Site Details							
Easting	423523	Northing	439035	Site area ha	3.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Outdoor sport facility	
Neighbouring land uses	
Outdoor sport facility	
Education	
Agriculture	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description	
Current use as outdoor sport facility, pitch with floodlights.	

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?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	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?	Yes
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Site is well connected to settlement, fairly well contained. Limited harm to green belt 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)
Poor	1
Access comments	
Access via Lee Lane West, junction with West End Lane very substandard	1
Local network comments	
Poor junctions with Brownberry Lane, accident record.	1
Mitigation measures	Total score
If access can be gained through Trinity University, the site would be more acceptable	3
Highways site support	
yes with mitigation, access through LTU	
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	

North Leeds

4247 Northern End of Lee Lane West

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Site is clear of mains

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
11/03874/FU	Digging up of existing playing pitch and laying out of replacement rubber crumb 3G pitch with drainage system, 3m - 5m high perimeter fence and eight 15m high floodlighting columns to university campus (amendment to approval 10/03662/FU)	A	98
10/03662/FU	Digging up of existing playing pitch and laying out of replacement rubber crumb 3G pitch with drainage system, 3m - 5m high perimeter fence and eight 15m high floodlighting columns to university campus	A	98

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

4247 Northern End of Lee Lane West

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	23.74	
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	0.04	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas	
Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.02
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	904.08
Nearest bus stop	6001
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	286.22

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 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 adjoins urban area and is well contained, limited impact on green belt. Part of site N6 (protected playing pitch) designation, majority of site is a new outdoor pitch and unsuitable for development. Poor access to site.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Majority of site is a new outdoor pitch and unsuitable for development. Poor access to site.

North Leeds

4255 Calverley Lane, Horsforth

Site Details

Easting	422698	Northing	437405	Site area ha	3.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topography	Sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Greenfield site with agricultural use. Surrounded by trees but with a road frontage to the north. Ring Road set to the east behind further trees. Small number of dwellings set 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?	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	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	No
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	Yes
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Well contained site which reduces potential for sprawl. However, Ring Road acts as a strong defensible boundary and provides clear separation between the site and built up area.

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		
Meets Accessibility Standards		5
Access comments		1
No direct access to Ring Road		
Local network comments		3
A65 / Ring Road congestion concern would require substantial works to Ring Road / A65 junction and widening of A65 along site frontage to provide right turning and public transport improvement		
Mitigation measures		Total score
		9
Highways site support		
No -not on its own		
Contingent on other sites		
4240		
Contingent on other sites		
4240		

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	Not supported
Red - A beck and lowland mixed deciduous woodland (including Swaine Wood - an area of semi-natural ancient woodland) run up the western side of this proposed allocation. There are also significant hedgerows within the site which link the woodland ares to neighbouring woodland adjacent to the outer ring-road. These are all UK BAP priority habitats. Buffer the beck and woodland by a minimum 15m and plant with locally native	



woodland species and include an area of wildflower meadow - as part of informal POS with a mown path along west, south and east boundaries (this will help offset inevitable loss of internal hedgerows and entrances for access roads). Retain the hedgerows within public open space where possible. Use additional locally native scrub and hedgerow planting within the development.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation (Amber) if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4255. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent woodland and hedgerows within the site are addressed - see comments on left.

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	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2444.97
Nearest bus stop	3819
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	325.41

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Set to the west of the Ring Road, which provides a clear separation between site and main urban area. Well contained site, natural boundaries created by lines of trees. Unsuitable to be developed on its own, could be considered alongside 4240, this would be a very large strategic development.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Concern regarding overdevelopment in the area if the site were to come forward alongside 1339 and 4240. The site is not locally preferable compared to other sites.

Site Details

Easting	422836	Northing	437270	Site area ha	7.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Horsforth	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mix 50:50
-----------	-----------

On-site land uses
-------------------

Other
-------

Neighbouring land uses
------------------------

Agriculture
-------------

Other
-------

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat and sloping	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description
-------------

College site. Education. Located in the Green Belt. UDP policy - redevelopment of the site is acceptable. Adjacent to Cemetery.
---

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes

Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl
--------------------------------	--

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes

Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements
------------------------	---------------------------

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	No
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No

Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment
-------------------------	---

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	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

Site is well contained by the ring road to the north west and woodland to the south. Site together with 1202 would round off the settlement and would not lead to unrestricted sprawl due to the road and woodland previously mentioned.
--

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)
Part PT meets health & Sec Ed, not primary	3
Access comments	
As a stnd alongs site, access would be via Calverley Lane onto the A65, concern raised with the increase in peak hour traffic, junction would need to be considered alongside scheme to signalise Horsforth Roundabout	3
Local network comments	
A65 congestion, concern with effect on signalisation scheme	3
Mitigation measures	Total score
traffic management within residential area, improved junction with Calverley Lane	9
Highways site support	
Yes with mitigation	
Contingent on other sites	
combine with 1202 to give second access option via Victoria Cres	
Contingent on other sites	
combine with 1202 to give second access option via Victoria Cres	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required
n/a			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	
FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation	

LCC

Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (Red) - This site lies within the River Aire corridor of land which bring biodiversity into the heart of Leeds and forms part of the Leeds Habitat Network. Swaine Wood lies along the southern boundary of thhis proposed allocation -it is a semi-natural ancient woodland with excellent bluebell cover. As well as the ancient woodland this proposed site also has lowland mixed deciduous woodland, hedgerows, native scrub, semi-improved acid grassland (that is being positively managed by the Park Lane College Conservation Department) and a pond most of which are UK BAP Priority Habitats. Remove the southern part of the proposed allocation - some of which may be available for public open space provided that funding is made available for contuing positive habitat management. The scrub and grassland is likely to support UK BAP bird species.	

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation (Amber) if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/5009. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed - through positive management of grassland and scrub as a nature area.

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	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	2.21
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2450.96
Nearest bus stop	3819
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	341.45

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
-----------------------------	---------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site together with 1202 would not lead to unrestricted sprawl.

Site affects others?

no

Sustainability summary

To complete - comments from ecology and highways/accessibility to be provided.

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. A significant portion of the site is brownfield (former Leeds City College buildings). The redevelopment of the College buildings for housing is acceptable under current policy. The site is well contained by the Ring Road, Swaine Wood and Horsforth Cemetery.



Site Details

Easting	428536	Northing	435761	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Headingley	

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
13/01027/FU	Change of use from student halls of residence to 39 self contained flats for student accommodation	A	100

5102	Headingley Halls Of Residence 54 - 56 Headingley Lane, Headingley, Leeds, LS6 2BP		
13/01028/LI	Listed Building application to carry out alterations to student halls of residence to form 39 self contained flats for student accommodation	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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	863.15
Nearest bus stop	11147
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	74.89

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 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

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	431604	Northing	439527	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Alwoodley	

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

## North Leeds

**5106**      **Former Squirrel Way Children's Home, Squirrel Way, Leeds, LS17 8fq**

## 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

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

13/02970/FU	Demolition of existing childrens home buildings and erection of part 3 and part 4 storey building, comprising 60 flats with communal facilities to provide extra care facilities/complex
-------------	--

**A**

100

5106      Former Squirrel Way Children's Home, Squirrel Way, Leeds, LS17 8fq

for the elderly			
14/00627/ADV	Two signs and three flagpoles	A	100
13/05140/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 5, 7, 15, 22 and 23 of Planning Application 13/02970/FU	A	100
13/05639/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 19 of Planning Application 13/02970/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	66.75	
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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.90
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	5712.97
Nearest bus stop	1362
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	49.78

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



## North Leeds

5112 Stratford Court, School Lane, Chapel Allerton

### Site Details

Easting	430398	Northing	436949	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Chapel Allerton	

### Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

### Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

#### 1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

#### 2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

#### 3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

#### 4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

**Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence**

--

## SHLAA conclusions

**Availability:**

**Suitability:**

**Achievability:**

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

## Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

## Environment Agency

Constraints	

## LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

## Utilities

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
13/04605/FU	Demolish sheltered housing premises and stone boundary wall in a Conservation Area		100

5112      Stratford Court, School Lane, Chapel Allerton

13/04606/FU	Demolition of existing building and erection of part 3 and part 4 storey block of 28 residential units for residents over the age of 55	A	100
13/00789/CA	Conservation Area Application to demolish building	W	100
14/00277/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23 and 24 of Planning Application 13/04606/FU	A	100
13/00148/FU	Demolition of existing building and erection of 3 storey block of 30 No. flats for residents over the age of 55	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	1.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.98
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	3062.22
Nearest bus stop	4899
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	108.21

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	424971	Northing	437630	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	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	

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
09/00348/FU	Change of use of former care home to 5 two bedroom flats and 2 one bedroom flats	A	100

12/01053/COND	Consent, agreement, or approval required by conditions 2, 3 and 4 of Planning Application 09/00348/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	100.00	% 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)	1606.26
Nearest bus stop	8011
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	229.16

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

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	431005	Northing	440440	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Alwoodley	

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
12/01100/FU	Three storey block of 6 flats with garages at lower ground level including demolition of existing house	A	70

5138 505 HARROGATE ROAD LS17

13/02600/FU	Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of approval 12/01100/FU for MINOR MATERIAL AMENDMENT to raise height of building and provision of full basement car park	A	70
14/9/00081/MOD	Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of approval 12/01100/FU for MINOR MATERIAL AMENDMENT to raise height of building and provision of full basement car park NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 13/02600/FU: Amendment to height of railings to bay balconies.	M01	70
10/04855/FU	Demolition of existing house and erection of 4 three storey semi-detached houses with attached garages	A	70

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	100.00	% 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 %	0.05
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	6109.93
Nearest bus stop	9071
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	122.30

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"/>

North Leeds

5138	505 HARROGATE ROAD LS17
------	-------------------------

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	427778	Northing	435064	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Kirkstall	

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
10/02325/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 7, 8 and 10 of Planning Application 06/00922/FU	A	100

HLA24048 83 Cardigan Lane LS4

10/02172/EXT	Extension of time for planning application 06/00922/FU for 4 storey block of 4 one bedroom flats and 18 studio flats	R	100
10/03131/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 12 of Planning Application 06/00922/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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	166.41
Nearest bus stop	489
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	249.81

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>



Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

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	426806	Northing	435437	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Kirkstall	

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
10/04879/EXT	Extension of time period for planning permission 07/03002/FU Part 3 and part 4 storey block comprising 16 two bed flats and 1 studio flat with 19 car parking spaces	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	100.00	% 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	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	390.52
Nearest bus stop	6677
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	38.18

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	427760	Northing	436069	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Headingley	

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
14/04918/FU	Retrospective application for use of garage block as a House in Multiple Occupation; alterations including formation of parking area and amenity space	R	57

11/00335/FU	One block of 4 garages to rear of flats	A	98
-------------	---	---	----

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	902.40
Nearest bus stop	10871
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	128.55

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>



Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation  
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	427769	Northing	435687	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Headingley	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--	--	--	--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works			
-----------------	--	--	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support	
-----------------	--

Ecology boundary

--	--	--	--

Education comments

--	--	--	--

Flood Risk

--	--	--	--

Utilities

Gas			

Electric

--	--	--	--

Fire and Rescue

--	--	--	--

Telecoms

--	--	--	--

Other

English Heritage			

Natural England

--	--	--	--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/00708/FU	Three storey block of 39 studio apartments and 2 two bedroom apartments, with ground floor office and 6 car parking spaces	R	100

12/01481/FU	Part three, part four storey block of 41 studio flats with ancillary office space, landscaping and car parking	A	100
10/00779/EXT	Extension of time of planning application 06/02738/FU for 3 and 4 storey block of 3, 5 and 6 bed apartments (47 beds in 11 clusters) with 14 car parking spaces	A	100
12/04515/FU	Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of approval 12/01481/FU for replacement of 10 parking spaces with 3 studio flats and communal areas; removal of condition 10 (retention of unallocated parking spaces)	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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	526.20
Nearest bus stop	491
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	131.80
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input 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	428510	Northing	436070	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Headingley	

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
13/01441/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 3 of Planning Application 11/02909/RM		100

HLA26033 1 North Grange Mount LS6

10/00926/EXT	Extension of time for planning application no. 06/07155/FU (change of use and alterations involving extensions to each side of dwelling to form 11 flats)	A	100
12/9/00104/MOD	Outline application for 2 detached houses to garden to either side of existing house NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to : Re-positioning of unit 1 2m closer to rear boundary	M01	100
13/00400/EXT	Extension of time period for planning permission 10/00926/EXT change of use and alterations involving extensions to each side of dwelling to form 11 flats	A	100
11/02909/RM	Two detached houses with garages to garden to either side of existing 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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	1081.29
Nearest bus stop	11147
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	378.74

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"/>



North Leeds

HLA26033 1 North Grange Mount LS6

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	427889	Northing	436163	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Headingley	

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
13/00062/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 11 of Planning Application 26/112/04/FU	A	100

10/01889/ADV	Retrospective application for 1 temporary non illuminated banner sign	R	86
--------------	---	---	----

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	100.00	% 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 %	2.34
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	985.82
Nearest bus stop	6672
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	42.29

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

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	427745	Northing	436539	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Weetwood	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/05063/FU	Change of use of former doctors surgery to form 7 flats including external alterations	A	100



HLA26039 8 Holly Bank, Otley Road, Headingley, Leeds, LS6 4DJ

14/00239/FU	Change of use and alterations of basement to form 1No. additional flat with lightwells to front	A	100
13/02296/FU	Change of use and alterations of basement layout to form additional one bedroom flat with lightwells to front and detached outbuilding to rear	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	100.00	% 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	Headingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1180.61
Nearest bus stop	1517
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	47.13

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	424204	Northing	438686	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	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	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/05044/FU	Change of use of 76, 80, 82 and 84 Long Row to form single house including lower ground floor and single storey extensions; single storey extension to stables at Hopwood	A	99

	House, alterations to boundary treatment and access; erection of observatory to garden		
11/05058/CA	Conservation Area Application for the demolition of outbuildings and extensions	A	97

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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)	502.24
Nearest bus stop	11301
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	29.28

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	424269	Northing	437172	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	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	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Suitability: Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--	--	--	--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works			
-----------------	--	--	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support			

Ecology boundary

--	--	--	--

Education comments

--	--	--	--

Flood Risk

--	--	--	--

Utilities

Gas			

Electric

--	--	--	--

Fire and Rescue

--	--	--	--

Telecoms

--	--	--	--

Other

English Heritage			

Natural England

--	--	--	--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/9/00159/MOD	Change of use involving alterations of house to form 6 flats and 2 houses NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 09/03303/FU : Annexe building to be revised from 2 houses	M01	100



	into one single 4 bedroom dwelling with access via Newlay Wood Crescent.		
09/03303/FU	Change of use involving alterations of house to form 6 flats and 2 houses.	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	100.00	% 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)	1973.46
Nearest bus stop	10892
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	23.22

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

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	423245	Northing	437471	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	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	

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

## North Leeds

### HLA27014 Low Fold Garage, New Road Side, Horsforth, Leeds

#### 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
10/01805/EXT	Extension of time period for planning application 07/00133/OT renewal of outline application 27/288/03/RE for residential redevelopment	<b>W</b>	100

10/05406/OT	Outline application for two semi-detached houses and three townhouses with car parking and garages to site of coach depot	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	100.00	% 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 %	13.16
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Horsforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2040.69
Nearest bus stop	10405
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	60.74

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

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	432144	Northing	438440	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

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	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	5352.80
Nearest bus stop	1876
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	351.06

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	430773	Northing	438995	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

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
10/02866/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3 and 5 of Planning Application 08/06633/FU	A	100

HLA30026 468 Harrogate Road LS17

10/02155/FU	1.8m high boundary fence and automated entrance gates to front of flats	A	100
11/01810/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 10 of Planning Application 08/06633/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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	4777.58
Nearest bus stop	10757
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	32.52

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary	

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	

North Leeds

HLA30026 467 Street Lane, Roundhay, Leeds

Site Details

Easting	430837	Northing	438582	Site area ha	0	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Moortown	

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
10/03743/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of Planning Application 10/02001/FU	SPL	100



HLA30026 467 Street Lane, Roundhay, Leeds

10/02001/FU	Retrospective application for change of use of dwelling and external alterations to form 6 one bedroom flats including rear dormer window	A	100
11/02668/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4 and 6 of Planning Application 10/02001/FU	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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	4496.55
Nearest bus stop	5041
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	37.55

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	

North Leeds

HLA34026 321 Chapeltown Road, Chapeltown, Leeds, LS7 3LL

Site Details

Easting	430863	Northing	436408	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Chapel Allerton	

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

North Leeds

HLA34026 321 Chapeltown Road, Chapeltown, Leeds, LS7 3LL

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Suitability: Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

Constraints	

LCC

Ecology support	

Ecology boundary

--

Education comments

--

Flood Risk

--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--

Fire and Rescue

--

Telecoms

--

Other

English Heritage	

Natural England

--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/00430/FU	Change of use of former care home to form 6 flats	A	98

11/04934/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4 and 6 of Planning Application 11/00430/FU	A	98
---------------	---	---	----

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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 %	0.58
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	3207.81
Nearest bus stop	13868
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	43.46

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	424483	Northing	438110	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	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	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--	--	--	--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works			
-----------------	--	--	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support	
-----------------	--

Ecology boundary

--	--	--	--

Education comments

--	--	--	--

Flood Risk

--	--	--	--

Utilities

Gas			

Electric

--	--	--	--

Fire and Rescue

--	--	--	--

Telecoms

--	--	--	--

Other

English Heritage			

Natural England

--	--	--	--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/9/00076/MOD	Erection of 5 three bedroom terrace houses NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 09/04591/FU: Alteration to dormers on front elevation	M01	100



09/04591/FU	Erection of 5 three bedroom terrace houses	R	100
11/9/00102/MOD	Erection of 5 three bedroom terrace houses NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 09/04591/FU, Change of rooflights on plots 4 and 5 to dormers	M01	100
12/00102/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4 and 5 of Planning Application 09/04591/FU	A	100
11/02790/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 7 and 9 of Planning Application 09/04591/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	100.00	% 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)	1031.81
Nearest bus stop	5936
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	23.85

Agricultural classification	Urban
-----------------------------	-------

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input 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	432538	Northing	438437	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Roundhay	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
-----------	------------

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description	
-------------	--

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs)	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

SHLAA conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail

--	--	--	--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works			
-----------------	--	--	--

Environment Agency

Constraints	
-------------	--

LCC

Ecology support			

Ecology boundary

--	--	--	--

Education comments

--	--	--	--

Flood Risk

--	--	--	--

Utilities

Gas	

Electric

--	--	--	--

Fire and Rescue

--	--	--	--

Telecoms

--	--	--	--

Other

English Heritage			

Natural England

--	--	--	--

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/00754/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12 of Planning Application 11/01968/EXT	INT	100

North Leeds

HLA34026 3 Park Crescent, Roundhay, Leeds

13/01623/FU	Installation of detached 5 air condenser units with enclosure to flats	A	93
11/02022/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 7, 8, 10 and 11 of Planning Application 07/06331/FU		100
10/9/00125/MOD	Alterations and 4 storey extension to 7 existing flats to form 8 two bedroom flatsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: To combine flats internally to create 5 flats instead of 8 by joining flat 2 with flood 3, flat 5 with flat 6 and flat 7 with flat 8.	M01	100
14/00525/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12 of Planning Application 11/01968/EXT		100
11/01968/EXT	Extension of Time of application of 07/06331/FU for change of use and extension to form 5 apartments	A	100
12/04868/FU	Variation to Condition 4 of previous approval 11/01968/EXT to vary window materials from timber to UPVC to the rear and side elevations	A	100
12/02635/FU	Variation to Condition 4 of previous approval 11/01968/EXT to vary windows and doors materials from timber to UPVC	W	100
12/04233/FU	Variation to Condition 4 of previous approval 11/01968/EXT to vary windows and doors materials from timber to UPVC		100
12/9/00124/MOD	Extension of Time of application of 07/06331/FU for change of use and extension to form 5 apartments NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 11/01968/EXT: Roof amendment	M01	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	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	5472.79
Nearest bus stop	11063
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	205.72
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

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	427952	Northing	436041	Site area ha	0	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Headingley	

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
13/02735/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3 and 4 of Planning Application 10/00255/FU	A	100

10/00255/FU	2 storey building comprising 4 two bedroom and 1 one bedroom flats, with car parking	R	100
-------------	--	---	-----

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	1.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	865.52
Nearest bus stop	13284
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	111.58

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	430856	Northing	436376	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	North Leeds				Ward	Chapel Allerton	

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
10/01045/FU	Detached three storey block of 5 two bedroom flats	A	100

11/02231/FU	Temporary detached single storey prefabricated private office building to vacant land	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	100.00	% 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	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	3188.99
Nearest bus stop	13868
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	15.48

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	