

Site Details

Easting	434233	Northing	434154	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Killingbeck and Seacroft	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
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

The site is situated off York Road and surrounded by Killingbeck Bridge, Diadem Drive. The Leeds York/Selby railway embankment runs adjacent to the site along the Southern boundary. Diadem Drive is a cul-de-sac of existing semi-detached properties. The York Road Highways flats complex, currently undergoing 4m renovation, sits opposite the site on the other side of Killingbeck Bridge. The site was formerly a Leeds City Council depot for the Highways Department. All the buildings have been demolished and the site is currently vacant with large areas of hard-standing which is overgrown by self-seeding plants and shrubs.

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

4 buses per hour. Good accessibility to primary and secondary education and health Services.

Rank (1-5)

5

Access comments

access achievable

5

Local network comments

Possible spare capacity at the moment, but some concerns over the cumulative impact.

4

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

Wyke Beck Culvert capacity and other 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 with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildlife corridor of the Wyke Beck Valley. Retain a minimum 20 metre corridor from the Wyke Beck. Beck supports White-clawed Crayfish and Water Voles.

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
14/03958/OT	Outline application for residential development to former depot site		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	100.00	
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)	2071.45
Nearest bus stop	2463
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	105.87

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed 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

Vacant brownfield site. Suitable in principle for residential development.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

minor negative - ecology. Significant positive - access to green space, brownfield site, flood risk and emissions, transport network and local needs met locally based on highways accessibility assessment. Minor positive - access to education, health, culture and leisure. Housing, community participation.

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development

Statutory

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. (Metro)

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

A cleared and vacant brownfield site in the Main Urban Area. Planning application pending (submitted July 2014).

Site Details

Easting	436990	Northing	434625	Site area ha	4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

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

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/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
12/01998/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 6, 7, 10, 11 and 12 of Planning Application 11/02315/RM		85

East Leeds

281 Manston Lane - Radial Park (Ph 1)

11/02808/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 16 of Planning Application 08/03440/OT		85
13/00582/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3 and 4 of Planning Application 11/02315/RM		85
12/9/00062/MOD	Reserved Matters Application for 129 houses and 19 flats NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 11/02315/RM: Minor amendments to plans and elevations for flat block B only	M01	85
11/02315/RM	Reserved Matters Application for 129 houses and 19 flats	A	85
12/01996/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 6, 7, 8, 16, 19, 20, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 33 of Planning Application 08/03440/OT		85
13/04915/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 27 of Planning Application 08/03440/OT		85
12/9/00012/MOD	Reserved Matters Application for 129 houses and 19 flats NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 11/02315/RM: Plots 11 & 12 house types switched to improve site entrance	M01	85
14/9/00041/MOD	Reserved Matters Application for 129 houses and 19 flats NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 11/02315/RM: Amended roof pitch and alterations to window detailing and porch elements to plots 38 to 41, 48, 49.	M01	85
11/02731/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 21 and 22 of Planning Application 08/03440/OT	A	85
11/03016/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of Planning Application 08/03440/OT		85
13/00581/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 of Planning Application 08/03440/OT		85

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 %	0.46
Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	728.33
Nearest bus stop	6286
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	88.14

281 Manston Lane - Radial Park (Ph 1)

Agricultural classification	Grade 3
Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

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	437201	Northing	434878	Site area ha	6.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Dwellings

Outdoor sport facility

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Former Optare bus fitting site, plus vacant cable manufacturer to east to the east of Cross Gates Centre. Existing residential estates to the West and North, the latter separated by playing fields to north. To east is more industrial/commercial development and to the south the Former Vickers 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	

East Leeds

282 Manston Lane

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

Has Planning Permission subject to S106

Rank (1-5)

5

Access comments

Has Planning Permission subject to S106

5

Local network comments

Has Planning Permission subject to S106 but require opening of Manston Lane Link Road to be fully built out

5

Mitigation measures

Junction Improvement at Station Road signals. Manston Lane Link Road needs to be built before site is fully developed.

Total score

15

Highways site support

yes with mitigation - has planning permission subject to S106 and Manston Lane Link Road

Contingent on other sites

no - However, several sites likely to require construction of Manston Lane Link Road

Contingent on other sites

no - However, several sites likely to require construction of Manston Lane Link Road

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

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

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop

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

Environment Agency

Constraints

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

East Leeds

282 Manston Lane

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	East Leeds Extension – 7000 houses plus sites 2062, 3119, 282, 1297, 2086, 2039 generates 1,750 primary and 700 secondary children. Already in discussions with planners and developers re. new primary and secondary school provision.
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
13/00234/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19 and 22 of Planning Application 08/00298/OT	A	100
13/00288/RM	Reserved matters application for 177 houses, one block of 9 apartments and one block 6 apartments including associated landscaping	A	100
14/01421/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 9 of Planning Application 08/00298/OT	A	100
13/01587/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 4 of Planning Application 08/00298/OT	A	100

Spatial relationships

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

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

Main Urban Area	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 %	0.08
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1013.36
Nearest bus stop	5367
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	131.59

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed 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. Planning permission granted for residential development 14/11/2012 (application no. 08/00298/OT).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - Pollution (Air quality management area or HSE zone). Minor negative - loss of employment site and agricultural land. Significant positive - Flood risk. Emissions, transport network and local needs met locally based on Highways accessibility assessment. Minor positive - Access to leisure and green space. Housing, community participation and an occupied brownfield site.

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development

Statutory

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. (Metro)

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	437763	Northing	433588	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Garforth and Swillington	

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
12/00646/FU	Laying out of access road and erection of 11 detached houses	A	100

353 Barrowby Lane (30-34), Austhorpe LS15 8QE

11/01963/EXT	Extension of Time for application 08/01087/FU for demolition of 3 bungalows, laying out of access road and erection of 11 houses	A	100
13/00993/FU	Variation of condition no. 13 of permission 12/00646/FU to allow surface water discharge proposal to an alternate location	A	100
12/03541/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 9, 10 and 18 of Planning Application 12/00646/FU	A	100
14/02078/FU	Substitution of housetypes to Plots 2, 5, 6 and 10 of previously approved scheme 12/00646/FU to include single storey rear extension to rear of currently approved house types	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)	1709.55
Nearest bus stop	2129
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	169.10

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 checked="" 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"/>

353 Barrowby Lane (30-34), Austhorpe LS15 8QE

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	434546	Northing	438507	Site area ha	14.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

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: 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 primary education only	1
Access comments	
Access on to Redhall Lane	5
Local network comments	
Congestion on A58, junction with Redhall Lane and further afield	3
Mitigation measures	Total score
	9
Highways site support	
No	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required
Assessment of cumulative impact with other sites needed			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

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

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	

Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	
----------	--

Fire and Rescue	
-----------------	--

Telecoms	
----------	--

Other	
English Heritage	

Natural England	
-----------------	--

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	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 %	99.68	
Nearest train station	Cross Gates	
Nearest train station distance (m)	4417.38	
Nearest bus stop	5012	
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	288.40	
Agricultural classification	Grade 3	

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps
Road infrastructure not good enough to cope with increase in traffic.

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	436311	Northing	437258	Site area ha	17.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

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

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Partially meets bus and employment (80%) partial primary health and education (30%)

3

Access comments

Agreed junction on A64

5

Local network comments

5

Mitigation measures

Access works

Total score

13

Highways site support

Already approved and under construction.

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

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

Assessment of cumulative impact with other sites needed

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

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

LCC

Ecology support | Not supported

Not supported (Red) - This site includes some areas of species rich semi-improved grassland. There are also hedgerows and lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority habitats. Retain areas of more species rich grassland to the south and east as well as woodland and hedgerows. Enhance as part of the development of the remainder of the site. Site already has planning permission.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/796. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats 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
12/03402/FU	Erection of 372 dwellings	A	92
14/9/00141/MOD	Erection of 372 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 12/03402/FU: Velux window to rear of Morley Housetype all winster housetypes changed to the new version.		92
14/01562/FU	Substitution of 31 plots to provide 28 dwellings, repositioning of substation	A	92
13/04932/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 22, 32 and 33 of Planning Application 12/03402/FU		92
09/03238/OT	Outline Application to layout access road and erect circa 500 dwellings, with ancillary retail and community facilities	R	92
14/01013/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 28 and 31 of Planning Application 12/03402/FU		92
14/00719/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 32, 33 of Planning Application 12/03402/FU		92

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 %	3.24
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2811.56
Nearest bus stop	11987
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	363.78

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development
Road infrastructure is not good enough to cope with an increase in traffic.

Statutory

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

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

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Short (= <5yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

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

3

Access comments

Local network comments

Mitigation measures

Total score

Highways site support

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact Major impact

Network Status

Likely to require significant physical mitigation

Assessment of cumulative impact with other sites needed

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

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

Environment Agency

Constraints

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

LCC

Ecology support

Not supported

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

Ecology boundary

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

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

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

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

For Development

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

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

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

The LLAF

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

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

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

Against Development

Members wish to register strong concerns with site 797.

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

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

Statutory

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

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

Site Details

Easting	436884	Northing	436198	Site area ha	4.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<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
10/04596/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 20 and 21 of Planning Application 32/446/03/OT		100

09/9/00069/MOD	Laying out of car parking areas and landscaping to housing estateNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Re-routing of the health trail due to development sites	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 %	4.05
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1851.78
Nearest bus stop	2786
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	173.67

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	436789	Northing	436389	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

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

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/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

East Leeds

802 Swarcliffe Avenue - PFI E LS14

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
10/04596/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 20 and 21 of Planning Application 32/446/03/OT		100

802 Swarcliffe Avenue - PFI E LS14

13/05377/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17 and 19 of Planning Application 13/01672/FU	A	64
13/01672/FU	17 houses with landscaping and car parking	A	64
09/9/00069/MOD	Laying out of car parking areas and landscaping to housing estateNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Re-routing of the health trail due to development sites		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 %	99.99
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2006.61
Nearest bus stop	7631
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	63.54

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed 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	436452	Northing	435790	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

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

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/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
09/9/00069/MOD	Laying out of car parking areas and landscaping to housing estateNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Re-routing of the health trail due to development sites		100

10/04596/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 20 and 21 of Planning Application 32/446/03/OT	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 %	3.10
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1353.54
Nearest bus stop	10565
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	127.25

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 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

East Leeds

804 Mill Green Garth - PFI L1 LS14

Site Details

Easting	436052	Northing	435990	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<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
09/9/00069/MOD	Laying out of car parking areas and landscaping to housing estate NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Re-routing of the health trail due to development sites		100

10/04596/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 20 and 21 of Planning Application 32/446/03/OT	100
---------------	--	-----

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	13.88	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping 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 %	0.96
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1561.21
Nearest bus stop	13255
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	102.12

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	434885	Northing	438358	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Other	
Dwellings	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Outdoor amenity and open space	
Other land uses	
Garden Centre	

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

Description	
Garden Centre and carpark currently in 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

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
n/a			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

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

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/05078/FU	Demolition of buildings, laying out of access road and erect 20 houses, with landscaping	A	99
11/01777/OT	Outline application for residential development	W	100
12/03754/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 and 24 of Planning Application 11/05078/FU	A	99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	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)	4154.42
Nearest bus stop	5154
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	101.01

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

Planning permission granted for residential development 20 units 17/08/2012 (11/05078/FU).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negatives - Access to leisure and green space. Significant positive - Flood risk. Minor positive - Housing and an occupied brownfield site.

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development

Statutory
The site falls 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. (Metro)

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

East Leeds

1076 **Leeds Valley Park (phases 3/4), Savannah Way, Leeds Valley Park LS10**

Site Details

Easting	432491	Northing	429551	Site area ha	23.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds, Outer South				Ward	City and Hunslet	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

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

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early)

Suitability: Unsuitable

Achievability: Uncertain

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

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

4

Access comments

Adequate existing access provision

4

Local network comments

spare capacity in local network

4

Mitigation measures

Pedestian linkages across the motorway

Total score

12

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact Material Impact Network Status No objection subject to satisfactory mitigation

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of city centre / Aire Valley cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Knostrop Low Level

Water main within estate road

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC

Ecology support Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

East Leeds

1076 Leeds Valley Park (phases 3/4), Savannah Way, Leeds Valley Park LS10

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	2.52	
CC Shopping 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	100.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	2.93
Nearest train station	Woodlesford
Nearest train station distance (m)	4355.48
Nearest bus stop	5691
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	113.89
Agricultural classification	Grade 3

1076

Leeds Valley Park (phases 3/4), Savannah Way, Leeds Valley Park LS10

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 checked="" 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
Aire Valley Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Employment site. Refer to emerging Aire Valley Action Plan.

Site Details

Easting	431961	Northing	431920	Site area ha	28.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Burmantofts and Richmond Hill	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Mineral works and quarries

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Mineral works and quarries

Other land uses - None

Topography	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially 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	

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

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

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

Environment Agency

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

LCC

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

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas	
-----	--

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

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

Natural England

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

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	100.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.01
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	2600.71
Nearest bus stop	7699
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	297.25
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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary	

Site affects others?	

Sustainability summary	

Summary of reps	

Comments on phasing	

DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley allocation	

DPP Allocation Conclusion	

Site Details

Easting	433649	Northing	430882	Site area ha	44	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Burmantofts and Richmond Hill	

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: Unsuitable Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments	Rank (1-5)
Public transport accessibility comments	
as currently served fails all standards. The size of the site and linkage with other employment allocations offers the potential for new Public Transport and other local services - SEE AIRE VALLEY TRANSPORT STRATEGY	2
Access comments	
Access is via the unadopted Skelton Moor Road and river bridge. This is likely to require a new river bridge. There is no route to the ELLR which would be required for a future PT link.	2
Local network comments	
Local congestion issues on Pontefract Road	3
Mitigation measures	Total score
New bridge, upgrade of Skelton Grange Road, PT link to ELLR	7
Highways site support	
yes with mitigation (all dwellings must be within 400m of bus stop meeting CS standards plus provision of local services) - SEE AIRE VALLEY AAP TRANSPORT STRATEGY	
Contingent on other sites	
PT link and improvement to local services would require developing out of adjacent sites	
Contingent on other sites	
PT link and improvement to local services would require developing out of adjacent sites	

Highways Agency			
Impact	Major Impact	Network Status	Likely to require significant physical mitigation
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of city centre/Aire valley cluster			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water
Treatment Works

Environment Agency
Constraints

LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but a range of valuable post-industrial habitats and protected bird species. The location immediately adjacent to the River Aire and Aire/Calder Navigation provides a valuable wildlife corridor function.	
Ecology boundary	
Needs assessment against Local Wildlife Sites criteria.	
Education comments	

East Leeds

1084 Skelton Grange Road (former power station) LS10

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	2.18	
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	100.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Woodlesford
Nearest train station distance (m)	3649.89
Nearest bus stop	12774
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	951.44
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Aire Valley Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Refer to emerging Aire Valley Action Plan.

Site Details

Easting	433165	Northing	430617	Site area ha	38.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	City and Hunslet	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

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

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5)
as currently served fails all standards. The size of the site and linkage with other employment allocations offers the potential for new Public Transport and other local services - SEE AIRE VALLEY TRANSPORT STRATEGY 2

Access comments
Vehicular access availbale from Pontefract Rd - likely to require signalised junction 4

Local network comments
Haigh Park Rd unadopted. Local congestion issues on Pontefract Road 3

Mitigation measures Total score
Signalised access, upgrade of Haigh park rd, new Pt services 9

Highways site support
yes with mitigation (all dwellings must be within 400m of bus stop meeting CS standards plus provision of local services) - SEE AIRE VALLEY AAP TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Contingent on other sites
PT link and improvement to local services would require developing out of adjacent sites

Contingent on other sites
PT link and improvement to local services would require developing out of adjacent sites

Highways Agency

Impact	Major Impact	Network Status	Likely to require significant physical mitigation
--------	--------------	----------------	---

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of city centre/Aire valley cluster

Network Rail

General asset protection issues

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

LCC

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

Not supported (RED). Includes Stourton Works Lagoon LNA and canalside and pond habitats. Otters, bats and birds to consider.

Ecology boundary
Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/ 1091. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed i.e. minimum 10 metre buffer alongside canal enhanced for wild

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	2.65	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping 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	100.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Woodlesford
Nearest train station distance (m)	3966.89
Nearest bus stop	9532
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	455.34

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Aire Valley Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
Refer to emerging Aire Valley Action Plan.

Site Details

Easting	438359	Northing	435808	Site area ha	377.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Office

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Substantial greenfield site to the east of the main urban area of Leeds. Site abuts the East Leeds Extension housing allocation to the west and Scholes to the east.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	Marginal effect on the setting & special character, could be mitigated against through appropriate detailed design

East Leeds

1094A Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane (between)

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

Large site which would merge Scholes with the urban area. Mid section of site is well connected to the settlement, however, peripheral sections in north and south could lead to further sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) is an extremely large site that has very limited coverage of Public Transport and local services

Rank (1-5)

1

Access comments

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) has long frontages with adopted highway however numerous access points would be required for a site so large. Access to large parts of the site does not appear possible. This site would be on the outside of the East Leeds Extension/East Leeds Orbital Road. The East Leeds Orbital Road is envisaged to provide the boundary to the edge of the City. This

2

Local network comments

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - The local network, even with the East Leeds Orbital Road in place is unlikely to be adequate. The size of the site and linkage with other allocations offers the potential for new public transport and other local services

1

Mitigation measures

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - Mitigation would be required but not achievable

Total score

4

Highways site support

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - No

Contingent on other sites

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - no, however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to improved local services and Public Transport. A reduced site boundary, but combined with adjacent but amended sites maybe acceptable.

Contingent on other sites

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - no, however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to improved local services and Public Transport. A reduced site boundary, but combined with adjacent but amended sites maybe acceptable.

Highways Agency

Impact

Network Status

Likely to require significant physical mitigation. Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Knostrop

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

Environment Agency

Constraints

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

East Leeds

1094A Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane (between)

LCC

Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Site is too large to make useful comments. Shape file is 377ha.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.99	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3591.15
Nearest bus stop	4987
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	305.11

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

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

Conclusions**Issues and Options Summary**

Site 1094 has been split into two as part B is not connected to A. If site A is developed the site would link Scholes with the boundary of the allocated East Leeds extension effectively merging Scholes with the main urban area, contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belt, to prevent the coalescence of settlements. Significant highway concerns relating to access, impact on local network and relationship to the proposed East Leeds Orbital Route.

Site affects others?**Sustainability summary**

Significant negative - Access to green space. greefield site, ecology. Emissions and local needs met locally based on highways accessibility assessment. High grade agricultural land, ecology and pollution. Minor negatives - Access to education, health and leisure. Community participation and cohesion and transport network based on highways accessibility assessment. Landscape and local distinctiveness. Minor positive - flood risk.

Summary of reps**For Development**

Housing supply deliverable within 5 years as land available now.

Some smaller parts of site suitable for residential development once the route of the East Leeds Orbital Road is fixed.

Part of the 1094A site (between Skeltons Lane and York Road and north of Bramley Grange Farm) does have potential for housing and should be colour coded amber.

The contribution which this site makes towards the housing requirement is significant.

It would seem inevitable that this site will be developed in its entirety following suitable highway infrastructure development and the construction of East Leeds Orbital Road.

the development of smaller parcels of this land would be wholly suitable as additional development which would adjoin the UDP East Leeds Extension area.

Against Development

EVERY EFFORT MUST BE MADE TO ENSURE THAT THERE IS A GREEN BELT SEPERATING VILLAGES OF THORNER AND SCHOLES

The village of Scholes and its identity would be lost.

Development of this site would join Scholes to the rest of the Leeds and remove its status as a separate village.

Significant encroachment on Green Belt.

Statutory

The site falls outside 400m of the current core bus network.

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

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

Comments on phasing**DPP Allocation**

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Very large Green Belt site. Development of the site would not be acceptable in Green Belt terms as it would result in significant sprawl, coalescence of the urban conurbation of Leeds with Scholes and fail to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Significant highway concerns relating to access, impact on local network and relationship to the proposed East Leeds Orbital Route.

Site Details

Easting	437889	Northing	435118	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds, Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Places of worship

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Flat, half scrubland half grassed field. Between a beck on the northern boundary and residential to the south, with no direct road access.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	
Character Conclusion	Significant effect on the setting and special character of historic features

East Leeds

1094B Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane (between)

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

Site 1094B is situated between a beck on the northern boundary and residential development on the southern boundary. The site has no direct road access.

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)
Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) is an extremely large site that has very limited coverage of Public Transport and local services	1
Access comments	
Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) has long frontages with adopted highway however numerous access points would be required for a site so large. Access to large parts of the site does not appear possible. This site would be on the outside of the East Leeds Extension/East Leeds Orbital Road. The East Leeds Orbital Road is envisaged to provide the boundary to the edge of the City. This	2
Local network comments	
Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - The local network, even with the East Leeds Orbital Road in place is unlikely to be adequate. The size of the site and linkage with other allocations offers the potential for new public transport and other local services	1
Mitigation measures	Total score
Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - Mitigation would be required but not acheivable	4
Highways site support	
Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - No	
Contingent on other sites	
Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - no, however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to improved local services and Public Transport. A reduced site boundary, but combined with adjacent but amended sites maybe acceptable.	
Contingent on other sites	
Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - no, however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to improved local services and Public Transport. A reduced site boundary, but combined with adjacent but amended sites maybe acceptable.	

Highways Agency	
Impact	Network Status
Likely to require significant physical mitigation. Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.	

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water
Treatment Works

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

LCC
Ecology support

East Leeds

1094B Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane (between)

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.	1.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.02	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

1094B Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane (between)

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2501.95
Nearest bus stop	11925
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	275.79

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 type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps 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 1094B is situated between a beck on the northern boundary and residential development on the southern boundary. The site has no direct road access.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - Greefield site, ecology. Emissions and local needs met locally based on highways accessibility assessment. Ecology, pollution and high grade agricultural land. Minor negatives - Access to education, health and leisure. Community participation and transport network based on highways accessibility assessment. Minor positive - flood risk.

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development
the village of Scholes and its identity would be lost

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

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site 1094B is situated between a beck on the northern boundary and residential development on the southern boundary. The site has no direct road access.

Site Details

Easting	435542	Northing	430907	Site area ha	74.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Garforth and Swillington	

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

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
14/00247/EXT	Extension of time of planning permission 32/369/01/FU (carrying out of engineering operations and laying out of access roads and landscaping)	A	56

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.26	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	1.36	
CC Shopping 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	99.74	% 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	99.96	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.17
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Woodlesford
Nearest train station distance (m)	2232.50
Nearest bus stop	245
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	1407.90

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary	

Site affects others?	

Sustainability summary	

Summary of reps	

Comments on phasing	

DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley allocation	

DPP Allocation Conclusion	

Site Details

Easting	435472	Northing	430461	Site area ha	28.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Garforth and Swillington	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Agriculture
Managed Forest

Neighbouring land uses

Other
Agriculture
Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses

Landfill (Operational)

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

Description

The site sits in the Green Belt to the south of an existing UDP allocation, now proposed for housing through the Aire Valley AAP. The boundary of 1295B is formed by the River Aire to the south and Pontefract Lane and the Skelton Grange landfill site to the east. Most of the site has been opencasted, filled and restored to agricultural use. Skelton Lake, also created as part of the restoration of the site, is an attractive landmark which lies within the south west part of the area. The area around the lake and other parts of the area along north bank of the River Aire in the south of the area is mainly semi-natural grassland. The area lies in an attractive green setting between the Temple Newsam estate to the north of the motorway and the River Aire corridor to the south. Both Temple Newsam and the land to the south of the river, including Rothwell Country Park, rise steeply above the area framing the setting of the area.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

Development would represent rounding off to the urban area. The canal to the south and neighbouring sites to the east and west would ensure that low risk for potential for future unrestricted sprawl.

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)
as currently served fails all standards. The size of the site and linkage with other employment allocations offers the potential for new Public Transport and other local services - SEE AIRE VALLEY TRANSPORT STRATEGY	2

Access comments	
Requires adjacent sites to be developed to gain access	1

Local network comments	
Capacity exists on the ELLR. Potential issues at Jct 45 when all Aire Valley built out	4

Mitigation measures	Total score
Likely to require significant physical mitigation on SRN & dependent on improved PT and local services	7

Highways site support	
No	

Contingent on other sites	
Requires adjacent sites to be developed to support access	

Contingent on other sites	
Requires adjacent sites to be developed to support access	

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	

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.	

East Leeds

1295B M1 (land to the east of) , LS9

Environment Agency	
Constraints	
FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.	
LCC	
Ecology support	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Site 1295B – 620 houses generates 155 primary and 62 secondary children. Expansion of nearby primary schools e.g. Woodlesford, Swillington will be required.	
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	Core Strategy
------------------	---------------

1295B M1 (land to the east of) , LS9

N32 Greenbelt	99.04	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	0.96	% 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	99.97	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Woodlesford
Nearest train station distance (m)	1932.23
Nearest bus stop	793
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	1502.79

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site on edge of the Main Urban Area. Development of the site would represent a rounding off to the urban area (subject to existing development site 1295a (see AVL AAP) being developed for residential). The canal to the south and neighbouring sites to the east and west would ensure a low risk for potential future unrestricted sprawl. The site would need to share services, such as a primary school, health and local shopping with the adjacent site and wouldn't be sustainable as a stand alone site. The site adjoins sensitive natural habitats along the River Aire corridor and includes areas of mature woodland, which would require mitigation. The site is also located on a plateau which has been formed by deposited materials and will necessitate ground investigations.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site, ecology, flood risk, landscape. Minor negative - Access to education and health. Community participation on the basis of access to existing services and community cohesion because of the scale of the site. Negative scores were also registered for the transport network and local needs met locally on the basis of highways assessment. Local distinctiveness also scored as a minor negative for the scale being out of character with the settlement. Minor positive - housing.

Summary of reps

For Development

The most appropriate site in Garforth and Swillington ward is the south west corner of the ward bounded by the M1, river and Bullerthorpe Lane incorporating 1295A, 1295B, 1830, 1137 and surrounding fields that dont appear to have a site number

Against Development

There are environmental issues and concerns as to how the resulting traffic would impact an already over-capacity network at peak times.

Statutory

The site falls outside 400m of the current core bus network.

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

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site on edge of the Main Urban Area. Development of the site would represent a rounding off to the urban area (subject to development of site 1295A being developed for residential; see AVL AAP). The canal to the south and neighbouring sites to the east and west would ensure a low risk of future unrestricted sprawl. The site would need to share services, such as a primary school, health and local shopping with 1295A and would not be sustainable as a stand alone site. The site adjoins sensitive natural habitats along the River Aire corridor and includes areas of mature woodland, which would require mitigation. The site is also located on a plateau which has been formed by deposited materials and will necessitate ground investigations.

Site Details

Easting	434190	Northing	431040	Site area ha	113.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Burmantofts and Richmond Hill	

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

as currently served fails all standards. The size of the site and linkage with other employment allocations offers the potential for new Public Transport and other local services - SEE AIRE VALLEY TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Good vehicular access can be achieved from the ELLR, but the opportunity for more than one access point is limited

4

Local network comments

Capacity exists on the ELLR. Potential issues at Jct 45 when all Aire Valley built out

4

Mitigation measures

Likely to require significant physical mitigation on SRN & dependent on improved PT and local services

Total score

10

Highways site support

yes with mitigation (all dwellings must be within 400m of bus stop meeting CS standards plus provision of local services) - SEE AIRE VALLEY AAP TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Contingent on other sites

requires development in ELLR corridor to facilitate PT and other local services

Contingent on other sites

requires development in ELLR corridor to facilitate PT and other local services

Highways Agency

Impact Major impact Network Status Likely to require significant physical mitigation

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of city centre/Aire Valley cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

LCC

Ecology support Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the Wyke Beck wildlife corridor. Retain a 40 metre corridor along the Wyke Beck. Lapwing, Kingfisher, Otter and White-clawed Crayfish to be considered. Other habitats to be enhanced in line with Aire Valley GI provision, and linkages north of Pontefract Lane.

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
14/03751/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 16, 21, 27, 33 and 37 of Planning Application 10/05048/EXT	A	76
10/05048/EXT	Extension of time for Outline planning application 21/199/05/OT to allow submission of Reserved Matters until 2023 (to erect warehouse and distribution development with car parking and landscaping)	A	76

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	12.52	
CC Shopping 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	100.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

1296 Pontefract Lane (land adjacent to) ,Cross Green LS9

LCC ownership %	2.35
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Woodlesford
Nearest train station distance (m)	3282.41
Nearest bus stop	926
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	1384.54

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation
Aire Valley Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion
See Aire Valley AAP.

Site Details

Easting	437469	Northing	434558	Site area ha	21.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Barnbow is within the Main urban area located east of Crossgates Town Centre in an area predominantly residential (Crossgates, Austhorpe, Manstons and Penda's Fields). The site is bounded to the north by Manston Lane, to the east by open space and a small number of dwellings/farm buildings, to the south by the Leeds-York railway line and to the west by the L-shaped part of Barnbow. Immediately opposite (north) is existing commercial/ industrial area, which includes a number of manufacturing companies. The Site is largely flat, with a slight rise in ground levels to the north, adjacent to Manston Lane. Most of the Site is covered by a number of large industrial buildings, with the main former Vickers tank factory building being the most prominent and large areas of hardstanding with grassed and wooded areas along the northern boundary and areas of trees and scrub to the south and west. The eastern part of the site is occupied by the Barnbow Sports and Social Club with associated pavilion and sports pitches used by Leeds Lions Football Club.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (early)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Planning permission pending, large site western portion meets Core Strategy standards but significant part of site does not. Opening of Manston Lane Link Road is likely to improve accessibility. Frontage may require new/improved footways or cycleways.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Adequate frontage. Ghost Island required

4

Local network comments

Local issues of rat running and congestion in town centre. Construction of wider Manston Lane Link Road/East Leeds Orbital Road would provide mitigation. Possible works to J46.

3

Mitigation measures

Ghost Island reqd. For access. Manston Lane Link Road /East Leeds Orbital Road required to resolve traffic impacts. Possible works to J46.

Total score

10

Highways site support

yes - Manston Lane Link Road/East Leeds Orbital Road. Possible works to J46.

Contingent on other sites

no - However, several sites likely to require and contribute to construction of Maston Lane Link Road/East Leeds Orbital Road

Contingent on other sites

no - However, several sites likely to require and contribute to construction of Maston Lane Link Road/East Leeds Orbital Road

Highways Agency

Impact	Minimal material impact	Network Status	No objection subject to satisfactory mitigation
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.			

Network Rail

Level crossings including one just east of site; General asset protection issues; width of Austhorpe Lane bridge Very long term four tracking

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.	

East Leeds

1297 Manston Lane - former Vickers Tank Factory Site, Cross Gates

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 wildlife corridor function adjacent to the railway line. Retain a minimum 20 metres buffer along the railway line. Great Crested Newts to be considered, recorded on-site.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

East Leeds Extension – 7000 houses plus sites 2062, 3119, 282, 1297, 2086, 2039 generates 1,750 primary and 700 secondary children. Already in discussions with planners and developers re. new primary and secondary school provision.

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Housing site 1297 includes an area of deciduous woodland BAP habitat. If retained this habitat should be conserved and enhanced.

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/04999/OT	Outline application for residential (C3), employment (B1c), health centre (D1), foodstore (A1), ancillary uses (A1/A2/A3/A4), community building (A4/D2), associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure		92
14/02521/FU	Site remediation works (including prior extraction of coal, demolition of existing buildings, removal of hard standing, mine shafts and other below ground structures and re-instatement of ground)		91
14/02514/OT	Hybrid application for outline application for up to 385 dwellings, retail development, associated site access, landscaping and site works with full details provided for an additional 100 dwellings including site access, public open space and landscaping		91

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 %	0.99
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1190.69
Nearest bus stop	11579
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	167.10

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 checked="" 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

Former Vickers Factory. Outline application for residential (C3), employment (B1c), health centre (D1), foodstore (A1), ancillary uses (A1/A2/A3/A4), community building (A4/D2), associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure. Application pending (09/04999/OT). Development of the full site is subject to the implementation of the Manston Lane Link Road.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - loss of employment use, ecology and transport network (based on highways assessment). Significant positive - flood risk.
Minor positive - housing, access to green space and occupied brownfield site.

Summary of reps

For development
Short term development - ASAP
No negative effects whatsoever.

Against Development

The site should not be allowed to be developed until a rail halt is built on the adjacent rail line. Especially at Thorpe Park

Statutory

This site falls outside 400m of the current core bus network.

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

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site in the Main Urban Area (site of Former Vickers Factory). Developer interest expressed through planning application for residential use with associated community facilities and ancillary uses (pending decision subject to prior extraction of coal and the implementation of the Manston Lane Link Road).

Site Details

Easting	433091	Northing	429190	Site area ha	3.2	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	East Leeds, Outer South				Ward	Rothwell	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Mix 50:50
-----------	-----------

On-site land uses

Agriculture
Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture
Dwellings
Wholesale distribution

Other land uses

Garden Centre on part of site

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

Description

Mixed brown/greenfield site to the north west of Rothwell. The site includes a garden centre to west and field to east. The site is well connected to residential area and fronts onto Wood Lane.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

Green Belt site. Mixed brown and greenfield site in Rothwell. The site relates well to the settlement being essentially an infill site between existing development and would not set a precedent 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)
4 buses per hour, Most of the site (70%) has access to primary education & employment 4

Access comments
Access ok from Wood Lane 5

Local network comments
cumulative issues 3

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

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works Lemonroyd
Water mains along road frontage

Environment Agency

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

LCC

Ecology support Supported
Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	99.88	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %

0.00

1359 Wood Lane - Rothwell Garden Centre LS26

Nearest train station	Woodlesford
Nearest train station distance (m)	3731.73
Nearest bus stop	8739
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	99.10

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input checked="" 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. Mixed brown and greenfield site in Rothwell. The site relates well to the settlement being essentially an infill site between existing development and would not set a precedent for sprawl. Only part of the site is in Outer South area, the rest is in East Leeds - capacity and area given are for the proportion within Outer South. (31 capacity in adjacent hmca)

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - loss of employment, access to health, part greenfield. Minor positive - housing, emissions and local needs met locally (based on Highways assessment) and flood risk.

Summary of reps

For Development
Compatible with its surrounding land uses.
Site could be either a stand alone site, or linked with the adjoining brownfield Garden Centre site (East Leeds HMCA).

Against Development

Statutory
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. (Metro)

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site on the edge of a Major Settlement (Rothwell). Mixed brown and greenfield site. The site relates well to the settlement being essentially an infill site between existing development and would not set a precedent for sprawl. Only part of the site is in East, with the rest in the Outer South area (split East/OS 31/52).

Site Details

Easting	437977	Northing	434078	Site area ha	34.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Temple Newsam	

Site Characteristics

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

Other land uses - None

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

Description

The site is greenfield within the Main Urban Area. The site lies in the northern half of the wider UDP employment allocation that totals approximately 65 hectares. The site is located to the south of the Leeds-York/Selby railway line and Manston Lane, west of the M1 (junction 46), north of A63 Selby Road and existing Thorpe Park buildings, Austhorpe Lane is to the west. The land to the west is allocated as Proposed Open Space ("Green Park") and to the east is open fields (Green Belt).

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	

East Leeds

2039 Thorpe Park, undeveloped non-submitted land

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: Uncertain

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Live planning permission mixed use. Large site that doesn't meet Core Strategy standards. Opening of Manston Lane Link Road (a requirement of access) is likely to improve accessibility.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Reliant on the construction of the Manston Lane Link Road

4

Local network comments

Has the benefit of an extant B1 permission. However, major Transport Assessment required to assess the need for Manston Lane Link Road and East Leeds Orbital Road

2

Mitigation measures

Manston Lane Link Road/East Leeds Orbital Road required to resolve traffic impacts. Possible works to J46.

Total score

8

Highways site support

yes - Manston Lane Link Road/East Leeds Orbital Road. Possible works to J46.

Contingent on other sites

no - However, several sites likely to require and contribute to construction of Manston Lane Link Road/East Leeds Orbital Road

Contingent on other sites

no - However, several sites likely to require and contribute to construction of Manston Lane Link Road/East Leeds Orbital Road

Highways Agency

Impact Major impact

Network Status

Likely to require significant physical mitigation

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

Network Rail

Level crossings including one just north of site; General asset protection issues; width of Austhorpe Lane bridge. Very long term four tracking

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.

East Leeds

2039 Thorpe Park, undeveloped non-submitted land

LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (RED). No site designations but parts of the site are likely to meet Local Wildlife Site criteria based on wetland, amphibians and mosaic of habitats criteria. Great Crested Newts to consider. Needs to be assessed against Local Wildlife Site	
Ecology boundary	
Site assessment needed against Local Wildlife Sites criteria.	
Education comments	
East Leeds Extension – 7000 houses plus sites 2062, 3119, 282, 1297, 2086, 2039 generates 1,750 primary and 700 secondary children. Already in discussions with planners and developers re. new primary and secondary school provision.	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
This site is crossed by a high pressure pipeline owned and operated by Northern Gas Networks. This pipeline will be protected by a legal easement. The Institution of Gas Engineers and Managers document TD1 Edition 5 recommends a minimum building proximity distance to normally occupied properties of 9m.	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
This western edge of this site lies adjacent to a length of Grim's Ditch which is a Scheduled Monument. National policy guidance makes it clear that substantial harm to the significance of such an asset should be wholly exceptional. Before allocating this site, therefore, it will have to be clearly demonstrated that residential development in this area would not result in harm to elements that contribute to the significance of this asset, including its setting. If, after undertaking this assessment, it is considered appropriate to allocate this area, the need to safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of this monument needs to be stated in the Policy and in its justification.	
Natural England	

Planning History			
Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/02406/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 5 of Planning Application 12/03886/OT	A	99
12/03886/OT	Outline Planning Application for mixed use development comprising offices (business park) (B1A), (B) and (C), retail and bar/restaurant (A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5), hotel (C1), leisure facilities (D1, D2), multi-storey car park, together with internal roads, car parking, landscaping and drainage.	A	99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

2039 Thorpe Park, undeveloped non-submitted land

N32 Greenbelt	1.64	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	1.94	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping 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	98.36	% 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)	1733.11
Nearest bus stop	9907
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	435.01

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 checked="" 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

Thorpe Park site. Outline Planning Application pending for mixed use development comprising offices (business park) (B1A), (B) and (C), retail and bar/restaurant (A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5), hotel (C1), leisure facilities (application no. 12/03886/OT). The western part of the site is currently designated as proposed greenspace on the existing UDP (see also greenspace section, page 22, question G8), the eastern part is allocated for employment on the existing UDP. The site could link in with residential development to the north in the allocated east Leeds extension, so development for residential could also have potential subject to the provision of the Manston Lane Link Road and East Leeds Orbital Route.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site, ecology and pollution. Minor negative - loss of employment, poor access to health, education and leisure services, community participation (access to services) and community cohesion (scale of site relative to settlement). It also scores minor negative for emissions, transport network and local needs met locally based on Highways assessment. Minor positive effect expected for housing and flood risk objectives.

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development

Statutory

Before allocating this site, therefore, it will have to be clearly demonstrated that residential development in this area would not result in harm to elements that contribute to the significance of this asset, including its setting.....the need to safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of this monument needs to be stated in the Policy and in its justification. (English Heritage)

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. (Metro)

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation with mixed uses

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Greenfield site within the Main Urban Area and forms part of the wider Thorpe Park employment allocation that has historic permission for a range of employment uses. The western part of the site is currently designated as proposed greenspace on the UDP, the eastern part is allocated for employment on the UDP. Local preference including a review of the wider delivery across the area considers suitable for residential subject to the provision of the Manston Lane Link Road and East Leeds Orbital Route. The site would also link in with residential development to the north in the allocated East Leeds Extension. Developer interest expressed through a planning application in September 2014 which seeks to revise the overall mix of uses to include up to 300 dwellings, alongside offices, retail and other supporting uses.

Site Details

Easting	437704	Northing	432725	Site area ha	2.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds, Outer South East				Ward	Garforth and Swillington	

Site Characteristics

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

Other land uses - None

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

Description	Site has been cleared with current permission for housing. Roughly rectangular in shape, the western side curves as it adjoins an existing office development. The eastern edge borders the motorway, which is hidden by a line of 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 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	

East Leeds

2040 Bullerthorpe Lane (Temple Point), Colton

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

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Has Planning Permission

5

Access comments

Has Planning Permission

5

Local network comments

Has Planning Permission

5

Mitigation measures

Has Planning Permission

Total score

15

Highways site support

Yes - has planning permission

Contingent on other sites

No

Contingent on other sites

No

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

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

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works 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. Part of site at risk from surface water flooding.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Within the Outer South East area there are eight nationally protected SSSIs, including significant wetland habitats adjacent to the River Aire. The effects of housing and employment allocations within this area should be assessed to determine their ecological impacts upon them. Recreational disturbance, loss of functional land (used by SSSI birds) and potential hydrological effects should be examined.

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
12/03712/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16 and 17 of Planning Application 12/01422/FU		95
11/02402/FU	Erection of 86 houses and associated greenspace	R	98
12/04236/FU	Variation of condition 3 of Planning Application 12/01422/FU (Erection of 86 houses and associated greenspace) to allow use of alternative materials	A	95
12/01422/FU	Erection of 86 houses and associated greenspace	A	95
12/9/00203/MOD	Erection of 86 houses and associated greenspace NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 12/01422/FU: House type substitutions to Plots 39, 40, 44, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 56, 57, 74, 75, 78, 79, 15, 16, 17, 66 and 67	M01	95

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

2040 Bullerthorpe Lane (Temple Point), Colton

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	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2231.90
Nearest bus stop	7932
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	323.63

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 type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed 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

Planning permission for residential development granted August 2012. Former employment allocation on the existing UDP.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - loss of employment and pollution. Significant positive effect projected as brownfield site, flood risk and as a result of highways assessment, emissions, transport network and local needs met locally. Minor positive housing and access to a wider range of green space typologies.

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development

Site 2040 is not physically or visually linked nor is it considered to be within the same housing market.

Statutory

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.

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	431834	Northing	430035	Site area ha	19	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds, Inner Area				Ward	Middleton Park	

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:

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

not all of site meets requirements for primary education and health

4

Access comments

Site is accessible from several points on the Middleton Ring Road

5

Local network comments

Capacity available in the local network. Large part of site required for NGT P&R and depot

5

Mitigation measures

potential for cumulative impact on SRN

Total score

14

Highways site support

No - P&R allocation must be maintained across whole site, but unused portion could be residential

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact

Network Status

No objection

Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of city centre / Aire Valley cluster.

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

LCC

Ecology support Not supported

Not supported (RED). No site designations but large parts of the site have semi-improved neutral/acid grassland (potential Leeds Habitat Network), and also identified in the Aire Valley GI as Local Corridors 13, 15 and 16.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/2041. Mitigation will still be required to ensure adjacent habitats and corridors are protected and enhanced, including Aire Valley GI Corridor 15 (s

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
13/04318/TWA	New Generation Transport routes		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	41.30	
CC Shopping 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	98.35	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.98
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	3814.26
Nearest bus stop	9991
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	302.41

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 checked="" 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	
Aire Valley allocation	

DPP Allocation Conclusion	

Site Details

Easting	434853	Northing	438589	Site area ha	14.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Office
Outdoor amenity and open space
Other

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture
Dwellings
Horticultural nursery

Other land uses

LCC depot

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

Description

The site is mixed (GF and BF) with a very small portion to the north of the site in the Green Belt. The site lies within the Main Urban Area and is bounded by agricultural and woodland to the north and west, the A6120 Leeds Ring Road and housing to the south, and the A58 Wetherby Road to the east. A large majority of the site is laid out as playing field land containing approximately 4 hectares of playing pitches and a 6 team changing block, now unused. These were previously laid out as 5 playing fields (4 football and 1 rugby league) but have drainage issues leaving the playing fields in a water-logged state for a large part of the year but generally remain capable of use for informal amenity purposes in dry periods. The Red Hall listed buildings sit within the middle of the site, owned and occupied by the Rugby Football League.

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?	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

Only a small part of the site is Green Belt, currently in use in relation to the nursery. Assessed on its own, its development would not be connected to the settlement, but it would only come forwards alongside the rest of the site and the ELOR as part of the East Leeds Extension, at which time it would not have a great impact against the purposes and characteristics of the Green Belt.

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)
3/2 buses per hour, limited access to other services, full East Leeds Extension allocation should improve offer	2
Access comments	
access options available	4
Local network comments	
provision of East Leeds Orbital Road should mitigate local impacts	4
Mitigation measures	Total score
provision of East Leeds Orbital Road and improved Public Transport	10
Highways site support	
yes with mitigation	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact		Network Status	
Awaiting Comments			

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	

2062 Red Hall Offices & Playing Field LS17

study.

Environment Agency

Constraints

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

LCC

Ecology support

Ecology boundary

Education comments

East Leeds Extension – 7000 houses plus sites 2062, 3119, 282, 1297, 2086, 2039 generates 1,750 primary and 700 secondary children. Already in discussions with planners and developers re. new primary and secondary school provision.

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Redhall House to the west of this site 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 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.

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

2062 Red Hall Offices & Playing Field LS17

N32 Greenbelt	15.20	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	84.80	% 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 %	99.85
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	4382.31
Nearest bus stop	9531
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	225.95

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Part Green Belt site (northern section, majority of site is an employment allocation on the existing UDP. The site is within the current planning brief for the East Leeds extension alongside the wider Redhall site and would be suitable for residential development in principle subject to the provision of the section of the East Leeds Orbital Route which would run through the site.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative effect - greenfield site. Minor negatives - Community participation (poor access to existing services), access to green space and from Highways assessment, emissions, transport network and local needs met locally. Further minor negative effects predicted against waste (waste site within 100m), landscape and historic environment. Minor positive effects - Access to leisure, housing and flood risk.

Summary of reps

For Development

Site should be brought forward in a coordinated way as part of the East Leeds Extension.

Against Development

Currently used as public playing field.

Road infrastructure is not good enough to cope with this increase in traffic to sites.

Listed buildings.

Statutory

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. (English Heritage)

This site falls 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 (Metro)

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Majority of site is a UDP employment allocation (key business park) with a small part along the northern boundary being Green Belt. It is now contrary to national and local policy to locate offices away from city and town centres and so it is more appropriate to identify Red Hall as suitable for housing (incorporating on site greenspace provision) than for any other use. The identification of the site as suitable for an allocation is consistent with the long-standing planning principle for its development stretching back 23 years.

Executive Board in September 2013 agreed an outline development brief for Red Hall with key development principles, as part of the relocation strategy for the horticultural nursery (also encompasses site 795). This includes routing of ELOR around its northern edge and retention of at least two playing pitches within the site. The central Red Hall buildings are in the ownership of the RFL, and any development will have to respect their listed building status. The existing pitches have protection under Sport England policies and through the UDP Policy E4:11 requirement for their replacement in development of the site, but they are not allocated greenspace. The wider Red Hall site will be the subject of a detailed planning brief and subject to the provision of the section of the East Leeds Orbital Route which would run through the site.

Site Details

Easting	432045	Northing	432542	Site area ha	11.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Burmantofts and Richmond Hill	

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: Suitability: LDF to determine 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
11/01874/LA	Temporary permission for 3 detached storage containers	A	76

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	23.82	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	43.51	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping 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	100.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	2440.24
Nearest bus stop	9592
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	109.07

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary	

Site affects others?	

Sustainability summary	

Summary of reps	

Comments on phasing	

DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley allocation	

DPP Allocation Conclusion	

Site Details

Easting	438586	Northing	434040	Site area ha	21.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Temple Newsam	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Transport tracks and ways

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Triangular site of agricultural fields bounded by railway to the northeast and M1 to the southeast, Thorpe Park site 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?	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
----------------------	---

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

Green Belt site. The site is contained by strong defensible boundaries to the north and south east (major roads) so release of the site would not set a precedent for further Green Belt sprawl. The site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the UDP.

East Leeds

2086 Barrowby Lane, Manston LS15

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (≤ 5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

No Public Transport or other local services

Rank (1-5)

1

Access comments

No frontage to adopted highway. Needs access via site 2039 but Manston Lane Link Road is likely to segregate or remove access options.

1

Local network comments

Reliant of adjacent site and Manston Lane Link Road/East Leeds Orbital Road Possible works to J46.

2

Mitigation measures

Access needs to be resolved. Manston Lane Link Road/East Leeds Orbital Road required to resolve traffic impacts. Possible works to J46.

Total score

4

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

yes

Contingent on other sites

yes

Highways Agency

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

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

Network Rail

Level crossings/bridge strength/asset protection Very long term four tracking

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

East Leeds

2086 Barrowby Lane, Manston LS15

Ecology boundary

Education comments

East Leeds Extension – 7000 houses plus sites 2062, 3119, 282, 1297, 2086, 2039 generates 1,750 primary and 700 secondary children. Already in discussions with planners and developers re. new primary and secondary school provision.

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	92.54	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping 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 %	99.71
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	2110.07
Nearest bus stop	9907
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	763.79

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 checked="" 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 contained by strong defensible boundaries to the north and south east (major roads) so release of the site would not set a precedent for further Green Belt sprawl. The site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP. (See also greenspace section, page 22, question G9). Situated to the east of Cross Gates, development would be dependent on site 2039 coming forward first, to join the site up more with the existing urban area. Any development would be subject to provision of Manston Lane Link Road and East Leeds Orbital Route.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative effects - Access to green space, greenfield site and based on highways assessment, pollution and local needs met locally. Minor negative effects - Access to health, education and leisure. Community participation (based on access to services) and community cohesion (scale of site out of keeping with the settlement). Transport network (based on highways assessment) and pollution. Minor positive - housing and flood risk.

Summary of reps

For Development

Possibility of some development but only whilst retaining some greenspace. Also provision of infrastructure required to support that development as it is currently not sufficient to cope with any increased demands.

Against Development

Keep for greenspace.
children need green spaces to play on

Statutory

The site 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.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is contained by strong defensible boundaries to the north and south east (major roads and railway) so release of the site would not set a precedent for further Green Belt sprawl, but would extend the settlement out beyond the East Leeds Orbital Road. Development would be dependent on site 2039 (Thorpe Park) coming forward first. Local preference is to not propose as housing allocation.

Site Details

Easting	439091	Northing	433867	Site area ha	11.3	SP7	
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Temple Newsam	

Site Characteristics

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

Other land uses - None

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

Description	
Agricultural field directly adjacent to the M1 and railway line, with tree lined boundary to south and further fields beyond. Site also contains a tree belt.	

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	Yes
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

East Leeds

2087 Barrowby Lane (north of), Crawshaw Wood, Garforth, LS25

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

Green Belt site. The site is isolated and not related to the existing settlement. Development would significantly reduce the Green Belt gap between Cross Gates and Garforth, contrary to the purposes of Green Belt in preventing the coalescence.

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

Barrowby Lane is only access route and is not suitable

1

Local network comments

cumulative issues

3

Mitigation measures

Total score

5

Highways site support

No

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	Material impact	Network Status	No objection subject to satisfactory mitigation
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East Leeds cluster.			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

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

Environment Agency

Constraints

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

LCC

Ecology support

Not supported

Not supported (RED). No site-based designations but 1.15ha of this site is Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland, Crawshaw Wood. This woodland and the adjacent wildlife corridor function provided by land alongside the railway should be retained an enhanced. At present the woodland is grazed and has poor ground flora and shrub layer.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is ammended as per Drawing RM/2087. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the northern boundary alongside the motorway and railway - providing a buffer and native shrub and small tree planting.

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"/>	

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 %	99.42
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1582.56
Nearest bus stop	5745
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	972.96

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is isolated and not related to the existing settlement. Development would significantly reduce the Green Belt gap between Cross Gates and Garforth, contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belts in preventing the coalescence of settlements. The proposed HS2 rail route runs through the site. Significant highway concerns regarding access and accessibility.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative effect - Access to green space, greenfield site, ecology, emissions and local needs met locally (based on highways assessment). Minor negative - Access to education, health, leisure, community participation (based on access to services), community cohesion (scale of site out of keeping with settlement), transport network and pollution. Minor positive - Housing and flood risk.

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development
Road networks under pressure.
healthcare and local services will be beyond breaking point

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

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site is isolated and not related to the existing settlement. Development would significantly reduce the Green Belt gap between Cross Gates and Garforth, contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belts in preventing the coalescence of settlements. The proposed HS2 rail route runs through the site. Significant highway concerns regarding access and accessibility.

Site Details

Easting	437173	Northing	432784	Site area ha	6.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Temple Newsam	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Fields with some scrub cover and lines of trees along some of the field boundaries. No distinct boundary to the south.
--

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	Yes
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	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	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	No
Encroachment Conclusion	Site does not perform an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

East Leeds

2090A Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton LS15

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

The site has a road frontage and is well related to the existing settlement form with minimal potential for further urban sprawl and retention of openness across Temple Newsam.

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

100% employment, 50% primary, 50% health, 100% bus access to secondary

Rank (1-5)

3

Access comments

Access could be achieved via Colton Road East

5

Local network comments

No known issues with capacity

5

Mitigation measures

Alterations may be required to existing traffic calming features/roundabouts

Total score

13

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

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

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	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	

Flood Risk	

Utilities	
Gas	

Electric	

Fire and Rescue	

Telecoms	

Other	
English Heritage	
<p>This site adjoins the boundary of the Colton 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>There are also Grade II Listed Buildings to the west (Holly Tree Farmhouse) and north (Vine Cottage and Yew Tree Cottage) of this site. 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, any development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.</p> <p>The site lies within 65 metres of the shrunken medieval village of Colton which is a Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>National policy guidance makes it clear that substantial harm to the significance of such an asset should be wholly exceptional. Before allocating this site, therefore, it will have to be clearly demonstrated that residential development in this area would not result in harm to elements that contribute to the significance of this asset, including its setting.</p> <p>If, after undertaking this assessment, it is considered appropriate to allocate this area, the need to safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of this monument needs to be stated in the Policy and in its justification.</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
------------------	---------------

2090A Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton LS15

N32 Greenbelt	86.20	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	67.86	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	67.87	
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	

Main Urban Area	13.80	% 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 %	95.56
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1885.58
Nearest bus stop	13335
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	103.45

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site 2090 has been split into 2. Site A is within the Green Belt, but has a road frontage and is well related to the existing settlement form. Development could retain openness and views across the Temple Newsam estate. The site is also designated as proposed open space (N5) on the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 22, question G10.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - Access to green space, greenfield site and ecology. Minor negative - Access to education and health services, community participation, landscape and, based on highways assessment, emissions, transport network and local needs met locally. Minor positive - Housing and flood risk.

Summary of reps

For Development

Less congested
Release for housing.

Against Development

The roads are already very busy with Colton Road East is already a rat run to avoid the traffic lights on Bullerthorpe Lane.
The land has an environmental interest and should be protected.
Retained for greenspace.

Statutory

National policy guidance makes it clear that substantial harm to the significance of such an asset should be wholly exceptional. Before allocating this site, therefore, it will have to be clearly demonstrated that residential development in this area would not result in harm to elements that contribute to the significance of this asset, including its setting.

If, after undertaking this assessment, it is considered appropriate to allocate this area, the need to safeguard those elements which contribute to the significance of this monument needs to be stated in the Policy and in its justification. (English Heritage)

The site is not considered suitable for allocation for housing and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network.

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

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

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site, with a road frontage. It is well related to the existing settlement form. Consists of fields with some scrub cover and lines of trees along some of the field boundaries. There is no distinct boundary to the south but consider minimal potential for further urban sprawl as would link up to create a consistent building line/edge of settlement. Development could retain openness and views across the Temple Newsam estate.

Site Details

Easting	436982	Northing	432371	Site area ha	87.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Temple Newsam	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

A very large site consisting of many agricultural fields, separated by hedgerows and tree belts. Adjacent to Temple Newsam Estate to the 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?	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	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	Significant effect on the setting and special character of historic features

East Leeds

2090B Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton LS15

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

Designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP (See also greenspace section, page 22, question G10) there is a Local Nature Area and Site of Ecological and Geological Importance within the site and three ancient monument

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)

Large site. Small part of northern area of site meets standards but the greater part of the site does not.

2

Access comments

Access would only be achievable on eastern boundary however, numerous accesses would be required for the capacity proposed and these could not all be accommodated along this length

2

Local network comments

A very large site would require a detailed TA. Likely that the network would be unsuitable. No realistic opportunity to provide mitigation.

1

Mitigation measures

Mitigation would be required but not achievable

Total score

5

Highways site support

no

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact	Network Status

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.

East Leeds

2090B Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton LS15

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	96.07	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	1.48	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	82.58	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	93.57	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	1.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	3.93	% 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 %	99.56
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2189.52
Nearest bus stop	13335
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	508.71

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site 2090 has been split into 2. Site B is within the Green Belt and the majority of the site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP (See also greenspace section, page 22, question G10) and there is a Local Nature Area and Site of Ecological and Geological Importance within the site and three ancient monuments to the west. There are public footpaths running across the site and through to Temple Newsam, and important views across the estate. Significant highway concerns regarding accessibility and impact on local network.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - Access to green space, greenfield site and ecology. Minor negative - Access to education and health services, community participation, community cohesion (scale relative to settlement), landscape, local distinctiveness and, based on highways assessment, emissions, transport network and local needs met locally. Minor positive - Housing and flood risk.

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development

Environmentally unsuitable for housing.

Green space must be kept green space.

The site has environmental interest and should be protected.

Statutory

This site is not considered suitable for allocation for housing' as it 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 which includes a Local Nature Area and Site of Ecological and Geological Importance, and three ancient monuments to the west. Significant highway concerns regarding accessibility and impact on local network. There are public footpaths running across the site and through to Temple Newsam, and important views across the Estate. A large site which would significantly extend the settlement, and the site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment and the setting and special character of historic features.

East Leeds

2144A **Cartmell Drive, Halton Moor**

Site Details

Easting	433909	Northing	433005	Site area ha	1.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds, Inner Area				Ward	Temple Newsam	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

--

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Highways Agency			
Impact		Network Status	

Network Rail			

Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works			

Environment Agency			
Constraints			

LCC			
Ecology support			

Ecology boundary			

Education comments			

Flood Risk			

Utilities			
Gas			

Electric			

Fire and Rescue			

Telecoms			

Other			
English Heritage			

Natural England			

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/01258/LA	Outline application for residential development	A	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	50.28	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	50.28	
CC Shopping 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	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)	2778.07
Nearest bus stop	8865
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	27.29

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 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

East Leeds

2144B Cartmell Drive, Halton Moor

Site Details

Easting	433908	Northing	432729	Site area ha	5.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Temple Newsam	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Dwellings

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Grassed open space with some tree cover as part of Wykebeck Valley, flat site sloping down to the beck on the western boundary. Bounded by tree belts apart from to the north, with residential also to 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	

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

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	98.81	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	99.14	
CC Shopping 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	100.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	96.81
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2931.35
Nearest bus stop	7827
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	250.81

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input 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 as greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace has been considered in the round across the area and through local preference. The site is part of a wider area of greenspace to the west and development would not unacceptable encroach into this larger area as the valley is wider at this point.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Designated as greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace has been considered in the round across the area and through local preference. The site is part of a wider area of greenspace to the west and development would not unacceptably encroach into this larger area as the valley is wider at this point.

Site Details

Easting	435111	Northing	434343	Site area ha	18	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Killingbeck and Seacroft	

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

East Leeds

2154 Seacroft Hospital (rear of)

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Partially meets bus and employment(40%) partially meets primary health and education & secondary education(5%)

3

Access comments

Local network comments

Congestion on A64

3

Mitigation measures

Total score

Highways site support

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

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

Assessment of cumulative impact with other sites needed

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

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

LCC

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

Not supported (Red) - This site includes lowland mixed deciduous woodland at the western end a UK BAP priority habitat. Exclude a wide linking corridor along the western end of the site - this should be enhanced as a mixed habitat of lowland mixed deciduous woodland and grassland with scattered scrub. This site forms an important link between Primrose Valley and Killingbeck Fields LNRs. The western end of the proposed allocation in particular should be retained as part of a wildlife corridor identified by WYE in 2010. This site supports a good range of red and amber list bird species including song thrush, starling, house sparrow, bullfinch and many more. The site also supports hedgehogs a UK BAP priority species.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/2154. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent woodland and grassland are addressed. There are known bat roosts in the hospital site buildings to the north - bat

2154 Seacroft Hospital (rear of)

activity surveys should be carried out to assess levels of commuting and foraging activity across the site, and ensure suitable wildlife corridors are designed into any layout.

Education comments

Flood Risk

Although in Flood Zone 1, special measures may apply to the surface water drainage, given the location of the site in relation to the Wyke Beck catchment.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

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	56.94	
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	

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	100.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	1.97
-----------------	------

2154 Seacroft Hospital (rear of)

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1177.85
Nearest bus stop	5382
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	361.75

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 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

For Development
Suitable for Gypsies & Travellers
The site should not be allowed to be developed until a rail halt is built on the adjacent rail line. Especially at Thorpe Park
Any proposed building in this area should only be considered provided the run off was diverted down stream of the Dunhills estate thereby alleviating the flooding issue.

Against Development
This site was discussed by MP G Mundie and Council Officers some time ago and a land swap was agreed and I was assured that no building would be proposed on his site in future.

Statutory

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

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

Site Details

Easting	433006	Northing	429425	Site area ha	3	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	East Leeds, Outer South				Ward	Rothwell	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Storage

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Part of a flat agricultural field, and a small belt of trees in the south. Adjacent to the m1 to the north. Hedgerow and fields to east, industrial estate/storage yard to the south, and no boundary to the west.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

Green Belt site. Whilst the site would be contained by the motorway to the north and existing development to the south west surrounding uses are an industrial estate, so it is not considered suitable for a residential use.

SHLAA conclusions**Availability:** Unknown**Suitability:** Unsuitable**Achievability:** Longterm (11+yrs)**Summary of infrastructure provider comments****LCC Highways Comments**

Public transport accessibility comments

4 buses per hour, Good accessibility to employment, Part of site (20%) accessibility to primary & secondary education and health services

Rank (1-5)**4**

Access comments

requires adjacent site for access

3

Local network comments

cumulative issues

3

Mitigation measures

Total score**10**

Highways site support

yes with adjacent site

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

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

Network Rail**Yorkshire Water**

Treatment Works Lemonroyd

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

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ1 over 1 ha, adjoins an Historic Landfill to the NE See comments in main text of our response

LCC

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.64	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Woodlesford
Nearest train station distance (m)	3830.88
Nearest bus stop	782
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	282.17

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input checked="" 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. Whilst the site would be contained by the motorway to the north and existing development to the south west surrounding uses are an industrial estate, so it is not considered suitable for a residential use. Development would be dependent on the adjacent site coming forward for access requirements.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Signiificant negative - Greenfield site. Minor negative - Access to education and health. Pollution. Minor positive - Housing, flood risk and, based on highways assessment, emissions, transport network and local needs met locally.

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Whilst the site would be contained by the motorway to the north and existing development to the south west surrounding uses are an industrial estate, so it is not considered suitable for a residential use. Development would be dependent on the adjacent site coming forward for access requirements.

Site Details

Easting	439432	Northing	433345	Site area ha	5.8	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	East Leeds, Outer South East				Ward	Garforth and Swillington	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Plant and pond business

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

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

Description

The boundaries do not relate to existing features, cutting across open fields and a hedgerow. The south western part of the site contains a series of building, greenhouses, and ponds relating to a water plant and pond supply business. There are fields and farm buildings beyond.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but there is no defensible boundary

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	Yes
Does the site provide access to the countryside	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

3111 Barrowby Lane (Barrowby Cottage), Garforth

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

Green Belt site. By itself the site is not well related to the settlement, but development could be considered if developed alongside sites 1100, 1044 or 3112. If these sites were put forward for development then this site would effectively round off the settlement. The boundaries do not relate to existing features.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

landlocked site and not all of site meets requirements for primary/secondary education and health. Public Transport standards are met, but crossing A642 would be potentially difficult for pedestrians walking to local centre

Rank (1-5)

4

Access comments

no frontage to highway, combine with adj site

3

Local network comments

local congestion/capacity issues and unclear whether mitigation is possible

2

Mitigation measures

the potential for mitigation needs to be considered in conjunction with adjacent sites

Total score

9

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	Owlwood/Garforth
-----------------	------------------

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

Environment Agency

Constraints

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

3111 Barrowby Lane (Barrowby Cottage), Garforth

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the ponds and wet drains - primarily for Water Voles and retain a 20 metre buffer from both sides of the drain. Water Voles to consider.

Ecology boundary

Education comments

3112+1100+1044+2156+2032+2091+3111(east area) + 1226 (outer NE area) = 2349 houses generates 587 primary and 235 secondary children. New 2FE primary school required, plus potentially land for expansion of existing schools.

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1252.32
Nearest bus stop	12909
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	354.04

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps 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. By itself the site is not well related to the settlement, but development could be considered if developed alongside sites 1100, 1044 or 3112. If these sites were put forward for development then this site would effectively round off the settlement.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - Greenfield site. Minor negative - Access to education, health and leisure. Community participation (based on access to services) and ecology. Minor positives - Housing, flood risk and based on highways assessment, emissions, transport network and local needs met locally.

Summary of reps

For Development

Against Development

Greenbelt

Site Boundary. It is an open site which is not visually contained. It is prominently located at the brow of the approach to Garforth. It is beyond the urban barrier of the A642. It is an isolated incursion into the Green Belt. It does not benefit from strong defensible barriers.

Traffic congestion/safety,development would massively increase already severely congested roads in Garforth, particularly Wakefield Road and Town End. The road traffic network in Garforth is not adequate to deal with additional traffic

Flooding/Drainage, there is already flooding, a situation that would be exacerbated if additional houses were built on natural soak aways

Impact on character

Brownfield first

Pressure on local services

GP/Dentist full

Wildlife/biodiversity impact

What Garforth really needs is a natural parkland and the agricultural land borderi the Wakefield Road is ideal.

Wakefield Road, and it's junctions at Town End and Garforth Bridge are already congested, and additional traffic created from this development could easily lead to total gridlock at any time of the day.

Garforth is built on clay. Surface water drainage is generally poor due to the impervious clay, inadequate drainage system and extensive building on green space that once acted as natural soakaways. Despite living on hill and on a relatively high point my garden has, during the last decade, started flooding after heavy rain. This is as a direct result of the inadequate drainage of the relatively new buildings nearby. The areas of land off Wakefield Road and marked 3111, 3112, 1100, 1044 and 3113 are natural soakaways and I believe they should be coded red on your plan.

Development not suitable as would cause traffic problems at Town End junctions and inevitably more accidents

The fields stand upon old mine working and bell pits which sink from time to time.

Many roads around the town are 'one way' e.g. Church Lane and Barleyhill Road due to on street parking.

There will be no distinct end to Garforth, Barwick or Colton.

HS2 route

The proposed travellers' usage/site is completely unacceptable

The site is essential to provide physical separation between 2 distinct communities.

Insurance costs

Statutory

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.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
348	4	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Site is isolated and unrelated to the existing settlement, with incursion into the Green Belt. Major site 1232B to east of Garforth chosen on balance as a better site for development than the combined sites to the east/north of Garforth.

Site Details							
Easting	436397	Northing	436960	Site area ha	3.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics	
Site type	Greenfield
On-site land uses	
Agriculture	
Neighbouring land uses	
Agriculture	
Restaurants and Cafes	

Other land uses - None

Topography	Undulating	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Poorly defined	Road front	Yes

Description	
Part of an undulating grassed field, and tree belt and scrub in the north and on the southern 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

East Leeds

3118 Site to south of York Road, Seacroft

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: Unsuitable

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

1

Access comments

1

Local network comments

1

Mitigation measures

Total score

3

Highways site support

No, park and ride site that must be maintained.

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

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

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

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	Knoctrop
-----------------	----------

Knoctrop 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 parts of the site are Lowland mixed deciduous woodland a UK BAP priority habitat and the Cock Beck flows near the northern boundary.

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	0.02	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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 %	84.91
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2515.94
Nearest bus stop	13484
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	261.14

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed 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 within the urban area. It is allocated as a park and ride site on the existing UDP.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield, ecology. Emissions and local needs met locally based on highways assessment. Minor negative - access to leisure, community participation (access to services) and cohesion (scale not in keeping with settlement). Transport network based on highways assessment. Minor positive - Access to education and health, housing, access to green space and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Metro				
Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network				
Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
221	9	Yes		
Yes	Yes			

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is within the urban area but is allocated as a park and ride site on the existing UDP.

Site Details

Easting	435062	Northing	438748	Site area ha	2.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	East Leeds, Outer North East				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Restaurants and Cafes

Dwellings

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Public house with parking and beer garden/field area, plus residential property with large garden to the west, and includes part of petrol station on the eastern side of York Road (cuts across without logical boundary). Fields beyond, with tree belt to the east.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

East Leeds

3119 Wetherby Road/Wellington Hill, Shadwell

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

Green Belt site. Development of the site alone would represent an isolated island of development within Green Belt. However, development in conjunction with site 2062 would effectively round off the settlement pattern although the boundary would need adjustment.

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Core Strategy not fully met but limited local services. No footways on Whin Moor Lane.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access comments

Long frontage give options for access. Footways and vis splays would need to be created and possibly road widening. Access from Wetherby Road would not be supported.

4

Local network comments

Potential widening and footways needed to Whin Moor Lane. Site will be adjacent to East Leeds Extension/East Leeds Orbital Road.

5

Mitigation measures

Widening and footway provision to Whin Moor Lane.

Total score

11

Highways site support

yes with miigation

Contingent on other sites

Existing Phase 3 East Leeds Eextension

Contingent on other sites

Existing Phase 3 East Leeds Eextension

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 the scrub and pond for amphibians on the east area of the site.	

Ecology boundary	

Education comments	
East Leeds Extension – 7000 houses plus sites 2062, 3119, 282, 1297, 2086, 2039 generates 1,750 primary and 700 secondary children. Already in discussions with planners and developers re. new primary and secondary school provision.	

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		Core Strategy	
N32 Greenbelt	99.43	Main Urban Area	0.55
N34 PAS	0.00	Major Settlement	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	Minor Settlement	0.00
N1 Greenspace	0.00	Overlaps Urban Extension	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
N1A Allotments	0.00	Regeneration Areas	
N5 Open Space	0.00	Inner South RA	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	LB Corridor RA	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	EASEL RA	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	Aire Valley RA	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00	West Leeds Gateway	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00		
Proposed Local Centre	0.00		
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00		

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	4471.28
Nearest bus stop	5720
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	97.08

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Development of the site alone would represent an isolated 'island' of development within Green Belt. However, development in conjunction with site 2062 would effectively 'round off' the settlement pattern. Existing uses within the site including a public house and residential properties to the west and east.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - Access to green space and greenfield sites. Minor negative - Access to health and leisure, ecology and, based on highways assessment, emissions, transport network and local needs met locally. Minor positive- Housing and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti
Our obvious concerns are traffic, services, density and listed buildings, especially Red Hall and its ancillary buildings, including dove cote, etc. Road infrastructure is not good enough to cope with this increase in traffic
Greenbelt, Site size

Metro				
Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network				
Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.				
Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
743	10	No	Yes	
Yes				

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site containing existing public house, with residential properties to the west and east. Development would be in conjunction with site 2062 and would effectively 'round off' the settlement pattern. However, do not want to promote new development directly outside the East Leeds Orbital Road; this principle is established all along its route. Existing use on site would still have the potential for a conversion/redevelopment in line with Green Belt policies.

East Leeds

3219 Ash Tree Grove, (PFI F) LS14

Site Details

Easting	436848	Northing	436083	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=<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
14/9/00142/MOD	13 houses NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 13/03635/FU: Velux window to rear of Moseley Housetype	M01	87

3219 Ash Tree Grove, (PFI F) LS14

10/04596/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 20 and 21 of Planning Application 32/446/03/OT	100
09/9/00069/MOD	Laying out of car parking areas and landscaping to housing estateNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Re-routing of the health trail due to development sites	100
14/03248/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17 and 19 of Planning Application 13/03635/FU	87
13/03635/FU	13 houses	A87

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 %	99.97
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1730.78
Nearest bus stop	10348
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	229.07

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

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	435965	Northing	437932	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography		Landscape	
Boundaries		Road front	No

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

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/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

East Leeds

3227 Naburn Approach, LS14

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
10/02310/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 28, 29, 30, 32 and 33 of Planning Application 09/04481/FU	SPL	100

3227 Naburn Approach, LS14

09/04481/FU	Twelve 3 bedroom sem	A	100
10/03805/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 5 and 6 of Planning Application 09/04481/FU	R	100
10/02429/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23 of Planning Application 09/04481/FU	SPL	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	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)	3500.31
Nearest bus stop	7309
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	96.71

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	434018	Northing	434090	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds, Inner Area				Ward	Killingbeck and Seacroft	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
On-site land uses	
Vacant land	
Neighbouring land uses	
Dwellings	
Outdoor amenity and open space	
Transport tracks and ways	

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is in a state of dereliction and is overgrown. Although surrounded by road and railway, considerable residential exists. The site adjacent is also used for 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	

East Leeds

4123 York Road / Selby Road

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

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (= <5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

4buses per hour, 100% employment, primary, secondary and health

Rank (1-5)

5

Access comments

Access not ideal however, given existing previous use of site a small development would be ok. However, alterations to signals required to facilitate access

4

Local network comments

No known issues with capacity

5

Mitigation measures

Alterations to signals to facilitate access.

Total score

14

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 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. Wyke Beck abuts.

LCC

Ecology support

Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation (Amber) provided that a scheme is brought forward to protect and enhance the eastern 20 metres of the site (Killingbeck Bridge access road) to include deculverting the Wyke Beck - and plant the adjacent 20 metre buffer from the Wyke Beck with native shrubs and trees.

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
09/00058/FU	Detached security hut with attached store and detached store to vacant site		71
14/03960/OT	Outline application for commercial A1/A3/A5 units and residential development of 20 flats (C3)		75

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	100.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	4.63
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2294.16
Nearest bus stop	8659
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	76.96

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

Brownfield site, suitable in principle for residential development. Some Highway concerns re access, but given former use and small scale of development that could be accommodated an acceptable solution is likely to be available.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Pro - Viable and available

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.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)	Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools	Access to Primary Health
55	5	Yes		
Yes		Yes		

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site, suitable in principle for residential development. Some Highway concerns regarding access, but given former use and small scale of development that could be accommodated an acceptable solution is likely to be available.

Site Details

Easting	434927	Northing	438850	Site area ha	1.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Extension
HMCA	East Leeds, Outer North East				Ward	Harewood	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Horticultural nursery

Public house

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Two agricultural fields separated by a hedgerow and bounded by hedgerows, with individual dwellings beyond.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

Would be isolated development unrelated to any settlement.

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Meets primary education only	1

Access comments	
Direct Access from Whin Moor Lane possible	4

Local network comments	
Whin Moor Lane is a remote, narrow country lane with no footways, unsuitable for development	1

Mitigation measures	Total score
	6

Highways site support	
No	

Contingent on other sites	

Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail

--

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

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

LCC

Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation (Amber) - hedgerows to retain and mitigate for otherwise acceptable. Hedgerows within and around the site are a UK BAP habitat. Retain and/or include hedgerows with boundaries between dwellings using locally native species.	

East Leeds

4170 Whinmoor Lane, Shadwell

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations			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				% overlap
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00				
UDP City Centre	0.00				
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00				
Proposed Local Centre	0.00				
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00				

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %0.00

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	4607.63
Nearest bus stop	5720
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	264.92

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

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

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Would be isolated development unrelated to any settlement.

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. The site would have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt in terms of unrestricted sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Do not want to promote new development directly outside the East Leeds Orbital Road; this principle is established all along its route.

Site Details

Easting	437694	Northing	434849	Site area ha	3.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Dwellings

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Brownfield site of separate plots within a larger industrial estate, containing a number of large shed type buildings, hardstanding, and storage. Estate bounded by residential to the north, and fields (future East Leeds Extension) to the east.

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	

East Leeds

4174 Sandleas Way, Crossgates

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

--

SHLAA conclusions

Availability: Short (=≤5 yrs)

Suitability: Suitable

Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Rank (1-5)

Meets primary health and secondary education

2

Access comments

Existing access points ok

5

Local network comments

Manston Lane link , query correct location for housing with mix

3

Mitigation measures

Manston Lane link

Total score

10

Highways site support

Yes with mitigation.

Contingent on other sites

Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

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

Assessment of cumulative impact with other sites needed

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Environment Agency

Constraints

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

LCC

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

Supported - within 500m of known great crested newt breeding pond, but unlikely to offer significant terrestrial 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
10/9/00074/MOD	Extension to warehouse and laying out of secure floodlights to trailer park and depotNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Amendments to elevational treatment of warehouse office refurbishment. Amendments to parking layout and access arrangements.	M01	85
12/9/00067/MOD	Extension to warehouse and laying out of secure floodlights to trailer park and depot NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 32/141/05/FU:Creation of a landscape zone between the service yard and car parking area		85
09/04909/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17 of Planning Application 32/141/05/FU	INT	85

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

4174 Sandreas Way, Crossgates

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 %	0.22
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1466.79
Nearest bus stop	11577
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	123.91

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 - Made up of 4 different plots which when taken into account with adjoining sites 4212 and 5003 are suitable in principle for housing. The surrounding sites 1297, 282, (green) 281 and 779 (lime green) mean this area is rapidly changing into a residential area which when all of these sites developed it will no longer be suitable, likely viable or attractive to keep these remaining sites as employment/industry. It should be noted that there are several small sites which remain pepper potted even if all above sites are allocated housing.

Site affects others?

yes - Made up of 4 different plots which when taken into account with adjoining sites 4212 and 5003 (new sites proposed green) are suitable in principle for housing. The surrounding sites 1297, 282, (green) 281 and 779 (lime green) mean this area is rapidly changing into a residential area which when all of these sites developed it will no longer be suitable, likely viable or attractive to keep these remaining sites as employment/industry. It should be noted that there are several small sites which remain pepper potted even if all above sites are allocated housing.

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site in the Main Urban Area - Made up of 4 different plots. Preference to retain these sites as employment/industry.

Site Details

Easting	435060	Northing	433541	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Temple Newsam	

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
14/02101/RM	6No. dwellings (3 Terraces houses, 1No. pairs of semi-detached properties (1No. detached dwellings)	A	100

4191 Land At Brooksbank Drive, Halton

14/00968/COND	Consent, agreement or approval by conditions 10 and 11 of Planning Application 12/03499/LA	100
12/03499/LA	Outline application for residential development	A100

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 %	97.95
-----------------	-------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1522.57
Nearest bus stop	6402
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	51.77

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
LG PP

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

East Leeds

4212 Manston lane, Cross Green

Site Details

Easting	437791	Northing	434685	Site area ha	4.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Agriculture

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Brownfield site of a plot on the eastern edge of a larger industrial estate, containing a number of large shed type buildings and access/hardstanding. Adjacent to fields (future East Leeds Extension) to the east.

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: Medium (6-10yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Meets primary health andsecondary education	2

Access comments	
Existing access points ok	5

Local network comments	
Manston Lane link , query correct location for housing with mix	3

Mitigation measures	Total score
Manston Lane link	10

Highways site support	
Yes with mitigation.	

Contingent on other sites	

Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required
Assessment of cumulative impact with other sites needed			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works	

Environment Agency

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

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported - Great crested newts within 150m, but the proposed allocation site is judge to offer little habitat for this species.	

East Leeds

4212 Manston lane, Cross Green

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/9/00200/MOD	Alterations and extension to form new entrance area to factoryNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Height increase in lift shaft to accommodate lift mechanism.	M01	97
09/03356/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 2 of Planning Application 08/06279/FU	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	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1525.43
Nearest bus stop	11156
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	281.74

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 checked="" 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 - when taken into account with adjoining sites 4174 and 5003 are suitable in principle for housing. The surrounding sites 1297, 282, (green) 281 and 779 (lime green) mean this area is rapidly changing into a residential area which when all of these sites developed it will no longer be suitable, likely viable or attractive to keep these remaining sites as employment/industry. It should be noted that there are several small sites which remain pepper potted even if all above sites are allocated housing.

Site affects others?

Brownfield site - when taken into account with adjoining sites 4174 and 5003 are suitable in principle for housing. The surrounding sites 1297, 282, (green) 281 and 779 (lime green) mean this area is rapidly changing into a residential area which when all of these sites developed it will no longer be suitable, likely viable or attractive to keep these remaining sites as employment/industry. It should be noted that there are several small sites which remain pepper potted even if all above sites are allocated housing.

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site in the Main Urban Area. Preference to retain site as employment/industry.

Site Details

Easting	437699	Northing	433496	Site area ha	1.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds, Outer South East				Ward	Garforth and Swillington	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Other

Neighbouring land uses

--

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Land is currently divided into seven parcels of land (six of which) classified as private residential gardens (substantial in size) with hedge tree cover (no current TPOs) across the site. Access to come from the employment (Thorp Park)

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		Rank (1-5)
Public transport accessibility comments		
Meets Standards except 50% Secondary Education		5
Access comments		3
Vehicular access OK, poor pedestrian connectivity		
Local network comments		4
Ok for scale of development		
Mitigation measures		Total score
Pedestrian access improvements		
		12
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.Ordinary watercourse meeting west and southern boundary of site	

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigation (Amber) - mitigation required to ensure impacts on hedgerows is addressed. Hedgerows, a UK BAP priority habitat, are found separating the gardens on this proposed allocation - these will provide good habitat for a variety of wildlife including birds, amphibians and invertebrates. Provide mitigation in the form of locally native species hedgerows and scrub planting - retain some of the existing hedgerows. Note - next to Grims Ditch Scheduled Ancient Monument, need to discuss with Archaeological Advisory Service.	
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
14/01224/FU	Laying out of access road and erect 14 dwellings	A	96

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input 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)	1704.59
Nearest bus stop	2129
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	131.36

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 checked="" 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

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Infill site which consists of a number of large private residential gardens, with hedges and tree cover. Access would be from Thorp Park. Acceptable in principle.

Site Details

Easting	439366	Northing	433525	Site area ha	14.4	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	East Leeds, Outer South East				Ward	Garforth and Swillington	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Outdoor amenity and open space

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

The land is currently farmed (pastural) and would provide a more logical larger boundary to site 3111 following exisitng hedgrows/field boundaries (within which are some trees). To the west is Barrowby Hall (listed building) and wider Recreation/tourism allocation in the UDP. To the south and east are existing agricultural fields and farm buildings (sites 3111/3112/5012/1100/1044). No direct road frontage - Barrowby Lane at this point is a farmers track.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	Yes
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

If brought forward on its own this site would constitute isolated development, unconnected to the main built up area of Garforth. There is potential for the site to be considered as rounding off the settlement if adjacent sites to the south are also developed, although this would be a significant incursion into the Green Belt. The development of the site could bring the settlement of Garforth significantly closer to the Main Urban Area of Leeds if site 2086 is developed. However, the risk of coalescence is reduced by strong barriers (motorway/tree belts) and changes in land levels.

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
Fails to meet standards	1
Access comments	
Access possible onto Barrowby Lane or A642 with improved access roads	3
Local network comments	
Town End signals congestion and elsewhere	2
Mitigation measures	Total score
	6
Highways site support	
No	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	

Highways Agency

Impact	Major impact	Network Status	Likely to require significant physical mitigation
Assessment of cumulative impact with other sites needed			

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works
The site is remote from existing public sewerage. Surface water should drain to SuDS/watercourse and a management plan in this respect should be drawn up for the whole site. Capacity at Garforth waste water treatment works would have to be increased in order to properly treat foul water from this development

Environment Agency

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

4258 Land Adjacent Barrowby Lodge, Graforth

LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
Red - there is a pond to the south west of the site and hedgerow and lowland mixed deciduous woodland features all of which are UK BAP priority habitats. There is also a strip of grassland within the parkland which may be species rich and should be excluded - this would also benefit the setting of the listed building (Barrowby Hall). Provide a minimum buffer around the pond of 50m for amphibians. Retain and strengthen the hedgerows, woodland fringe by removing land as shown hatched Red from the north and western sides of the site and managing to enhance grassland value and some planting with native shrubs and trees.	
Ecology boundary	
Supported with mitigation (Amber) if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4258. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed - see comments on left. There is a maternity roost of brown long-eared bats in Barrowby Hall - provide additional linear woodland strips for feeding habitat and minimise light pollution to woodland fringe. Note - archaeology may be an issue.	
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
------------------	---------------

4258 Land Adjacent Barrowby Lodge, Graforth

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

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1291.53
Nearest bus stop	12909
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	540.17
Agricultural classification	Grade 2
Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input 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. By itself the site is not well related to the settlement, but if developed alongside adjacent sites (3111,1044,1100,3112) it could constitute rounding-off of the settlement. However, this would result in significant incursion into the Green Belt.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Site is isolated and unrelated to the existing settlement, with significant incursion into the Green Belt. Major site 1232B to east of Garforth chosen on balance as a better site for development than the combined sites to the west/north of Garforth.

East Leeds

5003 Manston Road, Leeds, LS15 8SX

Site Details

Easting	437427	Northing	434835	Site area ha	3.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale
Dwellings
Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Brownfield plot in middle of a larger industrial estate, containing a number of large shed type buildings, hardstanding, and storage. Greenspace/residential to the north.
--

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	

East Leeds

5003 Manston Road, Leeds, LS15 8SX

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)
Part PT meets rest	4
Access comments	
Access from Manston Lane	5
Local network comments	
Site can only be delivered with Manston Lane Link + ELOR	4
Mitigation measures	Total score
Contribution to Manston Lane Link/ELOR	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
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	Supported
Supported (Green)	

East Leeds

5003 Manston Road, Leeds, LS15 8SX

Ecology boundary

Education comments

Flood Risk

Flood Zone 1

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/04788/FU	Installation of 9.2m high sugar storage silo to factory	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	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1206.89
Nearest bus stop	11579
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	113.86

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 checked="" 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 - when taken into account with adjoining sites 4174 and 282 site is suitable in principle for housing. The surrounding sites 1297, (green) 281 and 779 (lime green) mean this area is rapidly changing into a residential area which when all of these sites are developed it will no longer be suitable, likely viable or attractive to keep these remaining sites as employment/industry. It should be noted that there are several small industrial sites which remain pepper potted even if all above sites are allocated housing.

Site affects others?

YES- when taken into account with adjoining sites 4174 and 282 site is suitable in principle for housing. The surrounding sites 1297, (green) 281 and 779 (lime green) mean this area is rapidly changing into a residential area which when all of these sites are developed it will no longer be suitable, likely viable or attractive to keep these remaining sites as employment/industry. It should be noted that there are several small industrial sites which remain pepper potted even if all above sites are allocated housing.

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site in the Main Urban Area. Preference to retain site as employment/industry.

Site Details

Easting	439583	Northing	433261	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Major Settlement Extension
HMCA	East Leeds, Outer South East				Ward	Garforth and Swillington	

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Flat rectangular site currently used for agriculture, with a farm in place on the western part. It is set to the east of Garforth with a road separating the site from the settlement. The site is flat, borders another farm to the south and is surrounded on the north and west by further agriculture.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	Yes
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	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?	No
Can development preserve this character?	No
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of historic features

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

Well connected to settlement. Tree line to north west boundary contain 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	Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Standards	5
Access comments	
Access on to Green Lane achievable where site touches to the north, but narrowing between two portions of site to 6m precludes access to the remained of the site. Further access to the larger part of the site would need to be negotiated.	3
Local network comments	
Leeds Road / A63 capacity and safety concern	3
Mitigation measures	Total score
Contribution to Leeds Rd/ A63 junction	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.Ordinary watercourse north of site.	

LCC

Ecology support	Supported
Supported (Green)	

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	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	1129.83
Nearest bus stop	12909
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	206.62

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

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps 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. Whilst the site is connected to the settlement it would be more suitable if developed alongside SHLAA ref 1100 1044 which are both assessed as Green sites. However if this site comes forward it would be difficult not to change site 3112 from amber to green as it would no longer be isolated.

Site affects others?

Yes - Site 3112 will no longer be defensible as amber as this site would connect it to Green sites 1100 and 1044.

Sustainability summary

Summary of reps

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. There have been substantial objections to development due to access, traffic, and flooding issues. Also important strategic purpose in keeping gap between settlements open. On its own the site would not relate well to the existing settlement form. Major site 1232B to east of Garforth chosen on balance as a better site for development than the combined sites to the west/north of Garforth.

East Leeds

5124 Pepper Road LS10

Site Details

Easting	431605	Northing	430604	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds, Inner Area				Ward	City and Hunslet	

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

--

East Leeds

5124 Pepper Road LS10

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
10/03728/EXT	Extension of time period for planning permission 06/06269/FU laying out of access and erection of 14 dwelling 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 %	2.70
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	3217.77
Nearest bus stop	11927
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	95.07

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

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	436555	Northing	436486	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds				Ward	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	

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
10/04596/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 20 and 21 of Planning Application 32/446/03/OT		100

5140 FARNDALE VIEW (PFI K) LS14

14/00880/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17 and 18 of Planning Application 13/03636/FU	A	79
09/9/00069/MOD	Laying out of car parking areas and landscaping to housing estateNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Re-routing of the health trail due to development sites		100
14/9/00140/MOD	10 houses NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 13/03636/FU: Velux window to rear of Morley Housetype	M01	79
13/03636/FU	10 houses	A	79

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	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2057.28
Nearest bus stop	3102
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	146.72

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 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