ite Details				
Easting 430910 Northing 434940 Site area ha	4.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA Inner Area	Ward	City and H	lunslet	
ite Characteristics				
Site type Brownfield				
n-site land uses				
ducation				
Office				
Outdoor sport facility				
leighbouring land uses				
Vholesale distribution				
Other land uses - None				
Topography Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree	e Cover	
Boundaries Existing well defined	Road front	Yes		
locariation				
Description				
CC Highways Comments				
				Rank (1-5
CC Highways Comments Tublic transport accessibility comments Good accessibility to all services				
CC Highways Comments Tublic transport accessibility comments Tood accessibility to all services Tublic transport accessibility to all services				Rank (1-5
CC Highways Comments Tublic transport accessibility comments Good accessibility to all services				
CC Highways Comments Tublic transport accessibility comments Tood accessibility to all services Tublic transport accessibility to all services				4
ccc Highways Comments sublic transport accessibility comments sood accessibility to all services access comments arious options for acceptable access ocal network comments				4
ccess comments arious options for acceptable access ocal network comments				4
ccess comments arious options for acceptable access ocal network comments				4
ccc Highways Comments sublic transport accessibility comments sood accessibility to all services access comments arious options for acceptable access ocal network comments congested local network and significant development				4
ccc Highways Comments Sublic transport accessibility comments Sood accessibility to all services Cccess comments Carious options for acceptable access Cocal network comments Congested local network and significant development Mitigation measures				4
ccc Highways Comments sublic transport accessibility comments sood accessibility to all services access comments arious options for acceptable access ocal network comments congested local network and significant development				4 4
ccc Highways Comments public transport accessibility comments cood accessibility to all services access comments arious options for acceptable access cocal network comments congested local network and significant development ditigation measures aignficant - to be determined by TA				4
ccc Highways Comments public transport accessibility comments cood accessibility to all services access comments arious options for acceptable access cocal network comments congested local network and significant development ditigation measures ignificant - to be determined by TA				4
ccc Highways Comments public transport accessibility comments cood accessibility to all services access comments arious options for acceptable access cocal network comments congested local network and significant development ditigation measures aignficant - to be determined by TA				4
ccc Highways Comments public transport accessibility comments produces accessibility to all services access comments produces arious options for acceptable access access comments arious options for acceptable access arious options for acceptable access access comments arious options for acceptable access arious options for acceptable access access comments arious options for acceptable access a				4
ccc Highways Comments public transport accessibility comments cood accessibility to all services access comments arious options for acceptable access cocal network comments congested local network and significant development ditigation measures ignificant - to be determined by TA				4
ccc Highways Comments public transport accessibility comments produces accessibility to all services access comments produces arious options for acceptable access access comments arious options for acceptable access arious options for acceptable access access comments arious options for acceptable access arious options for acceptable access access comments arious options for acceptable access a				4
ccc Highways Comments public transport accessibility comments cood accessibility to all services access comments arious options for acceptable access cocal network comments congested local network and significant development ditigation measures significant - to be determined by TA dighways site support des with mitigation contingent on other sites				4
ccc Highways Comments public transport accessibility comments produces accessibility to all services access comments produces arious options for acceptable access access comments arious options for acceptable access arious options for acceptable access access comments arious options for acceptable access arious options for acceptable access access comments arious options for acceptable access a				4

Highwa	ays Agency		
Impact	No material impact	Network Status	No objection
All city of	centre sites have a cumulative ne	gative impact on the N	M621

CFSM049 Thomas Danby College, Roundahay Road, Leeds

	as banby conege, Roundanay Roud, Eccus		
Network Rail			
	1		
Yorkshire Water	Vacatron		
Treatment Works	Knostrop		
co-ordinated with Yor the site. The forthcome with YW's investment take into account ava	ow Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Developm kshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessing AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is ct. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or gilable sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount of the developer wants to be possible for the developer to provide contributions.	essary infrastruct one method used greater increase i ng a site forward	ure and capacity can be provided to serve to ensure sites are brought forward in line n population served by the works should before YW have completed any planned
Environment Agen	су		
Constraints			
FZ1 over1 ha. See co	omments in main text of our response.		
LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
E	7		
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Flood Zone 1			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and December	7		
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			
There is a requirement features of special are	West Yorkshire Archives Service (to the east of this site) is a Gracht in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desiral chitectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, hose elements which contribute to the significance of this asset and	ability of preservir if allocated, any o	ng Listed Buildings or their setting or any
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
	· · -	_ = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	

CFSM049 Thomas Danby College, Roundahay Road, Leeds

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

Core Strategy	

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	55.75	
Nearest train station	Leeds City	
Nearest train station distance	(m)	2131.20
Nearest bus s	7548	
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	106.20

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	✓
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overden - Minerale Ceferovended	_
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	L
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

CFSM049 Thomas Danby College, Roundahay Road, Leeds

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Call for sites submission for residential, industry, warehousing and offices. Brownfield site within the main urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development or mixed use with residential on upper floors. Capacity is an estimate based on half SHLAA housing capacity to allow for mixed use scheme as no figure supplied by submitter.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - pollution. Minor negative - employment and economic growth. Significant positive - flood risk. Minor positive - access to leisure facilities, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. MISSING OBJECTIVES TO FILL IN

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

94 12 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Mixed use with housing

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Call for sites submission for residential, industry, warehousing and offices. Brownfield site within the main urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development or mixed use with residential.

Site Detai	ls							
Easting	430363	Northing	435310	Site area ha	1.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA I	nner Area				Ward	Chapel All	erton	
Site Chara	acteristic	s				·		
Site type B	Brownfield							
On-site land	uses							
Vacant land								
Wholesale di	stribution							
Neighbouring	g land uses							
Manufacturin	g and Who	olesale						
Wholesale di	stribution							
Other								
Other land us	ses							
car repair/gar	rages							
Topography	Sloping				Landscape	No Tree Cov	/er	
Boundaries	Existing v	vell defined			Road front	Yes		

Description

A large area of brownfield land with some newer sheds (to the South-West of the site) which are largely occupied. Adjacent to still active tannery and other commercial buildings. To northwest is Hilltop Works (ref 210) within similar characteristics.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescopee 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

125 Education Road - former Buslingthorpe Tannery, Sheepscar Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Unknown Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary 5 Access comments requires development of adjacent site for access 3 Local network comments (Assuming 716 capacity is a mistake) Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 4 Total score Mitigation measures requires development of adjacent site for suitable access on Buslingthorpe Lane 12 Highways site support 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 city centre / Aire Valley 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

FZ 2 & FZ 3 - bottom half of site (South) See comments in main text of our response.

Planning History	tory Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
09/05411/FU	Part demolition, change of use, including 5 storey extension and addition of new floor to roof of industrial building, to form 190 flats and erection of multi level development up to 9 storeys in 4 blocks, comprising 9 town houses and 150 flats, with shop, car parking and landscaping	W	100	
10/00378/CA	Conservation area application to demolish industrial buildings	W	100	
12/00982/CA	Conservation Area application for demolition of mill buildings	w	100	

|--|

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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	1.00	

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

ouror opatial Rolationomp	
LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station Le	eeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	2221.92
Nearest bus stop	13360
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	107.84
Agricultural classification Ur	ban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Majority is vacant cleared brownfield site suitable in principle for residential development.

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Primary Health

124 9 Yes Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Majority is vacant cleared brownfield site suitable in principle for residential development.

184 M621 Interchange Site, Holbeck

Site Detai	Site Details							
Easting	429976	Northing	432308	Site area ha	1.5	SP7	City Centre Infill	
HMCA I	nner Area				Ward	City and H	unslet	
Site Chara	acteristic	cs						
Site type	Greenfield							
On-site land	uses							
Vacant land								
Neighbouring land uses								
Office								
Transport tra	cks and wa	ays						
Other land uses - None								
Topography	Flat				Landscape			
Boundaries	Partially v	well-defined			Road front	No		
Description								

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

•		
Would development lead to/cons	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an i		
Is the site well connected to the	built up area?	
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier band the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

_		
Would development lead		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

Characteristics of Openhess and permanence						

184 M621 Interchange Site, Holbeck

SHLAA conclusions					
Availability: Unknow	vn	Suitability:	Unsuitable	Achievability: Uncertain	
Summary of infra	structure provider	comments			
LCC Highways Com	ments				
Public transport access	sibility comments				Rank (1-5)
Good accessibility					5
Access comments					1
Access must be from 6	existing Apex View				4
Local network commellocal congestion issues					
					4
Mitigation measures					Total score
					13
Highways site support					
yes					
Contingent on other si	tes				ı
Contingent on other si	ites				
Highways Agency					
Impact No material i	mpact Netv	vork Status	No objection		
•	ve impact in combination	n with other sites	s. If site still incl	uded at next sift assess as part of city centre / Aire Va	lley cluster.
Network Rail					
Yorkshire Water	1				
Treatment Works	Knostrop				
co-ordinated with Yor the site. The forthcor with YW's investment take into account avai	kshire Water's Asset Mar ming AMP(6) will run fron . It is particularly import lable sewerage and Ww	nagement Plans m April 2015 to I ant that sites wh TW capacity. If a	(AMP) to ensure March 2020. Pha nich represent a 1 n developer want:	evelopment that will connect to the public sewer system the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provising is one method used to ensure sites are brought for 0% or greater increase in population served by the work is to bring a site forward before YW have completed and the amount would be determined by a developer funder	ded to serve brward in line orks should by planned
Environment Agend	су				
Constraints					
FZ1 over 1 ha. See co	omments 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

Spatial relationships

App Number

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	100.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Proposal

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

Decision

% of site

Inner South RA	0 00	
	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.41
-----------------	------

184 M621 Interchange Site, Holbeck

Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	927.45
Nearest bus stop	4404
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	216.80
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	✓
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	led
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 10	0m

184 M621 Interchange Site, Holbeck

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Located immediately adjacent to major vehicle infrastructure (the road network) which would create negative amenity issues for a residential use i.e. noise and pollution. History of office and employment permissions on this site.

Site affects others?

No

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site and pollution. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health, leisure and greenspace, community participation, flood risk and transport network.

Summary of reps

Metro

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

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

47 8 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Located immediately adjacent to major vehicle infrastructure (the road network) which would create negative amenity issues for a residential use i.e. noise and pollution. History of office and employment permissions on this site. Not suitable.

188 St Marks Walk - St Marks Flats, Woodhouse

Site Details							
Easting	429390	Northing	435122	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Hyde Park	and Woodhouse

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITICIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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/		
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the 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

188	St Marks Walk - St Mark	S Flats, Wood	unouse		
SHLAA cond	lusions				
Availability	Short (=<5 yrs)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability:	Short (=<5yrs)
Summary	of infrastructure provider	comments			
Highways A		1.00			
Impact	Netv	work Status			
Network Ra	il				
Yorkshire V					
Treatment W	orks				
Environmen	nt Agency				
Constraints					
LCC					
Ecology supp	ort				
-					
Ecology boun	dary				
Education cor	nments				
EL 1511					
Flood Risk					
Utilities					
Gas					
Electric					
Fire and Resc	ue				
Telecoms					
Other					
English Herita	nge				
Natural Engla	nd				

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/04449/FU	Demolition of existing student accommodation and erection of student accommodation, comprising 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 storey's, with 526 student bed spaces, warden	Α	100

188 St Marks Walk - St Marks Flats, Woodhouse				
	accommodation, an energy centre and central reception building.			
13/9/00012/MOD	Demolition of existing student accommodation and erection of student accommodation, comprising 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 storey's, with 526 student bed spaces, warden accommodation, an energy centre and central reception building NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 11/04449/FU: Amending the retaining wall to the rear of block A & B; the hard standing area outside the energy centre to be increased; changing Block EF access road to red brick; several additional windows in the right hand side of elevation; slightly increase the feature brick elevations to blocks A,D,F,H & K; Rooftop plant rooms to blocks EF/GH & JK to be omitted; errors in the window patterns to be corrected; changing the third floor plant room in block H into a study bedroom and relocating the binstore from the ground floor of Block H to a new external brick and block binstore	M01	100	
10/00407/FU	Demolition of existing student flats and erect replacement multi storey student accommodation, comprising 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 storeys, with 526 student bed spaces, warden accommodation, an energy centre and central reception building with landscaping, amenity spaces and car parking areas.	Α	100	
13/00936/COND	Consent, agreement or approval of conditions 3, 4, 11, 12 and 24 of Planning Application 11/04449/FU		100	

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy	
	400.00

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	0.01	
Nearest train station		Burley Park
Nearest train station distance		1490.57
Nearest bus s	top	391
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	120.95

Agricultural classification Urban

188 St Marks Walk - St Marks Flats, Woodhouse

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	~
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	Ī
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	Ē
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	ſ
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	Ē
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	~
Occasion - Minamala Cafe annual al	, –
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

188 St Marks Walk - St Marks Flats, Woodhouse

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
ouotamaziiti ouminary	
C	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

197 Bridge Street, Gower Street, Regent Street (land at)

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	430735	Northing	433906	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and H	unslet
Site Cha	racteristic	cs					
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 unresticted 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 bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

197 Bridge Street, Gower Street, Regent Street (land at) **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Public Transport accessibility and standards for local services, scools and healthcare 5 Access comments Access from Gower Street 5 Local network comments Will require capacity improvements at Gower St / Regent St junction, some site frontage needed. 2 Total score Mitigation measures Gower St / regent St junction, pedestrian linkage improvements 12 Highways site support yes - with mitigation Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact No objection **Network Status** 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 Supported **Ecology support** Supported Ecology boundary **Education comments**

Flood Risk

197 Bridge Street, Gower Street, Regent Street (land at)

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/03344/ADV	Scaffold mounted illuminated banner sign	R	100

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy

% overlap

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	0.11	
Nearest train station	Leeds City	
Nearest train station distance (m)		1264.93
Nearest bus s	7166	
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	121.66

Agricultural classification Urban

197 Bridge Street, Gower Street, Regent Street (land at)

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

197 Bridge Street, Gower Street, Regent Street (land at)

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
ouotamaziiti ouminary	
C	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

198 Kirkstall Road - Yorkshire Chemicals Plc

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	428558	Northing	433700	Site area ha	5.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	City and Hu	inslet		

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the 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

Education comments

198 Kirkstall Road - Yorkshire Chemicals Plc **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Public Transport accessibility and standards for local services, primary schools and healthcare but not secondary schools 4 Access comments Access from Kirkstall Road would require signalised junction also access from Wellington Road 4 Local network comments Congestion on A65, Armley Gyratory and West St gyratory 3 Total score Mitigation measures Armley Gyratory and West St gyratory 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 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 Not supported **Ecology support** Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but is located within an important wildlife corridor between the River Aire and the canal (SEGI), together with protected species Otters and bats. Current industrial development acts as a barrier to this **Ecology boundary** Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas excluded and boundary substantially amended as per drawing RM/198. Mitigation will still be required to ensure indirect impacts on adjacent wildlife corridor habitat are addressed.

198 Kirkstall Road - Yorkshire Chemicals Plc 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

Spatial relationships

App Number

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	63.46	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.34	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Proposal

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	%
		70
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	✓	

Decision

% of site

overlap

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	21.78

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %		0.35
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)		1242.67
Nearest bus stop		8114
Nearest bus stop distance (m)		198.57

198 Kirkstall Road - Yorkshire Chemicals Plc

Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	✓
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	~
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	~
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overland Minerala Cofemina	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ea
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m 🗸

boundary.

198 Kirkstall Road - Yorkshire Chemicals Plc

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Preferred housing allocation with mixed uses	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
Site to be removed from the 'identified' list and instead included as a preferred site as part of the group of four sites making up a larger area	
to be masterplanned. Capacity is revised accordingly - 273 - recalculated based on CC density and halved to allow for mixed use - KH/LP/SS 19/11/14. Suitable for mixed use office development based on previous permission for 31000sqm of offices and close proximity to city cent	

Site Details							
Easting	428663	Northing	433276	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and Hu	unslet

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Transport tracks and ways

Storage

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is on the edge of the City centre to the North of the Armley Gyratory. It appers that the foundations of the previous employment use are present although this is over-grown with trees. Surrounded by other employment uses.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 settle	ements?
Do features provide bound	daries to contain the developm	ent?
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

201 Armley Road, Armley Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Unknown Suitability: Unsuitable Achievability: Uncertain Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Core Strategy standards close to city centre 5 Access comments Adequate frontage but high percentage commercial vehicles 3 Local network comments Possible cummulative impact but ok for 48 units 4 Total score Mitigation measures none 12 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **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.

cology support Supported Supported Supported
upported
cology boundary
70.0 g 20 a a
ducation comments
ood Risk
tilities
as
ectric
re and Rescue
elecoms
ther
nglish Heritage
atural England
lanning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site
pp Number Proposal Decision % of site
pp i territorio i i oposur Decisioni /0 01 311C

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

3		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	100.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1032.93
Nearest bus stop	11060
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	70.59
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is within an existing employment area. Not considered a suitable location for residential.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - pollution. Minor negative - employment and economic growth. Significant positive - brownfield site, greenhouse emissions, flood risk and accessibity. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure, community participation and transport network.

Summary of reps

Metro

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

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

Yes

39 22

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is within an existing employment area. Not considered a suitable location for residential.

206 East Street (78) - adjacent To Rose Wharf

Site Details							
Easting	431233	Northing	432792	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and Hu	unslet

Site Characteristics

Cita tuna	Dunitungfiald
Site type	Browniieid

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

206 East Street (78) - adjacent To Rose Wharf SHLAA conclusions Availability: Short (later) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Public Transport accessibility and standards for local services, schools and healthcare 5 Access comments Access to East Street requires minor amendment to existing arrangements 5 Local network comments Capacity available 5 Total score Mitigation measures May require lay-by on east St for deliveries (previous consent) 15 Highways site support Yes - with mitigation Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact No objection **Network Status** 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 Supported with mitigation **Ecology support** Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the river-side wildlife corridor. Otters and bats use this corridor . Ecology boundary **Education comments**

206 East Street (78) - adjacent To Rose Wharf

Flood Risk

Utilities
Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

English Heritage

Other

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	99.67	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	21.49
Aire Valley RA	100.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

0.00
Leeds City
14356
)

Agricultural classification Urban

206 East Street (78) - adjacent To Rose Wharf

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
verlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	V
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<u></u>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps willerals safeguarded	
verlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

206 East Street (78) - adjacent To Rose Wharf

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley allocation	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	

207 Lowfold, East Street

Site Details							
Easting	431359	Northing	432622	Site area ha	2.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area		Ward	City and Hu	unslet		

Site Characteristics

C!1 - 1	Brownfield
SITA TUNA	RECMUTICIO
JILC LYDC	DIOWITICIA

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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				
Does the site provide acces				
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs				
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?				
Site includes Grade 1, Grad				
Does the site contain buildings				
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?				
Encroachment Conclusion				

4. Preserve the 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

207	Lowfold, East Stree	t	
SHLAA con	clusions		
Availability	: Short (early)	Suitability: LDF to determine	Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)
Summary	of infrastructure pro	vider comments	
LCC Highw	ays Comments		
Public transp	oort accessibility comments		Rank (1-5
Meets Public	Transport accessibility and	standards for local services, schools and healthcar	re _
			5
Access to Fa		nendment to existing arrangements	
Access to La	st street requires minor an	endifient to existing arrangements	5
	k comments	et gyratory arrangements adjacent site access	
Some amend	ament required to East Sire	et gyratory arrangements adjacent site access	<u> </u>
Mitigation m	easures		Total scor
Some modes	st works, footbridge connec	tion to west side of river required to improve pede:	strian connectivity 15
			15
Highways sit	e support		
Yes - with m			
Contingent of	on other sites		
Contingent of	n other sites		
Highways	Agency		
Impact No	material impact	Network Status No objection	
Potential for	cumulative impact in comb	ination with other sites. If site still included at nex	xt sift assess as part of city centre/Aire Valley cluster.
Network R	ail		
Yorkshire \			
Treatment W	70FKS		
Environme	nt Agency		
Constraints			
LCC			
Ecology supp	oort Supported with r	nitigation	
Supported w	vith mitigation to protect an		nd bats use this corridor - otters recorded on site in the
river revetm	ent.		
Ecology bou	ndary		
Education co	amments		

Inner Area

207 Low	fold, East Street		
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Licotife			
Fire and Rescue			
	_		
Telecoms			
Other			
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	10.05	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy	

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

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	89.76
Aire Valley RA	100.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

7.63
Leeds City
1761.24
p 8533
n) 87.33

Agricultural classification Urban

207 Lowfold, East Street

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	V
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlans Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

Inner Area

207 Lowfold, East Street

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
<u> </u>	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley allocation	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	

208 Mabgate, Macaulay Street, Argyll Road (land between)

Site Details							
Easting	431032	Northing	434047	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	MCA Inner Area		Ward	City and Hu	inslet		

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site comprises of low rise industrial buildings and car parking between Macaulay St, Mabgate and Argyll Rd. Located just beyond the north west boundary of Leeds City Centre.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound	daries 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?	
Francisch was at Osmalius's a	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

208 Mabg	jate, Macaulay Stre	et, Argyll Road (land betw	een)	
	from assessment aga	inst all 4 purposes of green be ence	It and essential	
SHLAA conclusions	•			
Availability: Short ((early)	Suitability: Suitable	Achievability: Medium (6-1	Oyrs)
Summary of infra	astructure provide	comments		
LCC Highways Com				
Public transport acces				Rank (1-5
Meets Public Transpor	rt accessibility and stand	ards for local services, scools and h	nealthcare	
				5
Access comments				
Access from Mabgate	and Macauly St ok			
				5
Local network comme	ents			
	due to size of developme	nt.		
				4
Mitigation measures				Total score
Improvements to Reg	gent St junctions			
	· -			14
Highways site suppor				
Yes - with mitigation				
_				
Contingent on other s	sites			
Contingent on other s	citas			
Contingent on other s	ites			
Highways Agency				
Impact No material	impact Net	vork Status No objection		
	·	-	ded at next sift assess as part of city centre/Aire	e Valley cluster.
Network Rail				
Network Rail				
Vanladatas Wahan				
Yorkshire Water				
Treatment Works				
Environment Agen Constraints	су			
O I I S II A II I I S				
LCC	Cupported			
Ecology support Supported	Supported			
Juppoi icu				

208 Mabgate, Macaulay Street, Argyll Road (land 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.

Planning History	y Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
12/04953/EXT	Extension of time period for Outline application 08/01248/OT for approval of layout, scale and access for multi level mixed use development in 8 blocks comprising residential, retail, offices and leisure uses, with car parking and landscaping	Α	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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	100.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

208 Mabgate, Macaulay Street, Argyll Road (land between)

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership 9	% 0.00
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m	1589.30
Nearest bus sto	p 7818
Nearest bus stop distance (m	179.16
Agricultural classification	urban
Overlaps SSS	SI 🗌
Overlaps SEC	GI
Overlaps LN	A
Overlaps LN	IR
Overlaps Conservation Are	ea
Overlaps Listed Buildin	ng 🔲
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffe	er
Overlaps Public Right of Wa	ay
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zor	ne
Overlaps EA Flood Zor	ne 🗸
Overlaps HSE Major Hazar	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipelir	ne
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	on 🗸
Overlaps Minerals Safegua	rded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 1	00m ✓

208 Mabgate, Macaulay Street, Argyll Road (land between)

Conclusions
ssues and Options Summary
Suitable site close to the boundary with the city centre for mixed residential/office development.
Site affects others?
Sustainability summary
Summary of reps
Comments on phasing
DPP Allocation
dentified housing site with mixed uses
DPP Allocation Conclusion
Site close to the boundary of the city centre. Suitable for mixed office/residential development. Previous permission 08/01248/OT extende

210 Buslingthorpe Lane, Hill Top Works

Site Details							
Easting	430297	Northing	435437	Site area ha	1.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Chapel All	erton
Site Cha	racteristic	es					
Site type	Brownfield						
On-site lan	d uses						
Vacant buil	ding						
Other							
Storage							
Neighbouri	ng land uses	;					
Outdoor an	nenity and op	en space					
Manufactur	ring and Who	olesale					
Wholesale	distribution						
Derelict							
Other land	uses						
Car repair v	workshop						
Topograph	ny Sloping				Landscape I	No Tree Co	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

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

Description

Site is adjacent to site (125) Buslingthorpe Tannery and shares some of the same chatacteristics. It is derelict and no longer in use. A wall facing onto Buslingthorpe Lane shields the poor view.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 boun				
Coalescence Conclusion				

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

210 Buslingthorpe Lane, Hill Top Works

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features? Can development preserve this character? **Character Conclusion** Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments LCC Highways Comments Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary 5 Access comments Access possible from Buslingthorpe Lane 5 Local network comments Could be cumulative issues on High Street and J45 if other Boston Spa sites are taken forward. Winnow Lane is not suitable at 4 present and would need to be upgraded with at least one continuous footway and possible road widening. Total score Mitigation measures 14 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites 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 city centre/Aire Valley 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.

UDP Designations

210 Buslingthorpe Lane, Hill Top Works

Environment Agen	псу
Constraints	
FZ 2 & FZ 3 clips the	edges of the site. See comments in main text of our response
LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported - but whit	te-clawed Crayfish record in adjacent beck
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
I IOOU KISK	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
Other English Heritage	
English Heritage	
Natural England	
	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site
App Number	Proposal Decision % of site
Spatial relationship	ns

Core Strategy

210 Buslingthorpe Lane, Hill Top Works

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	1.00	
SCH. AHCIEHT WOH.	1.00	

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	4.11
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	2325.40
Nearest bus stop	4886
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	190.53
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<u></u>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

210 **Buslingthorpe Lane, Hill Top Works**

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site within urban area. Suitable for housing or employment in principle.

Site affects others?

No

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 education, health, leisure and greenspace, community participation

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service

provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these

sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Yes

Primary Health

9 182

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site within urban area. Suitable for housing or employment in principle.

Site Details							
Easting	429777	Northing	435844	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Chapel Alle	rton		

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	No

Description

Site is in a small industrial area on Meanwood Road. Opposite and adjacent to some resdiential and bounded to the rear by green open space.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound	daries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

Environment Agency

Part FZ 2 & FZ 3 - Main River to North Edge of site. See comments in main text of our response.

Constraints

211 Meanwood Road - rear of 338/374 Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Unavailable Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Good Accessibility all round 5 Access comments Poor access onto Meanwood Road, but site could access onto Cliffdale Road which is acceptable. 5 Local network comments possible cumulative impacts into town 4 Total score Mitigation measures Stop vehicular access onto Meanwood Road, access from Clifford Road, possible cumulative fund for congestion 14 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 city centre/Aire Valley 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.

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitigated Water Voles and Otter	ation to protect and enhance the beck-side wildlife corridor - minimum 10 metres from the beck. Bats, White-clawed Crayfish, rs to consider.
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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

% overlap

_			
Rea	ener	atior	n Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	1991.11
Nearest bus stop	6473
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	73.11
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<u></u>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Currently in employment use, but suitable for housing in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - employment and economic growth, ecology mitigation and flood risk. Significant positive - derelict brownfield site, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health, leisure and greenspace and community participation.

Summary of reps

Metro

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

66 13 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Agreed to retain as employment site as agreed with members.

Site Details								
Easting	428929	Northing	433905	Site area ha		0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	CA Inner Area					Ward	City and Hu	ınslet

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Office

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

T	opography	Sloping	Landscape	No Tree Cover
В	Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Site near to City Centre and Little Woodhouse. Adjacent to two large purpose built student housing blocks. Some residential to the North.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an i	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the	built up area?	
Would development round off the	e settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier b and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

_		
Would development lead	to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries 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 pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		

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

Supported

226 Burley Street (46) LS3 1DH

SHLAA conclusions	
Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)	
Summary of infrastructure provider comments	
LCC Highways Comments	
	ank (1-5)
Good Accessibility all round	5
Access comments	
Good access onto the adotped highway can be achieved	4
Local network comments Week sumulative impacts into town	
likely cumulative impacts into town	4
Mitigation measures To	tal score
Reduce parking provision, block access pass adjacent to building and concvert to cycle/ped link, create flats	13
Highways site support Yes	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	
Highways Agency	
Impact No material impact Network Status No objection	
n/a Network Rail	
Yorkshire Water	
Treatment Works Knostrop	
Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system need co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to 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 with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works stake into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any plai improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasitudy.	serve d in line hould nned
Environment Agency	
Constraints	
FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.	
LCC Ecology support Supported	

Ecology boundary
Education comments
Flood Risk
Utilities
Gas
Electric
Fire and Rescue
Telecoms
relections
Other
English Heritage
Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/03735/FU	Student residential accommodation building comprising 113 studio flats, including ancillary communal facilities and retail unit, associated landscaping and car parking		100
13/05294/FU	Site boundary treatment	Α	100

Overlaps Urban Extension

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	100.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	

~

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1045.14
Nearest bus stop	6306
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	48.59
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

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

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

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

23 Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

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

Site Details							
Easting	428991	Northing	433737	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	City Centre Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and Hu	unslet
Site Characteristics							
Site type Brownfield							

Shops

On-site land uses

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Amusement and show places

Car Parks

Office

Other land uses - None

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

Description

On the edge of the City Centre. The site is now a Car Showroom.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound			
Coalescence Conclusion			

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

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

SHLAA conclusions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments

Public transport accessibility comments

Public Transport Core Strategy standards met schools/health, some local services distant but close to city centre

5

Access comments

Current access through shared car park, no adopted frontage

3

Local network comments

Local congestion/cumulative impact?

3

Mitigation measures

Unknown at this stage

Total score

Highways site support

yes with mitigation

Contingent on other sites

no

Contingent on other sites

no

Highways Agency

Impact No material impact Network Status No objection

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

FZ3 (ii) as shown on LCC SFRA - recommendation that no 'more vulnerable use' be permitted in FZ3a (ii) See comments in main text of our response.

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
11000 KISK	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
The distance state	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
English Horitage	
Natural England	

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/03834/FU	Access ramp and disabled parking bay to casino	W	100
12/01491/ADV	1 illuminated sign to casino and restaurant	Α	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

ODI 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	100.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		

Core Strategy

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

Regenera	tion Areas
----------	------------

Inner 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	ip
LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	888.76
Nearest bus stop	12811
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	160.46
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Currently in employment use. Residential area adjacent. Suitable in principle for residential or mixed use.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - pollution. Minor negative - employment and economic growth. Significant positive - brownfield site, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibity. Minor positive - access to health and leisure, community participation

Summary of reps

Metro

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

52 10 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Members agreed with this Officer suggestion that this site is unlikely to come forward for residential as it is now a car showroom.

232 Kirkstall Road - Maxis Restaurant site

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	428958	Northing	433780	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	City Centre Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and Hu	ınslet

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Restaurants and Cafes

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Amusement and show places

Office

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site adjacent to new Car Showrrom. Currrntly has use for a restaurant.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 t	o physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries 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

232 Kirkstall Road - Maxis Restaurant site

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

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

LCC Highways Comments Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Public Transport Core Strategy standards met schools/health, some local services distant but close to city centre 5 Access comments Suitable access 5 Local network comments Local congestion/cumulative impact? 3 Total score Mitigation measures Unknown at this stage 13 Highways site support yes with mitigation Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no

Highways Agency

 Impact
 No material impact
 Network Status
 No objection

 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

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

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ3 and part 3a (ii). See comments in main text of our response

Inner Area

232 Kirkstall Road - Maxis Restaurant site

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
	-
	1
Other English Heritage	
English Heritage	
Natural England]
Natural England	

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
13/01198/OT	Outline application for demolition of the existing building and construction of mixed use development consisting of office, hotel and use classes A1, A2 & A3 floorspace and basement car parking	A	100	
09/02339/OT	Outline application for part 7 part 9 storey mixed use development (A1, A3, B1 use) and associated parking	R	97	

Spatial relationships	
UDP Designations	Core Strategy

232 Kirkstall Road - Maxis Restaurant site

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	100.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

Regeneration Areas

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

<u>-</u>	-
LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	940.74
Nearest bus stop	5725
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	125.60
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	m

232 Kirkstall Road - Maxis Restaurant site

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Outline application granted for office, hotel and retail (13/01198/OT). Currently in employment use, but in a mixed use area and suitable in principle for residential development.

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 education and leisure, community participation.

Summary of reps

Metro

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

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

Primary Health

82 10 Yes

Yes

Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Memners agreed with Officer recommendation that this is not likely to be available as has planning permission.

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	431378	Northing	429515	Site area ha	2.2		SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Ward Middleton Park		Park

Site Characteristics

Site type Mix 50:50

On-site land uses

Outdoor sport facility

Education

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor sport facility

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is now largely green area with two games area pitches (MUGA). To the north of the site is a youth hub. Part of the site is in N6.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

•		
Would development lead to/const	itue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an isolated development?		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the	e settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead t		
Do features provide bound	daries 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

Constraints

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

252 Belle Isle Road - Merlyn Rees High School Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 50% health, 100% secondary 4 Access comments Access possible from Middelton Road 5 Local network comments spare local network capacity and suitable network 5 Total score Mitigation measures 14 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency**

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			
3			
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	Designa	tions

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

LCC ownership %	100.00
Nearest train station	Cottingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	4032.27
Nearest bus stop	7469
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	95.97
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site within urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development. Half of the site is designated as a protected playing pitch (N6) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N6 greenspace. Minor negative - part greenfield/brownfield site. Minor positive - access to education, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Metro

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

124 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The dwelling figure represents a reduction in developable area due to boundary redraw. Site is suitable for housing.

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	434181	Northing	433506	Site area ha	1.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area	1101 annig	100000	Sito di od fid	Ward	Temple Ne		
Site Cha	racteristi	cs						
Site type	Greenfield							
On-site land	d uses							
Vacant land	d							
Neighbouri	ng land uses	S						
Education	-							
Outdoor sp								
Indoor spor	t facility							
Dwellings								
Outdoor arr	nenity and op	pen space						
Other land	uses - None	:						
_	O					I –		
Topograph					Landscape	Limited Tree	Cover	
Boundarie	s Partially	well-defined			Road front	Yes		
Description								
Site is over	grown Brow	nfield land a	adjacent to r	esidential to the	north and so	me green am	enity space across the adjacent road.	
SHLAA co	nclusions							
Availabilit	y: Short (ea	arly)		Suitability:	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)	
Summar	y of infra	structure	provider	comments				
111-1								
Highways	Agency			1.01.1				
Impact			Netw	ork Status				
Network	Rail							
Yorkshire	Water							
Treatment								
	ent Agenc	у						
Constraints								
LCC								
Ecology su	oport							
Ecology bo	undary							
Leology DO	uriuai y							
	1							
Education of	comments							
Flood Risk								

Utilities	
Gas	
Cus	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	9
T-1	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	ie.
Lingiisii riciitage	
Natural England	b

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/02572/FU	Erection of 44 dwellings and associated works	Α	100
14/05552/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19 and 21 of Planning Application 13/02572/FU		100

Overlaps Urban Extension

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	

~

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	
,		

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2303.75
Nearest bus stop	6381
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	164.30

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

Overlaps SSSI	
010.1apo 000.	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	\Box
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	d
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100n	n [

onclusions	
sues and Options Summary	
te affects others?	
istainability summary	
immary of reps	
omments on phasing	
PP Allocation	
entified housing site	
PP Allocation Conclusion	
lit site - see 13/02572	

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	434132	Northing	433380	Site area ha	1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area	J			Ward	Temple Ne		
						'		
Site Cha	racteristi	cs						
Site type	Brownfield							
On-site lan	d uses							
Vacant land								
Vacant buil	ding							
	ng land uses							
	nenity and op	en space						
Outdoor sp								
Indoor spor	t facility							
Education								
Dwellings								
Other land	uses - None							
Topograph	ny Flat				Landscape	Limited Tree	Cover	
Boundarie	es Existing v	well defined			Road front	Yes		
Description Site is a co		f some over	grown brow	nfield land (whic	ch appears to	be used as ar	n informal car park and a disused	eisure centre.
SHLAA co	nclusions							
Availabili	ty: Short (ea	arly)		Suitability:	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	-<5yrs)
			provider	Suitability:	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	:<5yrs)
Summar	y of infra		provider		Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	-<5yrs)
Summar	y of infra			comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	-<5yrs)
Summar	y of infra				Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	:<5yrs)
Summar Highways Impact	y of infra			comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	-<5yrs)
Summar	y of infra			comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	:<5yrs)
Summar Highways Impact Network	y of infras s Agency Rail			comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	-<5yrs)
Highways Impact Network Yorkshire	y of infras s Agency Rail			comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	:<5yrs)
Summar Highways Impact Network	y of infras s Agency Rail			comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	:<5yrs)
Highways Impact Network Yorkshire Treatment	y of infras s Agency Rail	structure		comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	:<5yrs)
Highways Impact Network Yorkshire Treatment	y of infras s Agency Rail Water Works	structure		comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	-<5yrs)
Highways Impact Network Yorkshire Treatment	y of infras s Agency Rail Water Works	structure		comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	-<5yrs)
Highways Impact Network Yorkshire Treatment	y of infras s Agency Rail Water Works	structure		comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	<5yrs)
Highways Impact Network Yorkshire Treatment Environm Constraints	y of infras s Agency Rail Water Works	structure		comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	-<5yrs)
Highways Impact Network Yorkshire Treatment Environm Constraints	y of infras s Agency Rail Water Works	structure		comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	-<5yrs)
Highways Impact Network Yorkshire Treatment Environm Constraints	y of infrasta	structure		comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	<5yrs)
Highways Impact Network Yorkshire Treatment Environm Constraints LCC Ecology su	y of infrasta	structure		comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	-<5yrs)
Highways Impact Network Yorkshire Treatment Environm Constraints LCC Ecology su	y of infras s Agency Rail Water Works Pent Agency	structure		comments	Suitable		Achievability: Short (=	-<5yrs)

259B Cartmell Drive, Whitebridge Primary School, Halton Moor 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** % of site **Proposal** Decision

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	

0.00

Overlaps Urban Extension Regeneration Areas

Minor Settlement

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	

LCC ownership %				
(Cross Gates			
Nearest train station distance (m)				
Nearest bus stop				
(m)	109.08			
	(m)			

Agricultural classification	Hrhan
Agricultural classification	Ulbali

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

Conclusions	
ssues and Options Summary	
ite affects others?	
ustainability summary	
ummary of reps	
omments on phasing	
PP Allocation	
ot proposed as housing allocation	
PP Allocation Conclusion	
plit site - part B is required for school so not allocated	

Easting 429255 Northing 437036 Site area ha 2.6 SP7 Main Urban Area Infill HMCA Inner Area, North Leeds Ward Chapel Allerton	Site Details							
HMCA Inner Area, North Leeds Ward Chapel Allerton	Easting	429255	Northing	437036	Site area ha	2.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
	HMCA	Inner Area, North Leeds			Ward	Chapel Alle	rton	

Site Characteristics

Site type Mix 50:50

On-site land uses

Other

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses

Demolished school and playing fields

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

Description

Site is in the middle of of a residential area. Part of the site is N6 and the area seems to function as amenity space. The site also has a MUGA area within it.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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

•	3	5 5		
Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?				
Do features provide bound	daries to contain the	development?		
Coalescence Conclusion				

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

3	,	
Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain build		
Are these buildings used for		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

3	
Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	

Character Conclusion

262 Beckhill Approach, Miles Hill Primary School, Meanwood Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary 5 Access comments site frontage with Beckhill Approach should provide visibility 5 Local network comments Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 4 Total score Mitigation measures 14 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints

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

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
riodd Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
E: 15	1		
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			J
Other			
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	Desi	ignat	ions

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	7.03	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	56.94	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

LCC ownership %	99.83
Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	2300.15
Nearest bus stop	12755
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	120.22
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overland CCCI	
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Vacant land. Sport England have agreed the principle of remodelling playing pitch land, planning brief being produced, so residential development considered acceptable in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N6 greenspace. Minor negative - part greenfield/brownfield. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities, community participation, flood risk and energy and natural resources.

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

124 8 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Vacant land. Sport England have agreed the principle of remodelling playing pitch land, planning brief being produced, so residential development considered acceptable in principle.

Site Details							
Easting	429487	Northing	436686	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Chapel Alle	erton

Site Characteristics

Site type Mix 50:50

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

An area of land to the east of a park area to the North of Potternewton Lane. Apart fromt eh park area the site is almost enitely surrounded by residential. The state of the land appears to have no amenity value.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
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?	
Francisch was at Osmalius's a	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

263 Beckhill Grove - former Hill Top Public House, Meanwood Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Good accessibility 5 Access comments Adequate frontage 5 Local network comments Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 4 **Total score** Mitigation measures 14 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints

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

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other			
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	44.22	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	

Proposed Local Centre

N1 Greenspace	44.22
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00

Overlaps N37 SLA	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

0.00

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

LCC ownership %	100.00					
Nearest train station	Burley Park					
Nearest train station distance (m)	2189.36					
Nearest bus stop	5463					
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	122.57					
Agricultural classification	Urban					
Overlaps SSSI						
Overlaps SEGI						
Overlaps LNA						
Overlaps LNR						
Overlaps Conservation Area						
Overlaps Listed Building						
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer						
Overlaps Public Right of Way						
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone						
Overlaps EA Flood Zone						
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard						
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline						
Overlaps Pot. Contamination						
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed					
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m					

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Majority brownfield, vacant site, redevelopment will aid the regeneration of Beckhill Estate. Suitable for residential.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

72 6 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Majority brownfield, vacant site, redevelopment will aid the regeneration of Beckhill Estate. Suitable for residential.

Site Details								
Easting	431188	Northing	435059	Site area ha	1.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Chapel Alle	rton			

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Office

Vacant building

Car Parks

Neighbouring land uses

Medical and Health care services

Outdoor amenity and open space

Wholesale distribution

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is on the South western edge of Harehills. It is a mixture of overgrown Brownfield land and derelict buildings. However, a few of the buildings (Council Owned) are occupied.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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	ould development lead to physical connection of settlements?				
Do features provide bound					
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

264 Roundhay Road (79)/Barrack Road Area Offices etc. Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary 5 Access comments access achievable 5 Local network comments Local congestion issues 3 **Total score** Mitigation measures none identified 13 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ 2 & FZ 3 small part to south of the site. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
riodd Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
E: 15	1		
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			J
Other			
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

		1
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		

Sch. Ancient Mon.

0.00

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

LCC ownership %	99.97
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	2392.98
Nearest bus stop	13594
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	76.26
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Planning statement in progress. Whole site soon to be vacant. Mixed use potential.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Primary Health

75 12 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site required for school provision. Not available for residential.

Site Details							
Easting	432299	Northing	434799	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Gipton and	Harehills

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Shops

Manufacturing and Wholesale

General

Other land uses - None

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

Description

A large bownfield site in middle of Harehills. The site was a pub. Site has been subject to considerable regeration involvement. Also some attempts to regenerate the land have revolved around the concepts of viability.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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			
Do features provide boun			
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	

Character Conclusion

278 Compton Road - Compton Arms, Burmantofts LS9 7B Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary 5 Access comments access achievable 5 Local network comments Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 4 **Total score** Mitigation measures none identified 14 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			
3			
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	Desi	ıana	itions	S

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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	100.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

LCC ownership %	0.01
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	3062.69
Nearest bus stop	2954
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	77.43
Agricultural classification	Jrban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Cleared former pub site, although some trees have grown to the rear. Within mixed use area and frontage of site is within the town centre. Suitable for retail, offices, community uses and residential in principle. Application from 2008 for retail and flats still pending due to issues of overdevelopment and viability.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

56 20 Yes Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing with mixed uses (no employment)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Cleared former pub site, although some trees have grown to the rear. Within mixed use area and frontage of site is within the town centre. Suitable for retail, offices, community uses and residential in principle.

279 Church Road - St Marys Church and Presbytery, Richmond Hill

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	431318	Northing	433177	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Burmantoft	s and Richmond Hill
	'					<u> </u>	
Site Cha	racteristic	cs					
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 unresticted 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		
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/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

Natural England

279 Church Road - St Marys Church and Presbytery, Richmond Hill SHLAA conclusions

SHLAA COHCIUSIONS			
Availability: Short (e	arly) Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)
Summary of infra	structure provider comments		
Highways Agency			
Impact	Network Status		
	·		
Network Rail			
Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works			
Environment Agenc	у		
Constraints			
LCC			
Ecology support			
03 11			
F			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site					
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site			
11/01019/EXT	Extension of time application 07/05804/LI for Listed building application to demolish presbytery, part demolish, restore and add 7 storey extension to church to form 62 flats and	Α	100			

279 Chi	hurch Road - St Marys Church and Presbytery, Richmond Hill					
	erect 5 storey block of 109 flats, with car parking and landscaping					
11/01021/EXT	Extension of time application 07/05805/FU for change of use, part demolition, restoration and 7 floor extension to church to form 62 flats and erection of 5 storey block of 109 flats, with car parking and landscaping	Α	100			

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.01	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration	Λ
Regeneration	Areas
regerier atter	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

0.00	LCC ownership %			
Leeds City	Nearest train station			
1626.21	Nearest train station distance (m)			
9561	Nearest bus stop			
181.83	Nearest bus stop distance (m)			
Urban	Agricultural classification			
	Overlaps SSSI			
	Overlaps SEGI			
	Overlaps LNA			
	Overlaps LNR			
	Overlaps Conservation Area			
✓	Overlaps Listed Building			
✓	Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer			
✓	Overlaps Public Right of Way			
1				

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination

279 Church Road - St Marys Church and Presbytery, Richmond Hill

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	431136	Northing	434085	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward Burmantofts and Richmond Hill		s and Richmond Hill	

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vehicle Storage

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Office

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is partially occupied but under-developed. Some residential to the East and South east of the site. Also adjacent to a light industral area to the west.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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

•	5 5 5				
Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?					
Do features provide bound	pment?				
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

285 Macaulay Street - former Garage Site, Burmantofts Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary 5 Access comments access achievable 5 Local network comments Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 4 Total score Mitigation measures none identified 14 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints

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

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other			
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	

our besignations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.04	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

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	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1697.59
Nearest bus stop	2524
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	97.95
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<u></u>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed 🗸
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m 🗸

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site suitable for residential development in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Primary Health

96 6 Yes Yes Yes

C3 1C.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Bownfield site in urban area suitable for development.

301 Upper Accommodation Road, LS9

Site Details								
Easting	431458	Northing	433301	Site area ha		0.4	SP7	City Centre Infill
HMCA	City Centre, Inner Area				Ward	Burmantoft	s and Richmond Hill	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITICIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

_	
Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/const	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an is	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the I	ouilt up area?	
Would development round off the	e settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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 acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote	cted woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	e 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildi	ngs	
Are these buildings used fo	r agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion		

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

301 Upper Accommodation Road, LS9 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Public Transport accessibility and standards for local services, schools and healthcare 5 Access comments Access from Upper Accommodation Road ok 5 Local network comments Capacity available 5 Total score Mitigation measures possible crossing 15 Highways site support Yes - with mitigation Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Supported Ecology support Supported Ecology boundary **Education comments**

Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Other English Heritage Natural England Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

Spatial relationships

App Number

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

Proposal

Core Strategy	

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

% of site

% overlap

Decision

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	100.00
Aire Valley RA	100.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

0.00
Leeds City
1768.78
9561
33.31

Agricultural classification Urban

301 Upper Accommodation Road, LS9

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlans Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

301 Upper Accommodation Road, LS9

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
<u> </u>	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley allocation	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	

331 South Accommodation Road and Atkinson Street

Site Details							
Easting	431344	Northing	432292	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and Hu	ınslet

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ntion
DCJGII	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

331 South Accommodation Road and Atkinson Street **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (later) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **Highways Agency** Impact **Network Status Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary **Education comments** Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England **Planning History** Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site **App Number Proposal** Decision % of site

331

Spatial relationships

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

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

% overlap

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	% 2.69
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (r	n) 1881.30
Nearest bus sto	op 9167
Nearest bus stop distance (r	n) 88.43
Agricultural classification	on Urban
Overlaps SS	SI
Overlaps SE	GI
Overlaps LN	NA
Overlaps LN	NR
Overlaps Conservation Ar	ea
Overlaps Listed Buildin	ng 🗌
Overlaps Strat. Employment buff	er 🗸
Overlaps Public Right of W	ay
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zo	ne 🗸
Overlaps EA Flood Zo	ne 🗸
Overlaps HSE Major Haza	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeli	ne
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	on 🗸
Overlaps Minerals Safegua	arded

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

331 South Accommodation Road and Atkinson Street

Conclusions		
Issues and Options Summary		
Site affects others?		-
Sustainability summary		
Summary of reps		1
Comments on phasing		
DPP Allocation		
Aire Valley Not proposed as housing a	llocation	
DPP Allocation Conclusion		

340 Church Street (former motor dealers premises), Hunslet

Site Details								
Easting	430942	Northing	431311	Site area ha	1.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and Hu	inslet	
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 unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence $\frac{1}{2}$

340 Church Street (former motor dealers premises), Hunslet **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) Good accessibility 5 Access comments Existing access onto Balm Road suitable for level of development 5 Local network comments Small sclae development unlikely to have major impacts 5 Total score Mitigation measures 15 Highways site support Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact No objection **Network Status** 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 Supported Ecology support Supported Ecology boundary **Education comments**

340 Church Street (former motor dealers premises), Hunslet 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

Spatial relationships

App Number

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

Proposal

Core Strategy	

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

Decision

% of site

% overlap

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	% 0.00
No see at the least of the last	1 1 - 0!4
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (r	m) 2258.08
Nearest bus st	op 5536
Nearest bus stop distance (r	m) 55.04

Agricultural	classification	Urban

340 Church Street (former motor dealers premises), Hunslet

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	~
Overland Minerals Safaguarde	7
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100n	n

340 Church Street (former motor dealers premises), Hunslet

Conclusions		
Issues and Options Summary		
Site affects others?		-
Sustainability summary		
Summary of reps		1
Comments on phasing		
DPP Allocation		
Aire Valley Not proposed as housing a	llocation	
DPP Allocation Conclusion		

342 Low Road - Hemingway House, Hunslet LS10 2PR

Site Details							
Easting	431413	Northing	431556	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	City and Hu	unslet		
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	1		

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons		
Would development result in an i		
Is the site well connected to the		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	ı	
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/i	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used for		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the 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

342 Low Road - Hemingway House, Hunslet LS10 2PR **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) 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		
09/04961/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 10, 22, 23 and 24 of Planning Application 08/06530/FU	SPL	100		

342 Low Road - Hemingway House, Hunslet LS10 2PR					
09/9/00225/MOD	Demolish existing care home and erect care homeNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: PLANT ROOM MOVED TO THE GROUND FLOOR. REAR SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION HAS BEEN REDUCED IN FOOTPRINT, FLATS HAVE BEEN HANDED TO ENSURE LIVING ROOMS AND BEDROOMS ARE BACK TO BACK.	M01	100		
10/04017/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3 and 19 of Planning Application 08/06530/FU	Α	100		
10/9/00037/MOD	Demolish existing care home and erect care homeNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Brick built external meter housing to be replaced with GRP enclosures.	M01	100		
10/00018/COND	06/00857/‡Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 5, 10, 11 and 17 of Planning Application 08/06530/FU	A	100		

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00
N34 PAS	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.00
N1 Greenspace	0.00
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00

Core Strategy

% overlap

0.00

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

% overlap

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

Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon.

LCC ownersnip	100.00	
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance	2373.95	
Nearest bus s	top	8196
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	69.26

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	

Inner Area	1
------------	---

342	Low Road - Hemingw	vay House, Hunslet LS10 2PR
	Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Over	laps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

342 Low Road - Hemingway House, Hunslet LS10 2PR

onclusions
sues and Options Summary
te affects others?
ustainability summary
ummary of reps
omments on phasing
PP Allocation
re Valley Not proposed as housing allocation
PP Allocation Conclusion

370 Cambridge Road - Blenheim Middle School (land south of)

Site Details								
Easting	429966	Northing	435232	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area			Ward	Hyde Park	and Woodhouse		

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Medical and Health care services

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is an area of N1 greenspace. To the north is a school with residential to the south on the other side of the adjacent road.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 t	to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries 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 pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		

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

370 Cambridge Road - Blenheim Middle School (land south of)

SHLAA conclusions				
Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: Uncertain	
Summary of infrastructure provi	ider comments			
LCC Highways Comments				
Public transport accessibility comments				Rank (1-5)
Good Accessibility all round				5
Access comments				
Good frontage to Cambridge Road				5
Local network comments				
possible cumulative impacts into town				4
Mitigation measures				Total score
Parking restrictions on access, possible cu	mulative congestion	fund		14
Highways site support				
Yes				
Contingent on other sites				
Contingent on other sites				
Highways Agency				
	Network Status	No objection		
n/a				
Network Rail				
Yorkshire Water				
Treatment Works Knostrop				
co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will rur with YW's investment. It is particularly im take into account available sewerage and	t Management Plans n from April 2015 to nportant that sites wh WwTW capacity. If a	(AMP) to ensure the ne March 2020. Phasing is hich represent a 10% or a developer wants to bri	ment that will connect to the public sewer system cessary infrastructure and capacity can be provi- one method used to ensure sites are brought for greater increase in population served by the wo- ng a site forward before YW have completed ar- bunt would be determined by a developer funde	ded to serve brward in line brks should by planned
Environment Agency				
Constraints FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main t	ext of our response.			
LCC Supported				1
Ecology support Supported Supported				

370 Cambridge Road - Blenheim Middle School (land south of) 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

% of site **App Number Proposal** Decision

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	80.17	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.10
-----------------	------

370 Cambridge Road - Blenheim Middle School (land south of)

Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	2058.70
Nearest bus stop	14272
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	120.22
A	
Agricultural classification	Urban
	1 —
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlana Minarala Cafazzara	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	0m

370 Cambridge Road - Blenheim Middle School (land south of)

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The majority of the site is designated greenspace (N1) in the existing UDP, and links in with a wider greenspace area. Part of the site has a car park for adjacent industry. Mature trees and footpaths across site. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N1 greenspace and greenfield site. Minor negative- landscape. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities, community participation and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Metro

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required

but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

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

72 13 Yes

Yes Yes

Anti

Important green space in a densely built-up area.

All greenspace in inner-city areas of Leeds needs the fullest protection possible, for the future health of the residents of Leeds. Sports sites are especially important given the health problems, including child obesity, in inner-city Leeds.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The majority of the site is designated greenspace (N1) in the existing UDP, and links in with a wider greenspace area. Part of the site has a car park for adjacent industry. Mature trees and footpaths across site. Not suitable.

379 Runswick Place LS11

Easting 429086 Northing 432008 Site area ha 0.7 SP7 Main Urban Area Infill							
	Easting	429086 Northi	g 432008	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area Ward Beeston and Holbeck	HMCA I	Inner Area			Ward	Beeston an	d Holbeck

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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

2. Frevent neighbouring terms neighing	
Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	

Coalescence Conclusion

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

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

379 Runswick Place LS11

SHLAA conclusions					
Availability: Short (=	=<5 yrs)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability: Short (=<	ōyrs)
Summary of infra	structure prov	vider comments			
LCC Highways Com	ments				
Public transport access					Rank (1-5)
4buses per hour, 1009	6 primary, 100% h	nealth, 0% secondary			
					4
Access comments					
access achievable					5
Local network commer spare local network ca		network			O
Mitigation measures					Total score
iviitigation measures					9
Highways site support yes					
Contingent on other si	tes				
Contingent on other si	tes				
Highways Agency Impact No material i	maget	Notivork Status	No objection		
Impact No material i	Праст	Network Status	No objection		
Network Rail					
Yorkshire Water					
Treatment Works	Knostrop				
co-ordinated with York the site. The forthcon with YW's investment take into account avai	kshire Water's Asse ning AMP(6) will ru It is particularly ir lable sewerage and	et Management Plans in from April 2015 to I mportant that sites wh d WwTW capacity. If a	(AMP) to ensure tl March 2020. Phasi nich represent a 10 a developer wants	velopment that will connect to the public sewence necessary infrastructure and capacity can be not not one method used to ensure sites are brown or greater increase in population served by to bring a site forward before YW have complete amount would be determined by a developed	pe provided to serve bught forward in line y the works should leted any planned
Environment Agend	; у				
Constraints FZ1 under 1 ha. See of	comments in main	text of our response			
	1	5. 5di 165pori56.			
LCC					
Ecology support	Supported				
Supported					

Inner Area

Natural England

IIIIICI AIC	54
379	Runswick Place LS11
Ecology bo	oundary
Education	comments
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
public high building pr	Gas Networks owns and operates a high pressure pipeline which runs along the south side of Brown Lane East. As this pipeline is in nway there will be no easement. The Institution of Gas Engineers and Managers document TD1 Edition 5 recommends a minimum oximity distance to normally occupied properties of 14m. However, at this particular location the pipeline is laid in heavy wall pipe which is distance down to 7m.
Electric	
Fire and Re	escue
Telecoms	
Other	
English He	ritage

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/9/00172/MOD	24 houses and one block of 18 flats NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 13/00760/FU: Introduction of 600mm step between finished levels to plots 17/18 and a 900mm step to block of flats	M01	100
14/9/00045/MOD	24 houses and one block of 18 flats NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 13/00760/FU: Use of Juliet balconies to 4 flats in lieu of walk on balconiesAddition of roof window to House Type E.	M01	100
09/05132/DEM	Determination application for demolition of back to back houses	ANR	100
13/00760/FU	24 houses and one block of 18 flats	Α	100
14/00959/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 17 and 20 of Planning Application 13/00760/FU	SPL	100
13/04452/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17 and 28 of Planning Application 13/00760/FU		100

Spatial relationships		
UDP Designations	Core Strategy	

379 Runswick Place LS11

% overlap

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	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

	_
LCC ownership %	71.97
Nearest train station L	eeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1329.50
Nearest bus stop	2906
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	62.98
Agricultural classification Ur	ban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	✓
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

379 Runswick Place LS11

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brown field site in urban area. Suitable for housing in principle. Planning application for 23 houses and one block of 18 flats (13/00760/FU) submitted by Unity housing, decision pending.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

57 6 Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brown field site in urban area. Suitable for housing in principle.

381 Beverleys LS11 6DS

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	429862	Northing	431237	Site area ha	1.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and Hu	ınslet

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an i	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the	built up area?	
Would development round off the	e settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier b and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries 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 acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote	cted woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	e 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildi	ngs	
Are these buildings used fo	r agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

381 Beverleys LS11 6DS **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status Network Rail **Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/9/00054/MOD	Housing development of 55 dwellings comprising 26 three bedroom 19 four bedroom and 10 two bedroom houses with public open space: NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT	M01	84

Inner Area

381 Beve	erleys LS11 6DS			
	Revision to parking spaces and access			
09/02911/LA	Demolition of dwellings		78	
10/00930/FU	Housing development of 55 dwellings comprising 26 three bedroom 19 four bedroom and 10 two bedroom houses with public open space	Α	84	
11/9/00144/MOD	Housing development of 55 dwellings comprising 26 three bedroom 19 four bedroom and 10 two bedroom houses with public open space NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 10/00930/FU 600mm margin to Beverley Mews, gates repositioned to Beverley Square	M01	84	
12/9/00030/MOD	Housing development of 55 dwellings comprising 26 three bedroom 19 four bedroom and 10 two bedroom houses with public open space NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 10/00930/FU: Change of specification for slate-effect roofing tile; change of specification of rainwater goods	M01	84	
12/9/00144/MOD	Housing development of 55 dwellings comprising 26 three bedroom 19 four bedroom and 10 two bedroom houses with public open space NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 10/00930/FU: Omission of all trees to streets; change to entrance canopy design	M01	84	
11/01145/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 22 of Planning Application 10/00930/FU	SPL	84	
11/03174/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 15 and 16 of Planning Application 10/00930/FU	Α	84	

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.84	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

%	85.64
	Leeds City
m)	1961.05
ор	3334
m)	233.35
	m) op

Agricultural classification Urban

381 Beverleys LS11 6DS

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	\Box
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	Ē
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	ea
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	m

381 Beverleys LS11 6DS

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamazinty ourinnary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

383 Beckhill Garth/Approach

Site Details							
Easting	429149	Northing	436892	Site area ha	2.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area, North Leeds			Ward	Chapel Alle	erton		

Site Characteristics

C!t - t	Brownfield
NITA TVINA	RECMUTION
JILC LYPC	DIOWINCIA

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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	
Do features provide bound	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary			
Does the site provide acces			
Does the site include local/			
Areas of protected/unprote			
Site includes Grade 1, Grad			
Does the site contain buildings			
Are these buildings used fo			
Encroachment Conclusion			

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Inner Area

383 Beckhill Garth/Approach **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009 covering more than 50% of the site

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
10/02224/LA	Outline application for residential development comprising of 34 C3 (Residential Units) and 45 C2 (Residential institutions)	Α	99	

Beckhill Garth/Approach

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	%
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	38.21	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

overlap

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership % 99.97

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance ((m) 2121.08
Nearest bus s	top 5608
Nearest bus stop distance ((m) 114.08

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	\Box
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overder - Misservel - Cofe-	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlans Minerals Safeguarded 100m

383 Beckhill Garth/Approach

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamazinty ourinnary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

398 East Street/Ellerby Road LS9

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	431180	Northing	432975	Site area ha		0.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA City Centre, Inner Area			Ward	Burmantoft	s and Richmond Hill			

Site Characteristics

Cita tuma	Greenfield
7116 LVD6	(3) 660 (16) (1
Oito typo	O CO III CIA

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?			
Do features provide bound			
Coalescence Conclusion			

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary			
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside		
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs		
Areas of protected/unprote			
Site includes Grade 1, Grad			
Does the site contain buildings			
Are these buildings used fo			
Encroachment Conclusion			

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Inner Area

398 East Street/Ellerby Road LS9 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009 covering more than 50% of the site

Planning History	y Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site				
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site		
10/01061/EXT	Extension of Time Period for Planning application 20/21/04/FU for multi level development of mixed use comprising 185 flats commercial units and car parking	W	91		

overlap

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	%
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	27.68	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	19.81	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	78.41	
Aire Valley RA	100.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	
-		l

Other Spatial Relationship

11.68	LCC ownership %			
Leeds City	Nearest train station			
1503.71	Nearest train station distance (m)			
12556	Nearest bus stop			
36.50	Nearest bus stop distance (m)			
Urban	Agricultural classification			
_				
	Overlaps SSSI			
	Overlaps SEGI			
	Overlaps LNA			
	Overlaps LNR			
✓	Overlaps Conservation Area			
	Overlaps Listed Building			
✓	Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer			
✓	Overlaps Public Right of Way			

	Overlaps Listed Building		
	Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer		✓
	Overlaps Public Right of Way		V
	Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone		
	Overlaps EA Flood Zone		П
	Overlaps HSE Major Hazard		\Box
	Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline		$\overline{\Box}$
	Overlaps Pot. Contamination		V
_	Overlana Minarala Cafaguard	~ d	
L	Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	eu	Į
	Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	m	[

398 East Street/Ellerby Road LS9

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley allocation	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	

433 Globe Road - Doncasters/Lattitude LS11

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	429152	Northing	433001	Site area ha	1.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Ward City and Hunslet	

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Car Parks

Neighbouring land uses

Office

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Currently brownfield cleared land. Largely office, light industrial and cleared land in area. Side bordered to south by raised rail line.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 t		
Do features provide bound		
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 pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		

characteristics of openiness and permanence	
	╗

App Number

10/01420/FU

Proposal

spaces)

Retention of cleared site as car park (400 long stay parking

433 Globe Road - Doncasters/Lattitude LS11

SHLAA conclusions			
Availability: Short (early) Suitability:	Suitable Achiev	ability: Medium (6-10yrs)
Summary of infra	astructure provider comments		
Highways Agency			
Impact	Network Status		
Network Rail			
Yorkshire Water]		
Treatment Works			
Environment Agend	су		
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 mor	re than 50% of the site	

Decision

R

% of site

68

Inner Area

433 Globe Road - Doncasters/Lattitude LS11			
10/01670/EXT	Extension of time for Planning Application 20/499/04/FU (multi level development up to 31 storeys with 833 flats commercial units car parking and landscaping)	A	100
09/04593/FU	Retention of cleared site as car park	w	100
12/03459/FU	Multi level development up to 17 storeys with 609 residential apartments, commercial units (Class A1 to A5, B1, D1 and D2), car parking, associated access, engineering works, landscape and public amenity space	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	100.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

Proposed Local Centre

Overlaps N37 SLA
Sch. Ancient Mon.

LCC ownership	0.00	
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance	(m)	572.42
Nearest bus s	4261	
Nearest bus stop distance (m)		77.78

Agricultural classification Urban

0.00

0.00

	Overlaps SSSI
	Overlaps SEGI
\	Overlaps LNA
₹ _	Overlaps LNR
1	Overlaps Conservation Area
]	Overlaps Listed Building
	Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer
/	Overlaps Public Right of Way
•	Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone
	Overlaps EA Flood Zone
1	Overlaps HSE Major Hazard
)	Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline
	Overlaps Pot. Contamination
ded	Overlans Minerals Safeguard

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

433 Globe Road - Doncasters/Lattitude LS11

Conclusions			
Issues and Options Summary			
Permission extended in 2010 for 83	3 dwellings.	SHLAA expects delivery 2017/18.	Temporary car parking permitted to expire Feb 2017.
Site affects others?			
Sustainability summary			
Summary of reps			
Comments on phasing			
DPP Allocation			
Identified housing site with mixed u	uses		
DPP Allocation Conclusion			
			n past for mixed use including office and residential. Given sloyment is based on the approved planning application.

435 Ellerby Lane LS9

Site Details								
Easting	431324	Northing	432884	Site area ha		1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Burmantoft	s 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

Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound				
Coalescence Conclusion				

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary				
Does the site provide acces				
Does the site include local/				
Areas of protected/unprote				
Site includes Grade 1, Grad				
Does the site contain buildings				
Are these buildings used fo				
Encroachment Conclusion				

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

435	Ellerby La	ine LS9			
SHLAA conc	lusions				
Availability:	Short (early)	Suitability:	Suitable	Ach	ievability: Medium (6-10yrs)
Summary	of infrastr	ucture provider comments			
I Ii mlassassas A					
Highways A	gency	Network Status			
		10000000			
Network Ra	ail				
	-				
Yorkshire V	Vater				
Treatment Wo	orks				
Environmen	nt Agency				
Constraints					
LCC					
Ecology supp	OIT				
Ecology boun	darv				
Education cor	mments				
	'				
Flood Risk					
Utilities					
Gas					
Electric					
Fire and Resc	ue				
Telecoms					
Telecoms					
O.U.					
Other English Herita	age				
J					
Natural Engla	nd				
			th F 00′ (t'		
Planning His		cations since 1/1/2009, covering mo	re than 50% of the site	Destric	0/ 25 214
App Numbe	r Pr	oposal		Decision	% of site

435 **Ellerby Lane LS9**

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy

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

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	100.00
Aire Valley RA	100.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Titlet South KA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	100.00
Aire Valley RA	100.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.45

Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1660.62
Nearest bus stop	11026
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	132.91

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	✓
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<u> </u>
Overlane Minerale Safeguarde	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100n	n

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

Inner Area

435 Ellerby Lane LS9

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley identified	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	

437 South Accommodation Road LS9

Site Details							
Easting	431428	Northing	432473	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area			Ward	City and Hu	ınslet	

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Prownfield
Site type	Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to		
Can development preserve this character?		
Character Conclusion		

437 South Accommodation Road LS9

SHLAA conclusions

Natural England

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

	_		
Highways Agency			
Impact No material		Network Status	No objection
Potential for cumulat	ive impact in combir	nation with other sites	s. If site still included at next sift assess as part of city centre/Aire Valley cluster.
Network Rail			
Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works			
Environment Ager	су		
Constraints			
LCC			
Ecology support	Supported with m	itigation	
Supported with mitig	ation to protect and	enhance the riverside	e wildlife corridor. Otters, bats and Water Vole to consider
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities Gas			
Ous			
Electric			
Liectric			
Fire and Descrip			
Fire and Rescue			
Tologomo]		
Telecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
13/02172/FU	Use of vacant site for temporary open storage (Use Class B8)	R	99	

% overlap

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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy	
3,	

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

% overlap

Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	100.00
Aire Valley RA	100.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership % 51.72

Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1878.45
Nearest bus stop	10730
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	77.29

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
s Conservation Area	Overlaps
rlaps Listed Building	Over
Employment buffer	Overlaps Strat.
Public Right of Way	Overlaps
ps SFRA Flood Zone	Overlap
rlaps EA Flood Zone	Over
s HSE Major Hazard	Overlaps
ps HSE Gas Pipeline	Overlap
Pot. Contamination	Overlaps
N: 106	0 1
s Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

437 South Accommodation Road LS9

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley allocation	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	

444 The Parade & The Drive LS9

Site Details								
Easting	431220	Northing	433265	Site area ha	2.2		SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	City Centre, Inner Area			Ward	E	Burmantoft	s and Richmond Hill	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITICIU

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?				
Do features provide bound				
Coalescence Conclusion				

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

The Parade & The Drive LS9 444 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status Network Rail **Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/00085/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 8, 16 and 26 of Planning Application 10/02796/FU	Α	100

Inner Area

444 The	Parade & The Drive LS9		
10/02796/FU	Variation of conditions 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8, deletion of condition 10 of previous approval 09/01860/FU to reflect the proposed phasing of the development for the refurbishment to provide 410 flats	Α	100
10/00766/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 2 of Planning Application 09/01860/FU	R	100
11/05267/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 13 of Planning Application 10/02796/FU	Α	100
10/9/00046/MOD	Amendment to approved change of use extension and recladding of apartments to form an additional 37 flats total now 410 (previously 373) and reduced office spaceNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Omission of 41no. balconies from 'parade' building.	M01	100
09/01860/FU	Variation of conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14,15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26 of planning permission 06/07705/FU to reflect the proposed phasing of the development and the receipt of additional information relating to conditions attached to that permission in respect of the refurbishment to provide 410 flats	Α	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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core	Strategy
------	----------

	_
Main Urban Area 100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement 0.00)
Minor Settlement 0.00	
laps Urban Extension	_
_	

Regeneration Are	as
------------------	----

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	100.00	
Aire Valley RA	100.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	0.47	
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (1529.34	
Nearest bus s	7180	
Nearest bus stop distance (129.05	
Agricultural classificat	ion	Urban

444 The Parade & The Drive LS9

Overlaps SSSI
Overlaps SEGI
Overlaps LNA
Overlaps LNR
Overlaps Conservation Area
Overlaps Listed Building
aps Strat. Employment buffer
Overlaps Public Right of Way
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone
Overlaps EA Flood Zone
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline
Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard
aps Minerals Safeguarded 100

444 The Parade & The Drive LS9

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley identified	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	

447 Whitehall Road - Doncasters LS12

Site Details							
Easting	428982	Northing	433112	Site area ha	3.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	City Centre	, Inner Area			Ward	City and Hu	ınslet

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Large site on the north side of Whitehall Road to the west of the Leeds-Liverpool canal. Bisected by disused railway viaduct. Cleared with one office building completed prior to the base date of the Plan April 2012.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

	-	
Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

	=	=		

447 Whitehall Road - Doncasters LS12

сш	ΛΛ	200	مدياه	ions

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

Summary of infrastructure provider comments

Hiał	nwavs	Agency	

No objection subject to satisfactory mitigation Impact Minimal material impact **Network Status** 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 Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the canal-side wildlife corridor. Retain a minimum 20 metre corridor from the canal. Otters and bats to consider

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

12/01935/OT Variation of conditions 5,6,7,8,9,11,12,20,25,26,33,34,37,38,43,48 of previous % of site

Decision

447 Whit	itehall Road - Doncasters LS12					
	approval 06/02880/OT to allow date of implementation rather than commencement					
10/02587/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 7 of Planning Application 06/02880/OT	Α	99			
12/9/00138/MOD	Outline application to layout access and erect multi level mixed use development for residential and office uses up to 33 storeys high, with ancillary class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 and D2 uses and associated car parking and landscaped areas. NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 06/02880/OT: Amend date of required discharge of Conditions 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 20, 25, 26, 33, 34, 37, 38, 43 and 48	M01	99			
10/9/00209/MOD	Outline application to layout access and erect multi level mixed use development for residential and office uses up to 33 storeys high, with ancillary class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 and D2 uses and associated car parking and landscaped areas.NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Addition of specific new condition to planning approval listing or cross referencing the full list of approved plans and supporting details.	M01	99			
13/05240/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 26, 27, 30, 47, 49 and 50 of Planning Application 06/02880/OT	Α	99			
12/03430/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 8, 13, 14, 27, 30, 49 and 50 of Planning Application 06/02880/OT	Α	99			
10/04864/OT	Variation of condition CPLAN - Plans List of non material amendment 10/9/00209/MOD (previous approval 06/02880/OT) relating to re-alignment of Building 02	W	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	100.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

% overlap

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %		0.00
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)		714.27
Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop distance (m)		10229
		140.58

Agricultural classification Urban

447 Whitehall Road - Doncasters LS12

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	✓
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	✓
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	\Box
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

447 Whitehall Road - Doncasters LS12

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Full permission (06/05718/FU) was given for an office block of 17,220sqm which was completed. Outline permission (06/02880/OT) was given in 2007 for 69,500sqm of office space in 5 blocks and for 726 dwellings in 4 blocks and for 1577sqm of A1 and other supporting uses. Reserved matters approval was given for 2 residential blocks (07/04583/RM) comprising 103 and 166 flats) in 2008; a further reserved matters approval (11/03759/RM) was given in December 2012 for a residential block of 194 flats. The applicants claimed to have started commencement works prior to September 2012.

encement works prior to September 2012.	
ffects others?	
nability summary	
pary of reps	
nents on phasing	
llocation	
fied housing site with mixed uses	
Ilocation Conclusion	
as planning permission for a mix of office and residential development.	

465 Waterloo Sidings LS9

Site Details							
Easting	433445	Northing	433205	Site area ha	7.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Temple Ne	wsam

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ntion
DUSUIT	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons		
Would development result in an i		
Is the site well connected to the		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier b and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary	
Does the site provide acces	
Does the site include local/	
Areas of protected/unprote	
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	
Does the site contain buildi	
Are these buildings used fo	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Waterloo Sidings LS9 465 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) meets accessibility standards 5 Access comments Access from Halton Moor Avenue ok, secondary access onto Wykebeck Ave 5 Local network comments Congestion on A64/ A63 4 Total score Mitigation measures 14 Highways site support Yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact No objection, no mitigation required **Network Status Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation. LCC Not supported **Ecology support** Not supported (Red) - This site is designated as Waterloo Siding LNA an important site for lowland dry acid grassland and open mosaic habitat on previously developed land both UK BAP Priority Habitats. This site is expected to be rich in successional vegetation and invertebrates and should not be developed. The site is also a significant feature along the rail network which forms an important part of the wildlife habitat network in central Leeds Ecology boundary

Waterloo Sidings LS9 465 **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

our besignations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	•
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	~

% overlap

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 %	2.27
-----------------	------

465 Waterloo Sidings LS9

Nearest train station	(Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance	(m)	3098.37
Nearest bus s	stop	12501
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	174.07
Agricultural classifica	tion	Urban
Overlaps S	SSSI	
Overlaps S	EGI	
Overlaps I	LNA	✓
Overlaps I	LNR	
Overlaps Conservation A	\rea	
Overlaps Listed Build	ding	
Overlaps Strat. Employment bu	ıffer	
Overlaps Public Right of V	Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Z	one	
Overlaps EA Flood Z	one	
Overlaps HSE Major Haz	zard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipe	eline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamina	tion	<u></u>
Overlaps Minerals Safeg	uard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	1 100)m

465 Waterloo Sidings LS9

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Cummary of rone	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	431391	Northing	432190	Site area ha	2.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and Hu	ınslet

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?		
Would development result in an is	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the b	ouilt up area?	
Would development round off the	settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?		
Do features provide bound	daries 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	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/r	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildir	ngs	
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Avoid light spillage onto River Aire.

Ecology boundary

Goodman Street - Hunslet Mill LS10 467 **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) meets accessibility standards 5 Access comments Access on to Goodman St or Atkinson St 5 Local network comments Ok for scale of development 4 Total score Mitigation measures 14 Highways site support 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 Owing to the size of this site we would expect a surface water management plan (utilising SuDS as the preferred option) to be drawn up for the whole area. Appropriate stand off distance(s)/diversion(s) will be required for all infrastructure **Environment Agency** FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation.on historic landfill LCC Supported with mitigation Ecology support Supported with mitigation (Amber) - This site lies adjacent to the River Aire a UK BAP priority habitat. Leave a buffer zone of 10m from the top of

the river bank and establish with locally native trees and shrubs. Avoid light spillage onto the river. Important corridor for otter, birds, bats and fish.

Education comments

Flood Risk
Site located in SFRA Flood Zone 3A(i). High Probability of Flooding. Exception Test will need to be passed for housing to be sited in this location.

Utilities
Gas

Electric

Telecoms

Other
English Heritage

Natural England

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

Spatial relationships

App Number

UDP Designations

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

Proposal

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	~

Decision

% of site

% overlap

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 %

Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m	1971.83
Nearest bus sto	p 9167
Nearest bus stop distance (m	n) 90.41
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SS	SI
Overlaps SEC	GI 🗌
Overlaps LN	A
Overlaps LN	IR 🗌
Overlaps Conservation Are	ea
Overlaps Listed Buildir	ng 🗸
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffe	er 🗸
Overlaps Public Right of Wa	ay ne 🗸
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zor	ne 🗸
Overlaps EA Flood Zor	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazaı	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipelir	ne
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	on 🗸
Overlaps Minerals Safegua	rded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 1	00m

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley identified	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	

468 Yarn Street LS10

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	431467	Northing	431955	Site area ha	4.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and H	unslet

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti	itue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an is	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the b	ouilt up area?	
Would development round off the	settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries 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 pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		

468 **Yarn Street LS10 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 1/1/2000, sovering more than 50% of the site

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% or the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/04861/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 8 and 20 of Planning Application 06/02554/OT	w	100

468 Yarn	Street LS10			
10/01027/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 17, 21, 22, 23 and 35 of Planning Application 06/02554/OT	Α	100	
11/03695/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 8, 20 and 22 of Planning Application 06/02554/OT	Α	100	
13/00251/FU	Amendment of previous approval to remove commercial units and replace with six flats, removal of pavilion building and alterations to car parking and landscaping	Α	99	
10/01026/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 1 of Planning Application 08/03227/RM	Α	99	
10/9/00089/MOD	Laying out of access road and erection of 165 houses, 116 flats, 4 shop or cafe units and riverside pavilion, with landscaping, including creation of riverside walk and open space with boat mooringsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Minor replan of parking court and surrounding houses (plots 84-119) to allow creation of energy centre to power district heating system. Introduction of electricity sub station adj to energy centre. Introduction of ext bin stores to certain plots to comply with code for sustainable homes. Amendments to some garden layouts for same reason.	M01	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	2.04	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

D			Λ
Rec	ienera	tion	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		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)		2163.18
Nearest bus st	ор	3019
Nearest bus stop distance (m)		305.02
Agricultural classificati	on	Urban

468 Yarn Street LS10

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

468 Yarn Street LS10

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley identified	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	

Site Details							
Easting	430836	Northing	429896	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Middleton F	ark

Site Characteristics

Site type	Cusanfiald
SHE IVDE	(TEENLEIN

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the b	ouilt up area?	
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Education comments

473 West Grange Road (Ph 2) LS10 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) meets accessibility standards 5 Access comments Access from West Grange Road, preserve existing pedestrian links to play area and open space 5 Local network comments Ok for scale of development 5 Total score Mitigation measures 15 Highways site support Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection, no mitigation required **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation. LCC Supported Ecology support Supported Ecology boundary

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

טווו	I Jaciai	nations
ODE	Design	nations

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

Core Strategy

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

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	98.97

Nearest train station	Cottingley	
Nearest train station distance	3455.72	
Nearest bus s	2952	
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	204.71

Agricultural classification Urban

	Overlaps SSSI	
	Overlaps SEGI	
	Overlaps LNA	
	Overlaps LNR	
	Overlaps Conservation Area	
	Overlaps Listed Building	
Over	laps Strat. Employment buffer	
	Overlaps Public Right of Way	$\overline{\Box}$
	Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
	Overlaps EA Flood Zone	$\overline{\Box}$
	Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
	Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
	Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<u></u>
		_
	Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Ove	rlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

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 acce	pted

Site Details							
Easting	431600	Northing	429825	Site area ha	3.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Middleton F	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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?				
	Do features provide bound			
	Coalescence Conclusion			

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary			
Does the site provide acces			
Does the site include local/			
Areas of protected/unprote			
Site includes Grade 1, Grad			
Does the site contain buildings			
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?			
Encroachment Conclusion			

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

474 Middleton Road - Urn Farm LS10 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) meets accessibility standards 5 Access comments Access from Middleton Road or Ring Road Middleton 5 Local network comments Ok for scale of development 5 Total score Mitigation measures 15 Highways site support Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection, no mitigation required **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation. LCC Supported Ecology support Supported Ecology boundary **Education comments**

Flood Risk
Flood Zone 1

Utilities
Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other
English Heritage

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

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

Natural England

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	0.43	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy	

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	86.87
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	,
Nearest bus stop	7021
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	122.16

Agricultural classification Grade 3

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	l l
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m) [

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamazinty ourinnary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

476 Beeston Road - Shaftesbury House LS11

Site Details							
Easting	429640	Northing	431756	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area					Ward	City and H	unslet
Site Characteristics							

Sit	e type	Brownfield	
-----	--------	------------	--

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

_	
Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an i		
Is the site well connected to the		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to		
Can development pres		
Character Conclusion		

476 Beeston Road - Shaftesbury House LS11 **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
12/03307/FU	Subdivision of 3 vacant C3/B1 (flats/live work units) to create 10 one bedroom apartments.		100

476 Bees	ton Road - Shaftesbury House LS11			
09/02553/FU	Two 13.6m high wind turbines and forty-three solar collector units to roof of live/work units block	Α	100	
09/9/00151/MOD	Change of use of hostel to 172 flats/live work units gym and A3 unit with two storey roof extensionNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Cut back eaves overhang flush and omit 'Faux Channel' to top two floors. Amended render colour locations and entrance canopy.	M01	100	
10/04269/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2 and 8 of Planning Application 21/119/05/FU	Α	100	
12/04541/FU	Subdivision of two live/work units to form four one bed studio flats.	Α	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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
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		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)		1436.44
Nearest bus stop		13705
Nearest bus stop distance (m)		42.22

Agricultural classification Urban

3	
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded] г

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

476 Beeston Road - Shaftesbury House LS11

476 Beeston Road - Shaftesbury House LS11

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 de	velopment accepted

500 Sharp Lane F

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	431342	Northing	427880	Site area ha	6.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Middleton F	Park

Site Characteristics

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption
2 23011	J J

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an i	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the	built up area?	
Would development round off the	e settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier b and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries 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?	
Engraphment Conglusion	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

500	Sharp	Lane F					
SHLAA cond	clusions						
Availability	: Short (=	=<5 yrs)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievab	ility:	Short (=<5yrs)
Summary	of infra	structure prov	ider comments				
Highways I	Agency						
Impact	.9007		Network Status				
'							
Network R	ail						
Yorkshire \	Water						
Treatment W	orks						
Environme Constraints	nt Agend	; y					
CONSTIAINTS							
LCC		1					
Ecology supp	ort						
		1					
Ecology bour	ndary						
Education co	mments						
		<u> </u>					
Flood Risk							
Utilities							
Gas							
		_					
Electric							
]					
Fire and Reso	cue						
Telecoms		1					
		I					
Other							
English Herit	age						
		1					
Natural Engla	and						
Planning H	istory /	Applications since 1	1/1/2009 covering mo	re than 50% of the site	1		

Plaining History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50 % of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
12/9/00214/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 22/113/05/RM: Separation of terrace block to form pair of semi detached	M01	99	

500 Sh	arp Lane F			
	dwellings			
11/9/00086/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 22/113/05/RM: Substitution of house type of 10no. detached dwellings	M01	99	
10/9/00296/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Redesign of first floor layout of flat over garage (Plot 271/FOG) to remove windows from rear elevation and insertion of roof lights	M01	99	
09/9/00065/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Repositioning of plots A139/170 and 183 to become detached dwellings.	M01	99	
12/9/00222/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 22/113/05/RM: Redesign of first floor layout of Plot 289 flat over garage to remove windows from rear elevation and insertion of roof lights	M01	99	
09/9/00103/MOD	Outline application to layout residential developmentNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Reviewed garage locations and boundary treatment	M04	98	
10/9/00004/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Substitution of 1no. 2.5 storey detached dwelling house and 2no. 3 storey townhouse dwelling houses for equal number of similar dwelling houses	M01	99	
12/9/00140/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to: 22/113/05/RM: Plots 97 and 98 which have not been constructed in accordance with the approved drawings	M01	99	
10/9/00178/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Detach house in plot 60 from house in plot 59; amend roof style to houses in plots 58, 60, 61	M01	99	
10/9/00084/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: To detach plot B280 from plots B279 and B281, Detach plot B308 from plot B309, move plot B290 closer to plot B291 and detach plot B78 from plot B77.	M01	99	
12/9/00142/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 22/113/05/RM: Reconfiguration of apartments F188-199 including alteration to boundary treatment to front of plots F200-F202 and plot F208 from 1100mm high metal railings to 1800mm high timber screen fence	M01	99	
12/9/00013/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 22/113/05/RM: Housetype substitution to plots 78, 79, 90 & 91	M01	99	
10/9/00058/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Plots 49 and 50 have been flipped to show symmetry on street scene, plots 63 and 64 gardens have been increased, plots 68 garage moved backwards to provide 5.6m driveway. Plots 114 and 115 garages moved toward boundary to create move space on driveways.	M01	99	
11/9/00140/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 22/113/05/RM: Introduction of separations to terrace units including the substitution of townhouse dwellings with equal number of similar types - plot no's 35-38, 24-25, 219-225, 228-233, replacing square bay on the apartment block plots 144, 148, 152 & 156 with a turret	M01	99	

500 Sha	rp Lane F			
10/9/00233/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Introduction of separations within terrace units	M01	99	
09/9/00285/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Introduction of separations within terrace units.	M01	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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	%	0.04
Nearest train station		Morley
Nearest train station distance (r	n)	4383.47
Nearest bus sto	эр	13821
Nearest bus stop distance (r	n)	194.06
Agricultural classification	on	Grade 3

rigincultural diassification of	uuc 5
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	\Box
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<u></u>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

500 Sharp Lane F

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Summary of Teps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

502 Sharp Lane B

Site Details								
Easting	431033	Northing	427754	Site area ha		9.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area, Outer South West					Ward	Middleton F	Park	

Site Characteristics

Cita tuma	Greenfield
Site type	Greenreid

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/const			
Would development result in an is			
Is the site well connected to the built up area?			
Would development round off the			
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?			
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion			

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?			
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?			
Coalescence	e 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/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

502	Sharp Lan	е В						
SHLAA conc	lusions							
Availability:	Short (=<5 yr	rs)	Suitability:	Suitable	P	Achievability:	Short (=<5yrs)	
Summary	of infrastru	ıcture provider c	omments					
Highways A	Agency							
Impact		Netwo	rk Status					
Network Ra	ail							
Yorkshire V	Vater							
Treatment We								
Environmer	nt Agency							
Constraints								
	1							
LCC								
Ecology supp	ort							
	,							
Ecology boun	dary							
Education cor	mments							
Flood Risk								
Utilities								
Gas								
	,							
Electric								
Fire and Resc	ue							
Telecoms								
Other								
English Herita	age							
Natural Engla	nd							
	'							
Planning His	story Applic	cations since 1/1/2009	o, covering moi	re than 50% of t	the site			

r lanning mistory	ripplications since it 1/2000, devening more than 50 % of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
09/9/00285/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Introduction of separations within terrace units	M01	99	

separations within terrace units.

502 Sh	arp Lane B			
09/9/00103/MOD	Outline application to layout residential developmentNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Reviewed garage locations and boundary treatment	M04	100	
12/9/00140/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to: 22/113/05/RM: Plots 97 and 98 which have not been constructed in accordance with the approved drawings	M01	99	
11/9/00086/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 22/113/05/RM: Substitution of house type of 10no. detached dwellings	M01	99	
10/9/00296/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Redesign of first floor layout of flat over garage (Plot 271/FOG) to remove windows from rear elevation and insertion of roof lights	M01	99	
12/9/00222/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 22/113/05/RM: Redesign of first floor layout of Plot 289 flat over garage to remove windows from rear elevation and insertion of roof lights	M01	99	
10/9/00004/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Substitution of 1no. 2.5 storey detached dwelling house and 2no. 3 storey townhouse dwelling houses for equal number of similar dwelling houses	M01	99	
10/9/00233/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Introduction of separations within terrace units	M01	99	
11/9/00140/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 22/113/05/RM: Introduction of separations to terrace units including the substitution of townhouse dwellings with equal number of similar types - plot no's 35-38, 24-25, 219-225, 228-233, replacing square bay on the apartment block plots 144, 148, 152 & 156 with a turret	M01	99	
10/9/00178/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Detach house in plot 60 from house in plot 59; amend roof style to houses in plots 58, 60, 61	M01	99	
09/9/00065/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Repositioning of plots A139/170 and 183 to become detached dwellings.	M01	99	
10/9/00084/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: To detach plot B280 from plots B279 and B281, Detach plot B308 from plot B309, move plot B290 closer to plot B291 and detach plot B78 from plot B77.	M01	99	
12/9/00142/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 22/113/05/RM: Reconfiguration of apartments F188-199 including alteration to boundary treatment to front of plots F200-F202 and plot F208 from 1100mm high metal railings to 1800mm high timber screen fence	M01	99	
12/9/00013/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 22/113/05/RM: Housetype substitution to plots 78, 79, 90 & 91	M01	99	

502 S	harp Lane B			
10/9/00058/MOE	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Plots 49 and 50 have been flipped to show symmetry on street scene, plots 63 and 64 gardens have been increased, plots 68 garage moved backwards to provide 5.6m driveway. Plots 114 and 115 garages moved toward boundary to create move space on driveways.	M01	99	
12/9/00214/MOE	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 22/113/05/RM: Separation of terrace block to form pair of semi detached dwellings	M01	99	

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	2.64
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	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

Core Strategy

% overlap

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South	n RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor	· RA	0.00	
EASEL	. RA	0.00	
Aire Valley	/ RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gate	wav	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	0.32	
Nearest train station	Morley	
Nearest train station distance (4083.84	
Nearest bus s	6450	
Nearest bus stop distance (334.14	
Agricultural classificat	Urban	

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlana Minanala Cafanyanda	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	ı 🗀
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	1

502 Sharp Lane B

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamazinty ourinnary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

503 Sharp Lane C

Site Details									
Easting	431140	Northing	427651	Site area ha		2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area, Outer South West			Ward	Middleton F	Park			

Site Characteristics

Cito tun	e Greenfield	
Site tvi	e Greenneid	

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?			
Do features provide bound			
Coalescence Conclusion			

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

503	Sharp Lane C			
SHLAA c	onclusions			
Availabi	lity: Short (=<5 yrs)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)
Summa	ry of infrastructure	e provider comments		
	_			
Highway Impact	ys Agency	Network Status		
ППраст		Network Status		
Network	c Rail			
Yorkshii	re Water			
Treatmen	t Works			
Environ	ment Agency			
Constrain	ts			
LCC				
Ecology s	upport			
Ecology b	oundary			
Education	comments			
Flood Risl	V			
1 1000 Kisi				
Utilities Gas				
Gas				
Electric				
2.000.10				
Fire and F	Rescue			
Telecoms				
Other				
English H	eritage			
	'			
Natural E	ngland			
DI :	. I Wadana . A was Parati	since 1/1/2009 covering mo	th 500/	f she cite

Flairing History	Applications since 1/1/2005, covering more than 50 /0 of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
10/9/00004/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Substitution of	M01	100	

503 Sh	arp Lane C		
	townhouse dwelling houses for equal number of similar dwelling houses		
09/9/00103/MOD	Outline application to layout residential developmentNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Reviewed garage locations and boundary treatment	M04	100
12/9/00140/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to: 22/113/05/RM: Plots 97 and 98 which have not been constructed in accordance with the approved drawings	M01	100
11/9/00086/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 22/113/05/RM: Substitution of house type of 10no. detached dwellings	M01	100
10/9/00296/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Redesign of first floor layout of flat over garage (Plot 271/FOG) to remove windows from rear elevation and insertion of roof lights	M01	100
09/9/00065/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Repositioning of plots A139/170 and 183 to become detached dwellings.	M01	100
11/9/00140/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 22/113/05/RM: Introduction of separations to terrace units including the substitution of townhouse dwellings with equal number of similar types - plot no's 35-38, 24-25, 219-225, 228-233, replacing square bay on the apartment block plots 144, 148, 152 & 156 with a turret	M01	100
12/9/00214/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 22/113/05/RM: Separation of terrace block to form pair of semi detached dwellings	M01	100
10/9/00233/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Introduction of separations within terrace units	M01	100
10/9/00178/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Detach house in plot 60 from house in plot 59; amend roof style to houses in plots 58, 60, 61	M01	100
10/9/00084/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: To detach plot B280 from plots B279 and B281, Detach plot B308 from plot B309, move plot B290 closer to plot B291 and detach plot B78 from plot B77.	M01	100
12/9/00142/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 22/113/05/RM: Reconfiguration of apartments F188-199 including alteration to boundary treatment to front of plots F200-F202 and plot F208 from 1100mm high metal railings to 1800mm high timber screen fence	M01	100
10/9/00058/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Plots 49 and 50 have been flipped to show symmetry on street scene, plots 63 and 64 gardens have been increased, plots 68 garage moved backwards to provide 5.6m driveway. Plots 114 and 115 garages moved toward boundary to create move space on driveways.	M01	100
09/9/00285/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellingsNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Introduction of separations within terrace units.	M01	100

503 Sha	rp Lane C			
12/9/00013/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 22/113/05/RM: Housetype substitution to plots 78, 79, 90 & 91	M01	100	
12/9/00222/MOD	Laying out of access roads and erection of 1284 dwellings NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 22/113/05/RM: Redesign of first floor layout of Plot 289 flat over garage to remove windows from rear elevation and insertion of roof lights	M01	100	

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	

S2S6 Town Centre

Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon.

Proposed Local Centre

Core	Strategy
------	----------

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.59
Nearest train station	Morley
Nearest train station distance (m)	4200.41
Nearest bus stop	6450
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	455.78

Agricultural classification Grade 3

0.00

0.00

0.00

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
0 1 14 1 0 6 1	

Ove	rlaps Minerals	s Safeguarded
Overlaps N	linerals Safe	guarded 100m

503 Sharp Lane C

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamasmity ourminary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

620 Cardigan Road (214-244) LS4

Site Details							
Easting	428057	Northing	434743	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area		Ward	Hyde Park a	and Woodhouse		

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Prownfield
Site type	Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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 acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the 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

Cardigan Road (214-244) LS4 620 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Unavailable 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
12/03957/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 15 of Planning Application 09/00856/FU	Α	91

620 Care	digan Road (214-244) LS4			
09/00856/FU	Part 4, 5 and 6 storey block comprising 65 student cluster flats, with 154 bed spaces, car parking and landscaping	R	91	
12/03371/FU	Variation of condition 3 of previous approval 09/00856/FU for minor material amendment for alterations to elevations including removal of balcony portico, relocation of windows, and alterations to roof form	Α	91	
14/04732/FU	Variation of condition 3 of previous approval 12/03371/FU relating to external brickwork materials	w	91	
12/03549/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16 and 17 of Planning Application 09/00856/FU	W	91	
12/04069/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 14 of Planning Application 09/00856/FU	Α	91	

Spatial relationships

UDP Designation

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

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %		0.00
Nearest train station		Burley Park
Nearest train station distance	(m)	461.62
Nearest bus s	top	6100
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	100.78

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	V

Inner Area	In	ner	Α	rea
------------	----	-----	---	-----

620	Cardigan Ro	ad (214-244) LS4

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

620 Cardigan Road (214-244) LS4

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamasmity ourminary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

806 East Park Road, The Glensdales LS9

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	431991	Northing	433165	Site area ha	C	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Burmantoft	s and Richmond Hill	

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Prownfield
Site type	Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption
2 23011	

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

806 East Park Road, The G	ilensdales LS9			
SHLAA conclusions				
Availability: Short (early)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)	
Summary of infrastructure provide	ler comments			
LCC Highways Comments				
Public transport accessibility comments				Rank (1-5)
meets standards, within 2km of City Centre	e			_
				5
Access comments				
Access achievable				F
				5
Local network comments				
Ok for scale of development	1			5
				5
Mitigation measures				Total score
				15
				13
Highways site support				
Yes				
Ocation and an allowable			J	
Contingent on other sites				
Contingent on other sites				
Highways Agency				
Impact No material impact N	letwork Status	No objection, no r	mitigation required	
Network Rail				
Yorkshire Water				
Treatment Works				
Environment Agency				
FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous	ous I&O consultatio	<u> </u>		
		• • •		
LCC				
Ecology support Supported Supported				
Ecology boundary				
Education comments				

806 East Park Road, The Glensdales LS9

Flood Risk Flood Zone 1

Utilities Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other English Heritage

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

13/04249/FU 100 Residential development of 32 One bed and Two bed Α apartment units with associated landscaping and parking.

Spatial relationships

Natural England

UDP Designations

% overlap

0.00	%
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00

Core	Strategy	

Area 100.00 % overla	Main Urban Area
nent 0.00	Major Settlement
nent 0.00	Minor Settlement
sion	Overlaps Urban Extension

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 %	99.99

Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)		2298.93
Nearest bus stop		1995
Nearest bus stop distance ((m)	41.85

806 East Park Road, The Glensdales LS9

Irban
<u></u>
d
n 🗀

806 East Park Road, The Glensdales LS9

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamasmity ourminary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	433429	Northing	435266	Site area ha	2.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Gipton and	Harehills

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Dwellings

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Shops

Places of worship

Other land uses - None

Topog	graphy	Flat	Landscape	Limited Tree Cover
Bound	daries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

The site is green space. It appears that the street Oak Tree Close had housing around it in the past or was built for housing.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound			
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

814 Oak Tree Mount LS9 Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour 100% employment, primary and health + access to buses for secondary 5 Access comments Land split over different site. Various access points available for the sites. 5 Local network comments No known issues with capacity 5 Total score Mitigation measures 15 Highways site support Yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints

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

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
0.11			
Other 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 Designation	
	c

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

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 %		97.00
Na anast tusin atation		Catao
Nearest train station		Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (. ,	2970.58
Nearest bus s		799
Nearest bus stop distance ((m)	136.66
Agricultural classificat	ion	Urban
		1
Overlaps S	SSI	
Overlaps SE	EGI	
Overlaps L	NA	
Overlaps LNR		
Overlaps Conservation Area		
Overlaps Listed Building		
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer		
Overlaps Public Right of Way		
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone		
Overlaps EA Flood Zone		
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard		
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline		
Overlaps Pot. Contamination		
Overlaps Minerals Safegu	ıard	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Previous planning approval expired 07/01008/FU, site suitable in principle for residential development.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant positive - access to greenspace, brownfield site, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to health, community participation.

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Yes

16

Primary Health 15

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site suitable in principle for residential development.

815 South Parkway - Easel LS14

Site Details							
Easting	435234	Northing	435633	Site area ha	4.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area		Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft		

Site Characteristics

C!1 - 1	Brownfield
SITA TUNA	RECMUTICIO
JILC LYDC	DIOWITICIA

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons		
Would development result in an i		
Is the site well connected to the		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier b and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

815 South Parkway - Easel 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

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy

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

% overlap

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 %				
	-			
Nearest train station (
Nearest train station distance (m)				
Nearest bus stop				
Nearest bus stop distance (m)				
ricultural classification	Urban			
Overlaps SSSI				
Outsidens CECL	1 —			

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

815 South Parkway - Easel LS14

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Cummary of rone	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details							
Easting	435801	Northing	435699	Site area ha	0.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area		Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft			

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Outdoor amenity and open space

Vacant building

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is a mixture of brownfield and greenfield land. Signifiacant tree cover. Some of the trees appaera to be mature. There is sports ground to the south and residential in the surrounding areas.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/const	1			
Would development result in an is				
Is the site well connected to the built up area?				
Would development round off the settlement?				
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?				
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion				

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

.	·9 ·-····			
Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?				
Do features provide bound	daries 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

816 York Road Depot/South Parkway LS14 Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour 100% employment, primary secondary and health 5 Access comments Existing access via York Road but scope for access on South Parkway 5 Local network comments No known issues with capacity 5 Total score Mitigation measures 15 Highways site support Yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints

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

LCC	1		
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other	1		
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 D)esiç	gna	tions
-------	-------	-----	-------

ODI Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	35.35	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

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)	1341.88
Nearest bus stop	14267
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	44.35
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	led
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	Om

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Former site in the East and South East Leeds (EASEL) Area Action Plan. This plan is now withdrawn, but the principle of residential development is acceptable and the site has previous planning history for residential approval (2008).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

52 6 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The principle of residential development is acceptable and the site has previous planning history for residential approval (2008)

841 Oak Tree Drive LS8

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	433239	Northing	435474	Site area ha		3.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area		Ward	Gipton and	Harehills			

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 unresticted 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 be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

841 Oak Tree Drive LS8 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status Network Rail **Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/00732/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28 and 29 of Planning Application 07/01012/FU		100

841 Oak Tree Drive LS8

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	2.73	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area	100.0

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	100.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership % 1.70

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance ((m) 3213.39
Nearest bus s	top 3433
Nearest bus stop distance ((m) 120.18

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Occasion a Minamala Cafa manuala	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlans Minerals Safeguarded 100m

841 Oak Tree Drive LS8

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamasmity ourminary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

842 Coldcotes Thorn Walk LS9

Site Details							
Easting	433057	Northing	435459	Site area ha	1.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	CA Inner Area			Ward	Gipton and	Harehills	

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?			
Do features provide bound			
Coalescence Conclusion			

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

842 Coldcotes Thorn Walk LS9 **SHLAA** conclusions Suitability: Suitable Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) meets standards except secondary education 4 Access comments Access from Thorn Walk 5 Local network comments Ok for scale of development 5 Total score Mitigation measures 14 Highways site support Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection, no mitigation required **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ1 over 1ha. See comments in our previous I&O consultation. LCC Supported Ecology support Supported Ecology boundary **Education comments**

Inner Area

Fire and Rescue

Natural England

842 Coldcotes Thorn Walk LS9

Flood Risk Flood Zone 1			
Flood Zone 1			
Utilities			
Gas			
	1		
]		
Electric			

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/00732/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28 and 29 of Planning Application 07/01012/FU		99

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

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

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	3382.44
Nearest bus s	8857
Nearest bus stop distance	149.52

842 Coldcotes Thorn Walk LS9

Agricultural classification U	rban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

842 Coldcotes Thorn Walk LS9

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Summary of Teps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

846 Killingbeck Hospital - C LS14

Site Details								
Easting	434427	Northing	434796	Site area ha		10.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area				Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft	

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ntion
DUSUIT	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?				
Do features provide bound				
Coalescence Conclusion				

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary				
Does the site provide acces				
Does the site include local/				
Areas of protected/unprote				
Site includes Grade 1, Grad				
Does the site contain buildings				
Are these buildings used fo				
Encroachment Conclusion				

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

846	Killingbeck Hospit	al - C LS14			
SHLAA conc	lusions				
Availability:	Short (=<5 yrs)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achi	evability: Short (=<5yrs)
Summary	of infrastructure pr	ovider comments			
Highways A	gency	Network Status			
Impact		Network Status			
Network Ra	il				
Yorkshire W	/ater				
Treatment Wo					
Environmen	t Agency				
Constraints					
LCC					
Ecology suppo	ort				
Ecology boun	danı				
Ecology bourn	uai y				
Education cor	nments				
Flood Risk					
	,				
Utilities					
Gas					
Electric					
Fire and Resc	ue				
Telecoms					
Other	gg.				
English Herita	9 ^c				
Natural Engla	nd				
Planning His		ce 1/1/2009, covering mor	re than 50% of the site		
App Numbe	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	2.36	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

% overlap

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 %	0.60
Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m	1889.21
Nearest bus stop	11988
Nearest bus stop distance (m	332.89
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSS	
Overlaps SEG	
Overlaps LNA	· •
Overlaps LNF	!
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffe	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded				
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m				

Overlaps HSE Major Hazard

Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline

Overlaps Pot. Contamination

846 Killingbeck Hospital - C LS14

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
ouotamaziiti ouminary	
C	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

1011 Oldfield Lane (No 11) LS12 4DH

Site Details								
Easting	428035	Northing	432621	Site area ha		3.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Beeston an	d Holbeck			

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

The site is occupied with a large factory and is in use. On the edge od a large industrial area to the east.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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

2. Trevent neighbouring terms neim merging	
Would 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 pres			
Character Conclusion			

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

Supported

1011 Oldfield Lane (No 11) LS12 4DH

SHLAA conclusions Availability: Unavailable Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Core Strategy standards but falls short of Secondary school access 4 Access comments site frontage with Oldfield Land should provide visibility 4 Local network comments Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 4 Total score Mitigation measures Provision of footway to site frontage, 12 Highways site support yes with mitigation Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail** Footbridge Alterations required. General Asset Protection Issues Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response. LCC **Ecology support** Supported

TOTT Clutte	elu Lalle (No 11) L312 4DH
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	

Telecoms

Other English Heritage

Natural England

Fire and Rescue

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 0.00 N1A Allotments N5 Open Space 0.00 N6 Playing Pitch 0.00 99.99 N8 Urban Green Corridor CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 **UDP City Centre** 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00

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

~

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

Other Spatial Relationship

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

1011 Oldfield Lane (No 11) LS12 4DH

Nearest train station	L	eeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)		1752.14
Nearest bus s	top	5610
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	140.63
Agricultural classificat	tion Ur	ban
Overlaps S	SSI	
Overlaps S	EGI	
Overlaps l	_NA	
Overlaps L	_NR	
Overlaps Conservation A	rea	
Overlaps Listed Build	ling	
Overlaps Strat. Employment bu	ffer	
Overlaps Public Right of V	Vay	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Z	one	
Overlaps EA Flood Z	one	
Overlaps HSE Major Haz	ard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipe	line	
Overlaps Pot. Contaminat	tion	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safegu	uarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	100m	✓

1011 Oldfield Lane (No 11) LS12 4DH

Concl	

Issues and Options Summary

The site is in employment use and is not within a residential area.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required

but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

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

99 6 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is in employment use and is not within a residential area.

1023 Wesley Road (west of), Tong Road (north of), Armley

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	427200	Northing	433155	Site area ha	1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
		Northing	433133	Site area na			Wall Orbait Area IIIIII
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Armley	
Site Cha	racteristi	cs					
Site type	Greenfield						
On-site land uses							
Allotment and city farm							
Other							
Neighbouring land uses							
Dwellings							
Other land	uses						

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

Description

scout hut

Site has significant amount of tree cover. It also has good access and is with a significant residential area. The site (although greenspace) does not seem tobe open to the public.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound				
Coalescence Conclusion				

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

Wesley Road (west of), Tong Road (north of), Armley 1023 Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Good Accessibility all round 5 Access comments Good frontages to Tong Road and Wesley Road 5 Local network comments local network capacity, likely cumulative impact on Inner Ring Road and Outer Ring Road 4 Total score Mitigation measures Relocate parking bay on Tong Road, possible cumulative impact fund 14 Highways site support Yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail** General asset protection issues Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

1023 Wesley Road (west of), Tong Road (north of), Armley

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	

Other

English Heritage

This site adjoins the boundary of the Armley Conservation Area and the churchyard of St Bartholomew's Church (a Grade II* Listed Building). In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas including their setting, and the 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, if allocated, redevelopment proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets are not harmed.

Natural England

Planning History	y Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site				
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site		
10/05520/FU	2 storey community centre with covered link to church and overflow car park and outline residential development of 27 houses		100		
09/05317/FU	2 storey community centre with covered link to church and outline residential development of 33 houses	W	100		

Spatial relationships	
UDP Designations	Core Strategy

1023 Wesley Road (west of), Tong Road (north of), Armley

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	46.51	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	100.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	100.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

<u> </u>	
LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station Bu	urley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	2139.91
Nearest bus stop	2769
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	116.72
Agricultural classification U	rban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	n

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

1023 Wesley Road (west of), Tong Road (north of), Armley

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

Conclusions			
Issues and Options Summary			
Site within urban residential area.	Suitable in principle for resid	dential development.	
Site affects others?			
Sustainability summary			
Significant negative - access to gre accessibility. Minor positive - access			
Summary of reps			
Metro			
Metro			
The sites in this list are supported	for housing growth.		
current public transport	perspective, we would encour	·	would be required at these sites (based on the tes based on the proximity to the core public
Distance to Core Network (Centre Primary Health	of site) Buses Per Hour	Access to Primary Schools	Access to Secondary Schools Access to
77	6	Yes	
Yes Ye) S		
Neutral			
	s, if allocated, redevelopmen		or any features of special architectural or e that those elements which contribute to the
Comments on phasing			
DPP Allocation			

Site Details							
Easting	431366	Northing	432049	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and H	lunslet
Site Characteristics							
Site type Brownfield							
On-site land uses - None							
Adjacent la	nd uses - No	one					

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Description			

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/i		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

1065 Goodman Street (76) - Tetleys Motor Services, Hunslet LS10 **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) good accessibiliy 5 Access comments Existing access onto Goodman Street adequate for development 5 Local network comments Small scale development unlikely to have major impact on local network 5 Total score Mitigation measures 15 Highways site support Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Supported Ecology support Supported Ecology boundary **Education comments**

Flood Risk

Utilities
Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other
English Heritage

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

% overlap

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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy	

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	100.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %		0.00
Nissusset tusin station	Laada Citu	
Nearest train station Nearest train station distance (m) Nearest bus stop		Leeds City
		2026.15
		9167
Nearest bus stop distance (m)		175.34

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

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 Detai	ils						
Easting	428926	Northing	435940	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA I	nner Area	_			Ward	Headingley	у
Site Chara	acteristic	es					
Site type 0	Greenfield						
On-site land	uses						
Managed Fo	rest						
Neighbouring	g land uses	i					
Dwellings							
Managed Fo	rest						
Other land u	ses - None						
Topography	Flat				Landscape	Significant T	ree Cover
Boundaries	Existing v	vell defined			Road front	Yes	
Description Heavily wood	ded area w	ith Woodho	use Ridge to	the north.			

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	1
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	1
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

•		, ,	
Would development lead t	o physical connection	of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries to contain the c	levelopment?	
Coalescence Conclusion			•

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

	-	
Strong defensible boundary	between site and urban area	
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

SHLAA conclusions							
Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)	Suitability:	Unsuitable		Achievability:	Uncertain	
Summary of infra	actructuro prov	vidor commonts					
		nuel comments					
Public transport acces							Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy s	=	at from some local sor	wicos and rail				Kalik (1-5)
Meets core strategy s	stanuarus but distan	it iroini some local sei	vices and rail				4
Access comments							
Access potentially ach	ievable Grosvenor F	Road but Back Grosve	nor Terrace narrov	w with stone wall	and trees		3
Local network comme							
Possible cummulative	impact but limited	development ok					4
Mitigation massures							Total score
Mitigation measures none							11
Highways site support							٦
yes with suitable acce	ess						
Contingent on other s	ites						
no							
							_
Contingent on other s	ites						7
no							
High constants	1						
Highways Agency Impact No material	impact	Network Status	No objection				
Impact No material	mpuet	Network Status	TVO OBJECTION				
Network Rail							
Yorkshire Water							
Treatment Works	Knostrop						
Knostrop High and Lo co-ordinated with Yor the site. The forthcorwith YW's investment take into account ava improvements it may study.	kshire Water's Asseming AMP(6) will ru i. It is particularly in ilable sewerage and	et Management Plans in from April 2015 to inportant that sites wh d WwTW capacity. If a	(AMP) to ensure the March 2020. Phasion ich represent a 10 a developer wants	ne necessary infra ng is one method 1% or greater incr to bring a site for	structure and capa used to ensure site ease in population ward before YW h	acity can be provies are brought for served by the wave completed a	ided to serve orward in line orks should ny planned
Environment Agen	су						
Constraints							
FZ1 over 1 ha. See co	omments in main te	ext of our response.					
LCC							
Ecology support	Supported with m				-		
Supported with mitigate surveys will be required	ation to ensure mate ed. Density/type of	ure parkland-style tre housing will be affect	es (especially those ted by the need to	e with deadwood retain mature tre	habitat) are retair es and a suitable o	ned - bat roost ar distance buffer.	nd bat foraging

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	
12/03383/LI	Listed Building application to demolish lean-to extension and front extension and erection of single storey extensions to front and rear and internal alterations to form 3 flats and 1 dwelling house.	A	61	
12/02580/FU	Change of use of house to form four flats including alterations and single storey extension	A	61	

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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy	
---------------	--

overlap

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

	_					_	
ш	\mathbf{n}	~~~		a ti	20	Λ.	2002
Ш	TH	uer	œı	สแ	OH	А	reas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	1277.70
Nearest bus stop	8506
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	356.32
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlane CCCI	
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	✓✓
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Heavily wooded site within conservation area, so not considered suitable for housing.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - ecology mitigation, landscape and historic environment.

Summary of reps

Metro

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required

but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

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

Primary Health

348 13 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Heavily wooded site within conservation area, so not considered suitable for housing.

Site Details								
Easting	428725	Northing	436313	Site area ha	3.1		SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				W	ard	Headingley	

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Outdoor sport facility

Outdoor amenity and open space

Residential institution

Other land uses - None

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

Description

These sites are to the South of Grove Lane. They form much of the land around Meanwood Beck and Woodhouse Ridge. Some residenital exists to the east of the main site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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	

${\bf 2.\ Prevent\ neighbouring\ towns\ from\ merging}$

•	•		
Would development lead			
Do features provide boun			
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

1098 Boothroyd Drive, Meany	wood LS6		
Overall Conclusion from assessment agacharacteristics of openness and perman		essential	
SHLAA conclusions			
Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)	Suitability: LDF to determine	Achievability:	
Summary of infrastructure provide	r comments		
LCC Highways Comments	_		
Public transport accessibility comments			Rank (1-5
Good Accessibility except average primary			4
Access comments]		
Access requires dwelling to be bought to secu	ire suitbale access, access from Rawling W	ay not suitbale fro large development	3
Local network comments]		
possible cumulative impacts into town			4
Mitigation measures			Total score
Purchase house or houses for access, possible	e cumulative fund		11
I Balanca and American			
Highways site support Yes with mitigation			7
g			
Contingent on other sites	1		
3			
Contingent on other sites]		J
Sommingum on other sites			
Highways Agency			
'	work Status No objection		
n/a			
Network Rail			
Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works Knostrop			
Knostrop High and Low Level are large works co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Mathe site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run frowith YW's investment. It is particularly importake into account available sewerage and Wwimprovements it may be possible for the devistudy.	nagement Plans (AMP) to ensure the neces om April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is on tant that sites which represent a 10% or gr vTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring	ssary infrastructure and capacity can be provi ne method used to ensure sites are brought for reater increase in population served by the w g a site forward before YW have completed a	ided to serve orward in line orks should ny planned
Environment Agency			
Constraints			
Large part of site is FZ3 with Meanwood Beck	(main river) running along boundary. See	e comments in main text of our response.	

LCC **Ecology support** Not supported Not supported (RED). Woodhouse Ridge LNA covers the southern proportion of this site, based on the presence of woodland, adjacent grassland and the Meanwood Beck. The whole site also provides a good wildlife corridor function as part of the Meanwood Valle Ecology boundary Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary substantially amended as per drawing RM/1098. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed i.e. buffer along the goit planted up with nativ **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

LIDD Designations		
UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	4.28	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	92.67	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core S	trategy	

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.16
Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	1403.71
Nearest bus stop	5268
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	197.87
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	✓
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	□ ✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is designated as greenspace (N1) and proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. The southern part of the site is within a Local Nature Area (LNA) on the existing UDP. Highway concerns as would need to acquire a property to gain access.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - N1 and N5 greenspace, greenfield site, ecology objection, flood risk and landscape. Minor positive - access to health and leisure facilities, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Metro

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required

but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

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

184 5 Yes

Yes Yes

Neutral

Until we see Leeds City Council 's assessment of this site, we will not form a view

Anti

Retained for greenspace including for health of residents.

We partly support and_partly object to this site being allocated in the Site Allocations Plan.

The Forum's wants only the southern half of this site to be developed. We support the development of this part of the site as it is a "brown field" site and its development will reduce pressure on the abundance of sites in the Green Belt. However the garage business on the northern half of the site should be retained as it is one of the largest employers in the Forum's area.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is designated as greenspace (N1) and proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP. The southern part of the site is within a Local Nature Area (LNA) on the existing UDP. Highway concerns as would need to acquire a property to gain access. Not suitable.

1142 Park Lane - land and property at Oak House LS3

Site Detai	Site Details							
Easting	428980	Northing	433929	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA II	nner Area				Ward	Hyde Park	and Woodhouse	
011 01								
Site Chara	icteristic	CS						
Site type M	lixed							
On-site land	uses							
Vacant land								
Office								
Neighbouring	land uses							
Office								
Dwellings	Dwellings							
Other land uses - None								
Topography	Sloping				Landscape	Limited Tree	Cover	
Boundaries	Partially v	well-defined			Road front	Yes		
Description								

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
vvodia acvelopinent lead		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

•	5	
Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote	cted woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to		
Can development preserve this character?		
Character Conclusion		

1142 Park Lane - land and property at Oak House LS3 Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 5 Access comments Access possible from Burley St 5 Local network comments West St / Wellington Road concerns 4 **Total score** Mitigation measures Contribution to West St/ Wellington Road improvement 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 n/a **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints

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

1142 Park Lane - land and property at Oak House LS3

LCC	1		
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other	1		
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	Desi	ignat	ions

our besignations		
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	47.57	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

1142 Park Lane - land and property at Oak House LS3

Overlaps 5551	\Box
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
s Strat. Employment buffer	V
verlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
verlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

1142 Park Lane - land and property at Oak House LS3

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site adjacent city centre. Suitable in principle for residential use or residential on upper floors.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

64 21 Yes

Yes Yes

Pro

The whole Site should be identified for mixed uses including housing to recognise the potential for the re-use / adaptation of existing buildings and the development of adjacent land.

The site should have a 'amber' designation but have concerns that the height of any new building should not block light from properties on Kendal Walk. The group note that any housing provided at this site should be for longer term residents, for example families, key workers, couples or elderly residents, in order to address the population imbalance in the area created by a large number of transient student residents.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site on edge of City Centre currently being used as an office. Any residential proposals are 8 years old. No interest in residential since.

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	428876	Northing	434326	Site area ha	1.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA City Centre, Inner Area			Ward	Hyde Park	and Woodhouse		

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Education

Residential institution

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

A derelict building set in limited grounds that was a college. Lower floors are boarded. Somwhat overgrown.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 t	
Do features provide bound	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

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

SHLAA conclusions							
Availability: Short (6	early)	Suitability:	Suitable		Achievability:	Short (=<5yrs)	
Summary of infra	structure provide	r comments					
LCC Highways Com	ments						
Public transport access	sibility comments						Rank (1-5)
Public Transport Core	Strategy standards met	schools/health, s	some local service	es distant but close	e to city centre	_	5
Access comments Good frontage for acce	ess	1					
							5
Local network commer	nts						
Brownfield site, local t	o city centre						4
Mitigation measures							Total score
Unknown at this stage	,						14
Highways site support]					
yes							
Contingent on other si	tes						
no							
Contingent on other si	tes						
Highways Agency							
Impact No material i	mpact Net	work Status	No objection				
n/a							
Network Rail							
Yorkshire Water							
Treatment Works	Knostrop						
co-ordinated with Yorl the site. The forthcon with YW's investment. take into account avai	w Level are large works kshire Water's Asset Ma ning AMP(6) will run fro . It is particularly import lable sewerage and Ww be possible for the deve	nagement Plans (om April 2015 to Nation that sites who TW capacity. If a	(AMP) to ensure of March 2020. Phase ich represent a 1 of developer wants	the necessary infra sing is one method 0% or greater incr s to bring a site for	structure and ca used to ensure s ease in population ward before YW	pacity can be provided sites are brought for on served by the wo have completed any	ed to serve ward in line rks should y planned
Environment Agend	;y						
Constraints							
FZ1 over 1 ha. See co	omments in main text of	our response.					
LCC							
Ecology support	Supported						
Supported							

Foology houndary
Ecology boundary
Education comments
Education comments
Flood Risk
HOU MAN
Utilities
Gas
Od3
Electric
Fire and Rescue
Telecoms
Other
English Heritage
Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
13/04862/FU	Demolition of all existing buildings on the site other than the original St. Michael's College Building (the 1908 building). Refurbishment and extensions of the 1908 building and development of two new buildings to provide key worker housing, student accommodation and private market apartments, two ground floor commercial units, associated services, facilities and private amenity space	Α	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	3.64	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy	
Core Strategy	

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overla
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	✓	

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

O+1	C +: - I	Dalatianalsia
CITHER	Snatiai	Relationship

Nearest train station Nearest train station Nearest train station distance (m) Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop distance (m) Agricultural classification Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps FRA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded				
Parest train station distance (m) Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop distance (m) Agricultural classification Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps LNR Overlaps Listed Building Perlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	LCC o	wnership	o %	0.00
Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop distance (m) 275.51 Agricultural classification Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Nearest train	station		Burley Park
Nearest bus stop distance (m) 275.51 Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Nearest train station d	listance	(m)	1294.36
Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Neare	est bus s	top	7899
Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Nearest bus stop d	listance	(m)	275.51
Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Agricultural c	lassifica	tion	Urban
Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Ov	erlans S	122	
Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded				
Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded				
Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded				
Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded				
Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps Lis	ted Build	ding	
Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps Strat. Employ	ment bu	ffer	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps Public R	light of \	Nay	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps SFRA	Flood Z	one	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps EA	Flood Z	one	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps HSE M	ajor Haz	ard	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps HSE (Gas Pipe	line	
	Overlaps Pot. Co	ntamina	tion	
verlans Minerals Safeguarded 100m	Overlaps Minera	ls Safeg	uard	ed
chaps wither als sareguarded Toom	Overlaps Minerals Safe	guarded	100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

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

Site affects others?

Student accommodation would raise cumulative amenity concerns in locality, but site could be developed for non-student housing.

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

275 18 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Permission received on 11/09/2014 for residential scheme.

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	432131	Northing	434365	Site area ha	11.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area			Ward	Burmantoft	s and Richmond Hill	

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Wholesale distribution

Neighbouring land uses

Wholesale distribution

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is mostly a large manufacturing building. The site has been submitted. There is are areas of residential housing to the north east and south weat of the site. Site is flat.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
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

1145A Hudson Road, Hudson Mill (Arcadia), Burmantofts Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (later) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary 5 Access comments access achievable from Stoney Rock Lane, Hudson Avenue and possibly Torre Road 5 Local network comments Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 3 **Total score** Mitigation measures Capacity improvements, alterations to traffic calming/on-street parking bays 13 Highways site support Yes with mitigation Contingent on other sites No Contingent on other sites No **Highways Agency Network Status Impact** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints

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

LCC		
Ecology support		
Ecology boundary		
Education comments	:	
Flood Risk		
	·	
Utilities		
Gas		
Electric		
Fire and Rescue		
Telecoms		
Other English Heritage	-	
The northern part of		kett Street Cemetery a Grade II Registered Park and Garden.
If allocated, any devare not harmed.	elopment proposals for this are	ea would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset
Natural England		
vaturai Erigianu		
Planning History		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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

% overlap

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	%	0.29
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	2706.77
Nearest bus st	top	12751
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	185.58
Agricultural classificati	ion l	Jrban
Overlaps SS	SSI	
Overlaps SE		
Overlaps L		
Overlaps L	.NR	
Overlaps Conservation A	rea	
Overlaps Listed Build	ing	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buf	fer	
Overlaps Public Right of W	√ay	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zo	one	
Overlaps EA Flood Zo	one	
Overlaps HSE Major Haza	ard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipel	ine	
Overlaps Pot. Contaminat	ion	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safegu	iarde	d
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	100	m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Top half of site is in employment use (1145a). The rest of site is allocated for employment use on the existing UDP and has been assessed as a site to retain for employment use (1145b).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

179 6 Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Agreed for housing with members.

Site Details							
Easting	432106	Northing	434077	Site area ha	8.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area		Ward	Burmantofts and Richmond Hill				
Site Characteristics							
Site type	Brownfield						

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Wholesale distribution

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Wholesale distribution

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topograph	/ Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Sie is part of the Arcadia group. It is flat and level. Most of this area is either unused (green) or used for parking (both cars and lorry park).

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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	Nould development lead to physical connection of settlements?				
Do features provide bound					
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

1145B Hudson Road, Hudson Mill (Arcadia), Burmantofts Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Availability: Short (later) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary 5 Access comments access achievable from Torre road 5 Local network comments Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 3 **Total score** Mitigation measures Capacity improvements 13 Highways site support Yes with Mitigation Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency Network Status Impact** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints

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

LCC			
Ecology support			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			
Natural England			
Dianning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50	20% of the cite	
Planning History			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	S
------------------	---

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	~

% overlap

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 % 32.54 Nearest train station Leeds City Nearest train station distance (m) 2571.58 921 Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop distance (m) 242.46 Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area

Overlaps Listed Building

Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline

Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way

Overlaps Pot. Contamination			
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded			
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m			

Conclusions
Issues and Options Summary
Top half of site is in employment use (1145a). The rest of site is allocated for employment use on the existing UDP and has been assessed as a site to retain for employment use (1145b).
Site affects others?
Sustainability summary
Significant negative - access to greenspace. Minor negative - employment and economic growth. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility.
Summary of reps
Comments on phasing
DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation
DPP Allocation Conclusion
Agreed with members to propose employment use for this area.

Site Details								
Easting	431731	Northing	433520	Site area ha	5.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Burmantoft	s and Richmond Hill	

Site Characteristics

Site type Mix 70:30

On-site land uses

Education

Shops

Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site situated on the south side of York Road comprising of School with pitches, vacant former library facing York Road, a retail warehouse (Great Clothes), a recreation centre and public amenity space.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		14

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

1146 York Road (land south of), East of Pontefract lane, Richmond Hill LS9 Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Public Transport accessibility and standards for local services, schools and healthcare 5 Access comments Main vehicular access should be from Shannon Street 5 Local network comments No egress from Shannon St to Marsh Lane, route via A64 subject to T.A, cumulative impact concern 4 **Total score** Mitigation measures Pedestrian linkage improvements required, probably junction improvements for traffic capacity 14 Highways site support Yes - with mitigation Contingent on other sites Need to consider with 1140 and 2000. Contingent on other sites Need to consider with 1140 and 2000. **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 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

Environment Agency

Constraints

study.

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

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
There is a requirement features of special arc	d Library and Baths at the northern end of this site are Grade II Listed. It in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any chitectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, any development proposals for this area would nose elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.
Natural England	
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site
App Number	Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	20.41	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		

Core Strategy

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

D	. :	Λ
Rea	eneration	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	

Sch. Ancient Mon. 0	.00
Other Spatial Relationshi	р
LCC ownership %	37.26
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	2064.71
Nearest bus stop	179
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	114.25
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	✓
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
0 1 1105 0 51 11	

Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline
Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Proposed new town centre. Retail interest in site, but acceptable in principle for residential, or residential on upper floors.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - access to greenspace. Minor negative - employment and economic growth, part greenfield/brownfield site and pollution. Significant positive - access to leisure facilities, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health, community participation.

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

113 23 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing with mixed uses (no employment)

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site suited for residential development but part is required for a school extension and part must be retained as greenspace. Not preferred for general employment.

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	433766	Northing	435038	Site area ha	1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Gipton and	Harehills	
Cita Cha	racteristic							
		28						
Site type	Greenfield							
On-site lan	d uses							
Outdoor sp	ort facility							
Education								
Neighbouri	ng land uses	1						
Education								
Dwellings								
Other land uses - None								
Topograph	ny Flat				Landscape	No Tree Cove	er	
Boundarie	S				Road front	Yes		
Description								_

Area is open green space attached to school. Assocaited land is playing pitches and residential. Wyke beck lies to east of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound			
Coalescence Conclusion		1	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

•	5		
Strong defensible boundary	between site and urban area		
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside		
Does the site include local/			
Areas of protected/unprote			
Site includes Grade 1, Grad			
Does the site contain buildings			
Are these buildings used fo			
Encroachment Conclusion			

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

Oakwood Lane (land to east of), Leeds (Part of St Nicholas church site) 1152 Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Unknown Suitability: Unsuitable Achievability: Uncertain Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Good accessibility 5 Access comments access should be achievable from Oakwood Lane or Wykebeck Valley Road 5 Local network comments spare capacity but some cumulative issues 4 **Total score** Mitigation measures 14 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ3 (ii) as shown on LCC SFRA - recommendation that no 'more vulnerable use' be permitted in FZ3a (ii) See comments in main text of our response.

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	

Planning History	ry Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site				
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site		
10/03861/FU	New canopy and introduction of pedestrian access gate and route to main entrance to school	Α	100		
11/05163/FU	Attached canopy with roller shutters to form external play area to school	Α	100		

Spatial relationships	elationships
-----------------------	--------------

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	60.72	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Main Orban Area	100.00	76 Overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	~	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overla
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) 25	87.09
Nearest bus stop	6912
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	99.65
Agricultural classification Urba	n
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	/
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Two thirds of the site is a designated protected playing pitch (N6) on the existing UDP and is part of the school grounds. 80% of the site is within flood zone 3 (high risk).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N6 greenspace and greenfield site. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Metro

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required

but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

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

53 13 Yes Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Two thirds of the site is a designated protected playing pitch (N6) on the existing UDP and is part of the school grounds. 80% of the site is within flood zone 3 (high risk). Not suitable.

Site Details							
Easting	428498	Northing	433183	Site area ha	5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Armley	_

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Other

Neighbouring land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Dwellings

Other land uses

Centrica training site

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

Description

Site comprises of two areas. The site in the middle of Armley Gyratory which is ostensibly a car park. The rest of the site is currently a research/training centre for British Gas and is in existing employment use. There is residential to the west of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound				
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

Constraints

1265 **Armley Gyratory - former Gas Works** 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: Longterm (11+yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Public Transport accessibility and standards for local services, primary schools and healthcare but not secondary schools 4 Access comments Site requires complete re-ordering of Armley Gyratory which would need to be supported by more intensive development than 2 suggested. Local network comments Congestion at Armley Gyratory 2 **Total score** Mitigation measures Major reordering of Armley Gyratory required 8 Highways site support yes - with mitigation Contingent on other sites Better to combine with 1340 Contingent on other sites Better to combine with 1340 **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency**

FZ1 over 1 ha. Historic Landfill on southern part of site. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC		
Ecology support	Supported	
Supported		
Ecology boundary		
Education comments		
Flood Risk		
Utilities	1	
Gas		
Electric		
Fire and Rescue		
Telecoms		
Other	1	
English Heritage		
Natural England		
	II.	

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site						
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site				
11/02239/FU	Detached two storey pre-fabricated classroom units	Α	51				

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Sch. Ancient Mon.

0.00

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	100.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	100.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.01
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1194.25
Nearest bus stop	599
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	165.00
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<u> </u>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is designated for mixed use in the West Leeds Gateway Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Potential to come forward for residential in future, in principle, but this is a longer term prospect and would include the remodelling of Armley Gyratory junction.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - pollution. Minor negative - employment, economic growth and waste. Significant positive - brownfield site and flood risk. Minor positive - access to health and leisure facilities, community participation, greenspace, transport network and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

4 15 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation with mixed uses

DPP Allocation Conclusion

With the proposed remodelling of the Armley Gyratory junction land should become available for housing and general employment development. It is a suitable location for both.

1278 Gelderd Road - Symphony Group LS12

Site Details								
Easting	427617	Northing	431844	Site area ha		6.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Beeston and	d Holbeck	

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Wholesale distribution

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Wholesale distribution

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site on large industrial estate. Believe sheds to be empty. Other parts of site are on derelict land. There is some residential to the north of the area but this area is predomionantly industrial.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		14

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

1278 Gelderd Road - Symphony Group LS12 Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Suitability: Unsuitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 50% primary, 100% health, 40% secondary 4 Access comments access onto Whitehall road not achievable, Alternative access is an industrial road 2 Local network comments Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 4 **Total score** Mitigation measures 10 Highways site support 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 Morley/Gildersome cluster. **Network Rail** Engineer's access retention; General asset protection issues Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop

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

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ 3 - Southern tip of site Main river (wortley Beck) also runs through the southern tip. See comments in main text of our response

1278 Gelderd Road - Symphony Group LS12

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Florin	7		
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			
Natural England	1		
ivaturai Engiana			
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations					
	HIDD	Deci	ian	ati	nnc

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	~

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

1278 Gelderd Road - Symphony Group LS12

LCC ownership %	0.00
No and the least of	0 - 4451
Nearest train station	Cottingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	1789.44
Nearest bus stop	5375
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	226.76
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
<u>'</u>	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed 🗸
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

1278 Gelderd Road - Symphony Group LS12

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is not within a residential area and would be more suitable as an employment site.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - employment and economic growth and waste. Significant positive - brownfield site and transport network. Minor positive - access to leisure facilities and greenspace, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Metro

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required

but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

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

119 7 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is not within a residential area and would be more suitable as an employment site.

1338 Mistress Lane, Armley

Site Details								
Easting	427380	Northing	433582	Site area ha		1.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	MCA Inner Area				Ward	Armley		

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption
2 23011	

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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 acces	s to the countryside			
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs			
Areas of protected/unprote	cted woodland/trees/hedgerows?			
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	e 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?			
Does the site contain buildings				
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?				
Encroachment Conclusion				

4. Preserve the 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

Inner Area

1338	Mistress Lane, Armle	e y			
SHLAA conc	usions				
Availability:	Short (early)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)	
Summary of	of infrastructure prov	ider comments			
Highways A					
Impact		Network Status			
Network Ra	11				
Yorkshire Workshire Worksh					
Treatment wo	II KS				
	_				
Environmen Constraints	t Agency				
CONSTITUTION					
LCC Ecology suppo	ort				
200.095 0466					
Ecology bound	darv				
	, <u>,</u>				
Education con	nments				
Flood Risk					
11411141					
Utilities Gas					
Electric					
Fire and Rescu	ue e				
Telecoms					
	'				
Other					
English Herita	ge				
Natural Engla	nd				
	!				

1338	Mistress Lane, Armley		
10/02221/LA	Outline Application for residential development to vacant site	Α	95

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	43.09	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overla
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	~	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	100.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	100.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership % 99.40

Nearest train station Burley Park

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (n	n) 1677.58
Nearest bus sto	p 13913
Nearest bus stop distance (n	n) 85.07

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI
Overlaps LNA
Overlaps LNR
Overlaps LNR
Overlaps Conservation Area
Overlaps Listed Building
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer
Overlaps Public Right of Way
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline
Overlaps Pot. Contamination

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

Inner Area

1338 Mistress Lane, Armley

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	asting 428348 Northing 433227 Site area ha					2.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	MCA Inner Area			Ward	Armley			

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Office

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is Green area between British Gas training / research facility and residential area. Has some paths through it and appears to be used Green amenity space.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
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?	
Francisch was at Osmalius's a	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

Environment Agency

FZ1 over 1 ha. Historic Landfill abuts the site. See comments in main text of our response.

Constraints

1340 Oak Road, New Wortley - Gassey Fields Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Public Transport accessibility and standards for local services, primary schools and healthcare but not secondary schools Access comments Access form an extended Hedley Chase (traffic calm) Local network comments Tong Road / Wortley Road congestion 3 **Total score** Mitigation measures Pedestrian links to public transport / traffic calming in local neighbourhood 11 Highways site support Yes - with mitigation Contingent on other sites Better to combine with 1265 Contingent on other sites Better to combine with 1265 **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study.

LCC	1		
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other	1		
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 D)esiç	gna	tions
-------	-------	-----	-------

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	100.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	100.00	

LCC ownership %	95.11
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1344.28
Nearest bus stop	599
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	132.73
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	✓
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Allocated housing site in West Leeds Gateway Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Suitable for residential development.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - access to greenspace, greenfield site and pollution. Minor negative - waste. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities, community participation, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility.

Summary of reps

National Grid

Site Ref: 3454/1340. New Wortley. Crosses VR underground cable route (275kV).

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

153 6 Yes Yes

Yes

DPP Allocation

Comments on phasing

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Allocated housing site in West Leeds Gateway Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Suitable for residential development.

Site Detai	ls							
Easting	428877	Northing	433536	Site area ha	1.4	SP7	City Centre Infill	
HMCA I	nner Area				Ward	City and F	lunslet	
Site Chara	acteristic	cs						
Site type E	Brownfield							
On-site land	uses							
Other								
Outdoor spor	t facility							
Neighbouring	g land uses	,						
Hotels, board	ding and gu	est houses						
Restaurants	and Cafes							
Shops								
Other land us	ses							
parking								
Topography	Flat				Landscape	Limited Tree	e Cover	
Boundaries	Existing v	vell defined			Road front	Yes		
Description								

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

•	•		
Would development lead t	to physical connection	on of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries 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 co	onservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserv	ve this character?	
		,

Character Conclusion

Inner Area

2025 Aireside - adjacent Pai	rk			
Overall Conclusion from assessment ag characteristics of openness and perma		oses of green be	It and essential	
SHLAA conclusions				
	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability: Longtorm (11 u	(rc)
Availability: Short (later)	Sultability:	Sultable	Achievability: Longterm (11+)	/15)
Summary of infrastructure provid	er comments			
LCC Highways Comments				Donk (4.5)
Public transport accessibility comments Meets Public Transport accessibility and star	ndards for local ser	vices primary sch	ools and healthcare but not secondary schools	Rank (1-5)
inteets rubile transport accessibility and star	idal da 101 10cai sei	vices, primary scri	ools and healthcare but not secondary schools	4
Access comments				
Access from Wellington Bridge Street				5
Local network comments				
Congestion on A65, Armley Gyratory and We	est St gyratory			3
				3
Mitigation measures				Total score
Armley Gyratory and West St gyratory				12
				12
Highways site support				
yes - with mitigation				
Contingent on other sites				
Contingent on other sites				
_				
Highways Agency				
'	etwork Status	no objection		
n/a				
Network Rail				
Yorkshire Water				
Treatment Works Knostrop				
co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset N	Management Plans	(AMP) to ensure th	relopment that will connect to the public sewer sys	ovided to serve
with YW's investment. It is particularly impo	ortant that sites wh	ich represent a 10	ng is one method used to ensure sites are brought % or greater increase in population served by the	works should
			to bring a site forward before YW have completed e amount would be determined by a developer fun	
study.			, , , ,	
Environment Agency				
Constraints				
FZ3 (ii) as shown on LCC SFRA - recommen response.	idation that no 'moi	re vulnerable use'	be permitted in FZ3a (ii) See comments in main te	ext of our

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
Supported with mitig lighting.Otters to cor	gation to protect and enhance the River Aire wildlife corridor. Native tree planting and a suitable buffer with reduced street nsider - inlouding reducing road mortality in times of flood.
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
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	100.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

LCC ownership %	0.00		
Nearest train station	Leeds City		
Nearest train station distance (m)	885.55		
Nearest bus stop	12034		
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	91.99		
Agricultural classification	Urban		
Overlaps SSSI			
Overlaps SEGI			
Overlaps LNA			
Overlaps LNR			
Overlaps Conservation Area			
Overlaps Listed Building			
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer			
Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard			
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓		
Overlaps EA Flood Zone			
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard			
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline			
Overlaps Pot. Contamination			
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	led		
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	Om		

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

In existing employment use, suitable in principle for residential development or mixed use with residential on upper floors.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Primary Health

99 34 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

In existing employment use, therefore not considered available for residential.

2026 Cavendish Street - RSPCA

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	428911	Northing	433810	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and Hu	ınslet

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

_	
Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area		
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the 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

Inner Area

2026 **Cavendish Street - RSPCA** SHLAA conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status Network Rail **Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England

Planning History	nning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
14/03023/EXT	Extension of time of previous approval 08/02061/FU for multi-level development up to 9 storeys high above ground level comprising 46 student cluster flats and 24 studio flats		90	

2026 Cavendish Street - RSPCA

(total of 239 beds) and 1 retail unit, car parking, common room and ancillary facilities

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	100.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regenerati	on Areas
------------	----------

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

LCC ownership %		10.03
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)		996.43
Nearest bus stop		5725
Nearest bus stop distance (m)		70.89
Agricultural classification	on	Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	~
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	~
Overlans Minerals Safeguarded]

<u> </u>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

2026 Cavendish Street - RSPCA

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 acce	pted

2027 Round House (rear of)

Site Details							
Easting	428907	Northing	433191	Site area ha	1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	MCA City Centre, Inner Area			Ward	City and Hu	unslet	

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Car Parks

Neighbouring land uses

Vacant land

Office

Dwellings

Shops

Other land uses - None

To	pography	Flat	Landscape	No Tree Cover
В	oundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Site is currently being used as car park (and apparent overflow car park) for adjacent office and resiential development.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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			
Do features provide bound			
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

2027	Round House (rear of)	
	nclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential stics of openness and permanence	
SHLAA cor	nelusions	
		ro)
Availability	y: Short (later) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Longterm (11+y)	15)
Summary	y of infrastructure provider comments	
LCC Highw	ways Comments	
	port accessibility comments	Rank (1-5)
	c Transport accessibility and standards for local services, primary schools and healthcare but not secondary schools - walking environment	4
Access com Access from	ments n Wellington Road, left in left out only	5
	on A65, Armley Gyratory and West St gyratory, unpleasant walking environment needs footbrodge over canal to link y centre	3
Mitigation m Armley Gyra	neasures atory and West St gyratory / footbridge over canal	Total score
Highways si Yes - with n		
Contingent (on other sites	
Contingent (on other sites	
Highways Impact No	Agency o material impact Network Status no objection	
Network F	Rail	
	e, General asset protection issues	
Yorkshire Treatment		
co-ordinate the site. Th with YW's in take into ac	Works Knostrop igh and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system of with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be properly for forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the ecount available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed into it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer function.	vided to serve forward in line works should any planned
Environme	ent Agency	
Constraints		

FZ2 40 % of site to east. See comments in main text of our response

Inner Area

2027	Round House (rear o	of)				
LCC						
Ecology suppo	ort Supported					
Supported						
Ecology bound	lary					
33	3					
Education com	nments					
Flood Risk						
Utilities						
Gas						
Electric						
Fire and Rescu	ue e					
Telecoms						
211						
Other English Heritag	ne e					
		the north of this site	(the Round House (Grade II*); the	e half Ro	ound House and the	former Railway Repair
Shop (both Gr	ade II).					
features of sp	ecial architectural or histori	ic interest which they p	uld be had to the desirability of proossess. Consequently, if allocated,	, any		
development p	proposals for this area wou	lld need to ensure that	those elements which contribute	to the si	gnificance of this as	set are not harmed.
Natural Englar	nd					
Planning His	tory Applications since	1/1/2009, covering more	e than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal		Decision	n	% of site	
Spatial relati	ionships					
-	•		Church			
UDP Desi	gnations	Cor	re Strategy			

2027 Round House (rear of)

0.00	% overlap
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
100.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00 0.00

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

Regeneration Areas

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

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	784.86
Nearest bus stop	789
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	136.65
Agricultural classification l	Jrban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	✓
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<u></u>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<u> </u>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	d
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100r	m _

2027 Round House (rear of)

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

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

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Primary Health

145 9 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

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

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	429225	Northing	436076	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Chapel All	lerton	

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Allotment and city farm

Unmanaged Forest

Neighbouring land uses

Unmanaged Forest

Outdoor sport facility

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is a heavy wooded area of mature tress on a slope next to a main road.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
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

2077 Meanwood Road, Meanwood LS6 Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Unavailable Suitability: Unsuitable Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Good Accessibility except average primary 4 Access comments Good frontage onto Meanwood Road but development land steep and there may be gradient issues to implement adopted highway 5 Local network comments possible cumulative impacts into town 4 **Total score** Mitigation measures Development land needs flattening/engineering works, possible cumulative fund 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 n/a **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints Small amount of site in FZ 3. Main river Wortley Beck abuts NW corner. See comments in main text of our reply

LCC		
Ecology support	Not supported	
Not supported (RED) buffer to the adjacen). Woodhouse Ridge LNA covers all this site, based on the ability of the site to na nt mature woodland of Woodhouse Ridge. Currently used as allotments so has lir	turally regenerate to woodland and provide a nited wildli
Ecology boundary		
Education comments	3	
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	0.01	
N1A Allotments	99.99	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

LCC ownership %	100.00
Nearest train station Bu	ırley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	1600.56
Nearest bus stop	3980
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	60.22
Agricultural classification U	rban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	✓
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<u></u>
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\bar{\Box}$
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site is a designated allotment site (N1A) on the existing UDP and part is a Local Nature Area. The allotments are overgrown, mature trees around boundary. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N1A allotment, greenfield site and ecology objection. Minor negative - landscape. Minor positive - access to health facilities, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Metro

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required

but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

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

Yes

13

56

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is a designated allotment site (N1A) on the existing UDP and part is a Local Nature Area. The allotments are overgrown, mature trees around boundary. Heavily Wooded area. Not suitable.

2079 Matthew Murray High School (former), Holbeck LS11

Site Details							
Easting	428635	Northing	431848	Site area ha	6.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Beeston and	d Holbeck
Site Characteristics							
Site type Mix 60:40 On-site land uses							

Neighbouring land uses

Outdoor sport facility

Outdoor sport facility

Allotment and city farm

Shops

Education

Vacant land

Other land uses - None

Topography Flat	Landscape Limited Tree Cover
Boundaries	Road front Yes

Description

Site is a mixture of N6 and brownfield land. The Ingram distributor lies to the west. Rseidential anda school are also nearby. To the west of the site on the other side of the Ingram distributor is a large industrial estate. To the South west is Elland Road. The site is an old school site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
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?	
Observator Osmalisais	

Character Conclusion

2079	Matthew Murray High So	chool (former	r), Holbeck LS	11			
Overall Co	nclusion from assessment aga stics of openness and permand	inst all 4 purpo ence	oses of green bel	It and essentia	al		
SHLAA cor	nclusions						
Availabilit	y: Short (early)	Suitability:	Suitable		Achievability:	Medium (6-10yrs)	
Summary	of infrastructure provider	comments					
LCC Highw	ays Comments						
Public trans	port accessibility comments						Rank (1-5)
4buses per	hour, 100% primary, 100% health	, 50% secondary	,				4
Access com	ments						
access achie	evable						5
Local netwo	rk comments						
Potential cu	mulative impact with adjacent site	S				_	4
Mitigation m	neasures						Total score
		I					13
I II alamana at	A]					
Highways si yes	te support						
, , ,							
Contingent	on other sites						
no							
Contingent	on other sites						
no							
Highways	Agency						
Impact No	material impact Netv	vork Status	No objection				
Potential fo	r cumulative impact in combination	n with other sites	. If site still includ	led at next sift a	ssess as part of o	ity centre / Aire Vall	ey cluster.
Network F	Rail						
Yorkshire	Water						
Treatment V	Vorks						
Environme	ent Agency						
Constraints	THE AGENCY						
	ha. See comments in main text of	our response.					
LCC							
Ecology sup	port Supported						
Supported							

Inner Area 2079 Matthew Murray High School (former), Holbeck LS11 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

% of site **App Number Proposal** Decision

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	52.21	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	97.19	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	99.39	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

LCC ownership %	99.43
-----------------	-------

2079 Matthew Murray High School (former), Holbeck LS11

Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1709.23
Nearest bus stop	1112
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	315.46
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	~
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m 🗸

2079 Matthew Murray High School (former), Holbeck LS11

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site within urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development, although half of the site is designated as a protected playing pitch (N6) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N6 greenspace and pollution. Minor negative - part greenfield/brownfield site and waste. Minor positive - access to health facilities, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

270 8 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site unavailable at present.

2138 Kirkstall Road, Abbey Street

Site Details								
Easting	428890	Northing	433763	Site area ha	0.3		SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			War	d	City and Hu	nslet		

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

	Would 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			
Does the site provide acces			
Does the site include local/			
Areas of protected/unprote			
Site includes Grade 1, Grad			
Does the site contain buildings			
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?			
Encroachment Conclusion			

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

2138 Kirkstall Road, Abbey Street **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Public Transport accessibility and standards for local services, primary schools and healthcare but not secondary schools 4 Access comments Access from Abbey St Ok for 40 units proposed 5 Local network comments Cummulative impact on West st / Armley Gyratory 4 Total score Mitigation measures Contribution to improvements at West St and Armley gyratories 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 n/a **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Supported Ecology support Supported Ecology boundary **Education comments**

Inner Area

2138 Kirkstall Road, Abbey Street

Flood Risk		
Utilities		
Gas		
Electric		
Fire and Rescue		

Telecoms		
Other		

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/01850/EXT	Extension of time period for outline application 06/02359/OT to erect mixed use development up to 11 storeys comprising of residential and/or hotel and/or office (B1) use, ground floor A3/A4 units with undercroft car parking and infrastructure works including landscaped public space	A	87
12/02887/FU	Change of use to financial and professional services (A2	Α	89

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	100.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
	-	

use)

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Iviairi Urbari Area	100.00	76 Overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	~	

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

Sch. Ancient Mon.

LCC ownership %	3.25

0.00

2138 Kirkstall Road, Abbey Street

Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	985.30
Nearest bus stop	12811
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	56.72
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<u></u>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

2138 Kirkstall Road, Abbey Street

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamasmity ourminary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

2139 Cross Green Grove, Cross Green

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	431783	Northing	432633	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area		Ward	Burmantoft	s 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

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

2139 Cross Green Grove, Cross Green **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Good accessibility 5 Access comments Existing housing location - good access 5 Local network comments Existing housing and small scale - no local impact 5 Total score Mitigation measures 15 Highways site support Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Supported **Ecology support** Supported Ecology boundary **Education comments**

Inner Area

2139 Cross Green Grove, Cross Green

Flood Risk		
Utilities		
Gas		
Electric		
Fire and Rescue		
Telecoms		
	=	
Other		
English Heritage		

Matural	England

Planning History	anning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site						
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site				
09/02101/DEM	Determination to demolish 24 back to back residential properties	Α	57				
11/05317/FU	Six pairs of housing association semi detached and three blocks of terrace houses (21 in total) including associated car parking, landscaping and greenspace	Α	92				

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	84.71

2139 Cross Green Grove, Cross Green

Nearest train station	eeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	2164.03
Nearest bus stop	10781
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	106.08
Agricultural classification U	rban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	✓
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	\Box
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	n

2139 Cross Green Grove, Cross Green

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley identified	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	

2140 Raincliffe Road, Richmond Hill

Site Details									
Easting	432211	Northing	433541	Site area ha		0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA Inner Area				Ward	Burmantoft	s and Richmond Hill			

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Vacant building

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Cleared school site. Brownfield/Greenfield. Surrounded by residential with green amenity area nearby. Major distributor road adjacent.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		

2140 Raincliffe Road, Richmond Hill

SHLAA conclusions					
Availability: Short (e	early)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)	
Summary of infra	structure prov	vider comments			
LCC Highways Com	ments				
Public transport access					Rank (1-5)
Meets Public Transpor	t accessibility and s	standards for local ser	rvices, schools and healthca	are	5
Access comments					
access should be achie	evable from Vinery	Terrace			5
Local network comme spare capacity	nts				5
Mitigation measures					Total score
none					15
Highways site support yes					
Contingent on other si	tes				
Contingent on other si	tes				
	1				J
Highways Agency			.		
Impact No material i	mpact	Network Status	No objection		
Network Rail Yorkshire Water					
Treatment Works	Knostrop				
co-ordinated with Yor the site. The forthcor with YW's investment take into account avai	kshire Water's Asse ning AMP(6) will ru . It is particularly ir lable sewerage and	et Management Plans in from April 2015 to mportant that sites wh d WwTW capacity. If a	(AMP) to ensure the necess March 2020. Phasing is one nich represent a 10% or great developer wants to bring	nt that will connect to the public sewer systems of the sary infrastructure and capacity can be proved the method used to ensure sites are brought feater increase in population served by the waste forward before YW have completed at would be determined by a developer fundation.	rided to serve forward in line vorks should any planned
Environment Agend	cy				
Constraints					
FZ1 under 1 ha. See	comments in main	text of our response.			
LCC					
Ecology support	Supported				
Supported					

2140 Raincliffe Road, Richmond Hill 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

Spatial relationships

App Number

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

Proposal

Core Strategy	

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

% of site

Decision

			_
Reg	ener	ation	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 %	0.26
-----------------	------

2140 Raincliffe Road, Richmond Hill

Nearest train station		Leeds City	
Nearest train station distance	nin station distance (m)		
Nearest bus s	top	8797	
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	43.59	
Agricultural classificat	tion	Urban	
Overlaps S	SSI		
Overlaps S	EGI		
Overlaps I	NA		
Overlaps I	NR		
Overlaps Conservation A	rea		
Overlaps Listed Build	ling		
Overlaps Strat. Employment bu	ffer		
Overlaps Public Right of V	Vay		
Overlaps SFRA Flood Z	one		
Overlaps EA Flood Z	one		
Overlaps HSE Major Haz	ard		
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipe	line		
Overlaps Pot. Contamina	tion		
Overlaps Minerals Safegu	uard	ed	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	100)m	

2140 Raincliffe Road, Richmond Hill

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

School closed and moved to new Richmond Hill Primary Sept 2012. Vacant site. Could be used for community use but residential more likely.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - pollution. Significant positive - access to greenspace, brownfield site, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities and community participation.

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Primary Health

51 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Members and oficers identified the site for a community use. Not available for residential.

2141A Wykebeck Avenue, Osmondthorpe

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	433672	Northing	433536	Site area ha	1.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Temple Ne	wsam	

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
· ·	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion	3 1 1	L

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

2141A Wykebeck Avenue, Osmondthorpe **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/04369/LA	Outline Application to layout access and erect residential development	Α	100

2141A Wykebeck Avenue, Osmondthorpe

Spatial relationships

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

Core	Strategy

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

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

0.00	% overlap
0.00	
100.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	100.00	
Nearest train station	Cross Gates	
Nearest train station distance (2765.64	
Nearest bus s	1764	
Nearest bus stop distance (127.16	
Agricultural classificat	ion	Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
0 14 0 6 1	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

2141A Wykebeck Avenue, Osmondthorpe

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

2141B Wykebeck Avenue, Osmondthorpe

Site Details							
Easting	433615	Northing	433644	Site area ha	1.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area		Ward	Temple Ne	wsam		

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Transport tracks and ways

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Larger green area (with some amenity value) adjacent to train tracks. To south of the site is some brownfield land that is currently fenced off. An area across the road is an identified housing site that is also brownfield line.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
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

2141B	Wykebeck Avenu	ie, Osmondthorpe				
Overall Con characterist	clusion from assessn ics of openness and	nent against all 4 purpo permanence	oses of green belt	and essential		
SHLAA cond	lusions					
Availability	Short (early)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achieval	bility: Medium (6-10yrs)	
Summary	of infrastructure p	provider comments				
Highways A	agency					
Impact		Network Status				
Network Ra	nil					
Yorkshire V	Vater					
Treatment W	orks					
Environmer Constraints	nt Agency					
LCC Ecology supp	ort					
35 111						
Ecology boun	dary					
Education cor	mments					
Flood Risk						
Utilities Gas						
Electric						
Fire and Resc	ue					
Telecoms						
Other English Herita	age					
	- 3 -					
Natural Engla	nd					

2141B	Wykebeck Avenue,	Osmondthorpe			
App Number		·	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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy	•
---------------	---

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overla
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	✓	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	100.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

	LCC ow	nership	% (99.93

Nearest train station	(Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (2786.71	
Nearest bus s	1764	
Nearest bus stop distance (244.60	

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	\Box
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	П
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	$\overline{\Box}$

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

2141B Wykebeck Avenue, Osmondthorpe

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	1
ouotamasmity ourmnary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	1
Preferred housing allocation	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	area. Adjacent area is identified site. Suitable for residential.

2142 Kendall Drive, Halton Moor

Site Details								
Easting	434123	Northing	433208	Site area ha	0.5		SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area			War	⁻ d	Temple Nev	vsam	

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is open greenspace straddling a road with the majority of the site being on the North Side of the Road. The site is almost enitrely surrounded by residential.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

•	•	
Would development lead to/const	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an is	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the I	ouilt up area?	
Would development round off the	e settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

=		
Would development lead	to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries 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?	
F 1 10 1 1	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

2142 Kendall Drive, Halton Moor

SHLAA conclusions					
Availability: Short (ea	arly)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability: Medium (6-10yr	s)
Summary of infras	structure provi	der comments			
Public transport accession 4buses per hour, 100%	ibility comments	ealth, 100% secondar	ry		Rank (1-5)
Access comments access achievable					5
Local network commen local congestion. Poten		act with adjacent site	es		3
Mitigation measures					Total score
none indentified		,			13
Highways site support yes					
Contingent on other site	es				
Contingent on other site	es				
no					
Highways Agency Impact No material in	nnact	Notwork Status	No objection		
Impact No material in	праст	Network Status	No objection		
Network Rail					
Yorkshire Water					
	Knostrop				
Knostrop High and Low co-ordinated with York the site. The forthcom with YW's investment. take into account availated.	Level are large wo shire Water's Asset ing AMP(6) will rur It is particularly im able sewerage and	Management Plans (In from April 2015 to N portant that sites wh WwTW capacity. If a	(AMP) to ensure the March 2020. Phasing nich represent a 10% n developer wants to	opment that will connect to the public sewer syst necessary infrastructure and capacity can be pro g is one method used to ensure sites are brought to or greater increase in population served by the value bring a site forward before YW have completed a mount would be determined by a developer func	vided to serve forward in line works should any planned
Environment Agency	v				
Constraints					
FZ1 under 1 ha. See co	omments in main to	ext 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

Spatial relationships

App Number

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

Proposal

Core Strategy	
Martin I Indonesia Assaul	100.00

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

% of site

Decision

Regenera	tion	Δreas
ixegenera	uon	AI Cas

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

2142 Kendall Drive, Halton Moor

Nearest train station	Cross Gates	
Nearest train station distance (m	2491.01	
Nearest bus stop	p 3361	
Nearest bus stop distance (m) 104.37	
Agricultural classification	Urban	
Overlaps SSS		
Overlaps SEG	I	
Overlaps LNA	Α	
Overlaps LNI	R	
Overlaps Conservation Are	a 🗌	
Overlaps Listed Building	g	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffe	r	
Overlaps Public Right of Wa	у	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zon	e	
Overlaps EA Flood Zon	e	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	d D	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipelin	e	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	n _	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguar	ded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 10	00m	

2142 Kendall Drive, Halton Moor

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Vacant brownfield site, grassed over. Suitable in principle for residential development. Formerly identified for housing on the withdrawn East and South East Leeds (EASEL) Area Action Plan.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

116 5 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Vacant brownfield site, grassed over. Suitable in principle for residential development. Formerly identified for housing on the withdrawn East and South East Leeds (EASEL) Area Action Plan.

2143 Neville Road, Halton Moor

Site Details							
Easting	434377	Northing	433219	Site area ha	2.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Temple Ne	wsam

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

Topograph	Sloping	Landscape	No Tree Cover
Boundaries	Existing well defined	Road front	Yes

Description

Area of flat Green land in between housing. Surrounded by residntial.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/const		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the I		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

_		
Would development lead		
Do features provide boun		
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			
Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?			
Can development pres			
Character Conclusion			

characteristics of openiness and permanence						
	_					

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

2143 Neville Road, Halton Moor

SHLAA conclusions Availability: Unavailable Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary 5 Access comments access achievable 5 Local network comments local congestion. Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 3 Total score Mitigation measures none indentified 13 Highways site support Contingent on other sites 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

2143 Neville Road, Halton Moor 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

Spatial relationships

App Number

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

Proposal

Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area	100.00

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

% of site

Decision

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 %	99.46
-----------------	-------

2143 Neville Road, Halton Moor

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m) 2268.06
Nearest bus stop	p 4629
Nearest bus stop distance (m) 115.92
Agricultural classification	n Urban
Overlaps SSS	1
Overlaps SEG	il 🗌
Overlaps LNA	Α 🗌
Overlaps LNF	R
Overlaps Conservation Area	a 🗌
Overlaps Listed Building	g
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffe	r
Overlaps Public Right of Way	у
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	е
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	e
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	d 🗆
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	e 🗆
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	n 🗌
Overlaps Minerals Safeguar	ded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 10)0m

2143 Neville Road, Halton Moor

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Vacant brownfield site, grassed over. Suitable in principle for residential development. Formerly identified for housing on the withdrawn East and South East Leeds (EASEL) Area Action Plan.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

177 5 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Part of land available in line with members and officer agreement on level of greenspace.

2144A Cartmell Drive, Halton Moor

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

Site Characteristics

Cita tuma	Greenfield
7116 LVD6	(3) 660 (16) (1
Oito typo	O CO III CIA

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

_	
Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

2144A Cartmell Drive, Halton Moor **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	Α	100	

2144A **Cartmell Drive, Halton Moor**

% overlap

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	
N32 Greenbelt	0.00
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	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00
·	

Core	Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	100.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Inner South	RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor	RA	0.00	
EASEL	RA	100.00	
Aire Valley	RA	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	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Г

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overland Minerals Safaguarded 100m

Inner Area

2144A Cartmell Drive, Halton Moor

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	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

2145 Primrose High School (former), Lincoln Green

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	431327	Northing	434337	Site area ha	5.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Burmantoft	s and Richmond Hill	

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Prownfield
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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti	itue ribbon development?		
Would development result in an is	solated development?		
Is the site well connected to the b	ouilt up area?		
Would development round off the			
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?			
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion			

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?		
Do features provide bound			
Coalescence Conclusion			

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary	between site and urban area	
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote	cted woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

2145 Primrose High School (former), Lincoln Green **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **Highways Agency** Impact **Network Status Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary **Education comments** Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England **Planning History** Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site **App Number Proposal** Decision % of site

2145 Primrose High School (former), Lincoln Green

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	22.24	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

% overlap

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 %	97.27
Nearest train station	Leeds City
	,
Nearest train station distance (m)	1996.55
Nearest bus stop	12221
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	185.11
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlanc SSSI	1 🗖
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	

Nearest train station	I	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (r	n)	1996.55
Nearest bus st	ор	12221
Nearest bus stop distance (r	n)	185.11
Agricultural classification	on L	Jrban
3		
Overlaps SS	SI	
Overlaps SE	GI	
Overlaps Ll	AV	
Overlaps Lf	NR	
Overlaps Conservation Ar	ea	
Overlaps Listed Buildi	ng	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buff	fer	
Overlaps Public Right of W	ay	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zo	ne	
Overlaps EA Flood Zo	ne	
Overlaps HSE Major Haza	ırd	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeli	ne	
Overlaps Pot. Contaminati	on	<u> </u>
Overlaps Minerals Safegua	arde	d
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	100n	n 🗌

2145 Primrose High School (former), Lincoln Green

Conclusions
Issues and Options Summary
Site affects others?
Sustainability summary
Summary of reps
Sammaly of repo
Comments on phasing
DPP Allocation
Not proposed as housing allocation
DPP Allocation Conclusion
Expired permission, now likely to go for free school

2146 Barncroft Close, Seacroft

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	434688	Northing	437032	Site area ha		0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area		Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft				

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Cleared housing site - flat and grassed over in middle of residential area.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/const			
Would development result in an is			
Is the site well connected to the I			
Would development round off the settlement?			
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?			
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion			

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	
Do features provide bound	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

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

2146 Barncroft Close, Seacroft

Supported

Ecology support
Supported

SHLAA conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary 5 Access comments access achievable 5 Local network comments Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 4 Total score Mitigation measures Pedestrian crossing facilities on Easterly road 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 n/a **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response. LCC

2146 Barncroft Close, Seacroft 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** % of site **Proposal** Decision

Spatial relationships

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

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

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	
vvest Lecus Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

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

2146 Barncroft Close, Seacroft

Nearest train station	(Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3038.34
Nearest bus st	ор	6701
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	115.91
Agricultural classificati	on	Urban
Overlaps SS	SSI	
Overlaps SE	GI	
Overlaps LI	NA	
Overlaps LI	NR	
Overlaps Conservation Ar	ea	
Overlaps Listed Buildi	ng	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buf	fer	
Overlaps Public Right of W	/ay	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zo	ne	
Overlaps EA Flood Zo	ne	
Overlaps HSE Major Haza	ard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeli	ne	
Overlaps Pot. Contaminati	on	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safegu	ard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	100)m

2146 Barncroft Close, Seacroft

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Vacant brownfield site, grassed over. Suitable in principle for residential development. Formerly identified for housing on the withdrawn East and South East Leeds (EASEL) Area Action Plan.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

121 6 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Vacant brownfield site, grassed over. Suitable in principle for residential development. Formerly identified for housing on the withdrawn East and South East Leeds (EASEL) Area Action Plan.

Site Details								
Easting	434144	Northing	436853	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

	Would 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		
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi	ngs	
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the 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

2147A Askets and Boggarts (A), Seacroft **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **Highways Agency** Network Status Impact **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support 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 sit	е	
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/01254/LA	Outline application for residential development	Α	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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core	Strategy

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

% overlap

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

LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	100.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	98.79

Nearest train station C		cross Gates	
Nearest train station distance (m)		3220.57	
Nearest bus stop		1658	
Nearest bus stop distance ((m)	22.69	

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
ouotamaziiti ouminary	
C	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	434310	Northing	436624	Site area ha	5.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft
Site Cha	racteristic	cs					
Sito typo	Croonfield						

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constit	tue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an iso		
Is the site well connected to the bu	uilt up area?	
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

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

characteristics of openness and permanence

Not Supported

Ecology support

SHLAA conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary 5 Access comments Various access options available - Boggart Hill Gardens or Kentmere Approach 5 Local network comments local congestion. Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 3 Total score Mitigation measures may require amendments to existing traffic management and capacity improvements at signals 13 Highways site support Yes with mitigation Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency Impact Network Status 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

Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but the main block with the site of the former school, has areas of species-rich grassland and scrub that should be excluded.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/2147. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent grassland habitat north of the former school site is addressed i.e. a buffer of minimu

Education comments

Flood Risk

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Telecoms

Other

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

obi besignations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	32.09	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	47.09	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

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 %	98.83
-----------------	-------

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Former school site now grassed over. The majority of the site is designated as protected playing pitch (N6) and greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Site slopes from north to south, with a cluster of mature trees in the north-west of the site. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N1 greenspace and N6 playing pitch. Minor negative - ecology mitigation, part greenfield/brownfield. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities, community participation and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti

greenspace in inner-city areas of Leeds needs the fullest protection possible, for the future health of the residents of Leeds. Sports sites are especially important given the health problems, including child obesity, in inner-city Leeds.

Pro

regular attempts are made to secure the site, therefore restricting public access. As such it is difficult to determine how the N1 greenspace can be considered as providing amenity greenspace whilst the sports pitches have not been used since the school was closed and demolished and are deemed unsafe to use. It should also be noted that the cleared site has not been 'grassed over' but vegetation has simply been allowed to grow since demolition.

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)

Buses Per Hour

Access to Primary Schools

Access to Secondary Schools

Access to Primary Schools

Primary Health

Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Part of site for residential and part for greenspace as agreed with members.

Site Details							
Easting	434164	Northing	436534	Site area ha	2.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area		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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

2147C Askets and Boggarts (C), Seacroft **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **Highways Agency** Network Status Impact **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support 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		
11/01255/LA	Outline application for residential development	A	100		

% overlap

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations				
N32 Greenbelt	0.00			
N34 PAS	0.00			
RL1 Rural Land	0.00			
N1 Greenspace	0.38			
N1A Allotments	0.00			
N5 Open Space	0.00			
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00			
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.38			
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00			
UDP City Centre	0.00			
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00			
Proposed Local Centre	0.00			
Overlaps N37 SLA				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00			

Core Strategy	
---------------	--

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

% overlap

Reg	en	era	ati	on	Ar	eas

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

96.14	LCC ownership
Cross Gates	Nearest train station
2975.24	Nearest train station distance (
4003	Nearest bus st
55.76	Nearest bus stop distance (I
Urban	Agricultural classificati
	Overlaps SS
	Overlaps SE
	Overlaps LI
	Overlaps LI
	Overlaps Conservation Ar
	Overlaps Listed Buildi
	Overlaps Strat. Employment buf
✓	Overlaps Public Right of W
	Overlaps SFRA Flood Zo
$\overline{\sqcap}$	Overlaps EA Flood Zo
	Overlaps HSE Major Haza

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
ouotamaziiti ouminary	
C	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details								
Easting	434643	Northing	436413	Site area ha	4.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	A Inner Area			Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft		

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

A large green area in surrounded predominantly by residential. The site is sloping. Currently a path bisects the site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
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 pres			
Character Conclusion			

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

2147D Askets and Boggarts (D), Seacroft **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary 5 Access comments Access achievable from Kentmere Approach 5 Local network comments local congestion. Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 3 Total score Mitigation measures may require amendments to existing traffic management and capacity improvements at signals 13 Highways site support yes with mitigation Contingent on other sites

Highways Agency

Contingent on other sites

no

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 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	Support

2147D Askets and Boggarts (D), Seacroft Ecology boundary **Education comments** Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England

Spatial relationships

Planning History

App Number

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	% overlap	
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	43.99	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	22.66	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Proposal

Core Strategy			
Main Urban Araa	100.00		
Main Urban Area	100.00		

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

% of site

Decision

Regeneration Areas

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

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)	2561.36				
Nearest bus stop 1					
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	53.96				
Agricultural classification	Urban				
Overlaps SSSI					
Overlaps SEGI					
Overlaps LNA					
Overlaps LNR					
Overlaps Conservation Area					
Overlaps Listed Building					
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer					
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓				
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone					
Overlaps EA Flood Zone					
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard					
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline					
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓				
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed				
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m				

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Located within the main urban area. The eastern half of site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See greenspace section, page 34, question G15. The southern side of the site is sloping.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - N1 greenspace. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti

greenspace needs the fullest protection possible, for the future health of the residents of Leeds

Pro

Support the allocation of site for housing and deletion of N1 greenspace designation. An overarching view must be taken across the area to ensure that open space is effectively reduced and reconfigured and that the remaining greenspace is of high quality and relates well to new and existing housing areas.

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)

Buses Per Hour

Access to Primary Schools

Access to Secondary Schools

Access to Secondary Schools

Access to Secondary Schools

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site split between housing and greenspace as agreed with members.

Site Details							
Easting	435445	Northing	436303	Site area ha	1.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft		

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Shops

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

_					
Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?					
Do features provide bound					
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

Constraints

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

2148 Baileys Lane East, Seacroft Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary 5 Access comments access achievable 5 Local network comments Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites 3 Total score Mitigation measures Capacity improvements at nearby roundabout 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 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**

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Florin	7		
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			
Natural England	1		
ivaturai Engiana			
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP D	esigi	natio	ns
-------	-------	-------	----

ODI 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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

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	98.01			
Nearest train station	C	Cross Gates		
Nearest train station distance (r	m)	2037.85		
Nearest bus st	ор	10737		
Nearest bus stop distance (r	m)	82.43		
Agricultural classificati	Agricultural classification			
Overlaps SS	SSI			
Overlaps SE		\Box		
Overlaps Li	NA			
Overlaps Li				
Overlaps Conservation Ar				
Overlaps Listed Buildi	ing			
Overlaps Strat. Employment buff	fer			
Overlaps Public Right of W	/ay	✓		
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zo	ne			
Overlaps EA Flood Zo	ne			
Overlaps HSE Major Haza	ard			
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeli	ine			
Overlaps Pot. Contamination				
Overlaps Minerals Safegua	arde	ed		
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m				

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Suitable in principle for residential development. Formerly identified for housing on the withdrawn East and South East Leeds (EASEL) Area Action Plan.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

236 9 Yes

DPP Allocation

Comments on phasing

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

To be retained as greenspace

2149 Ramshead Approach, Seacroft

Site Details									
Easting	435572	Northing	436717	Site area ha	3.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill		
HMCA	A Inner Area			Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft			

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Wholesale distribution

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

2149 Ramshead Approach, Seacroft

SHLAA conclusions	
Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)	
Summary of infrastructure provider comments	
LCC Highways Comments	
	Rank (1-5)
4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 100% secondary	
	5
Access comments	
access achievable onto Ramshead Approach	5
Local network comments	
Local congestion issues	
	3
Mitigation measures	Total score
Capacity improvements at nearby roundabout	13
Highways eita auppart	
Highways site support yes with mitigation	
J-a mininganan	
Contingent on other sites	
Contingent on other sites	
Highways Agency	
Impact No material impact Network Status No objection	
n/a	
Network Rail	
Yorkshire Water	
Treatment Works Knostrop	
Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system n	oods to bo
co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forwawith YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any p improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded fe study.	to serve ard in line should lanned
Environment Agency	
Constraints	
FZ1 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.	
1 CC	
Ecology support Supported	

2149 Ramshead Approach, Seacroft 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** % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	91.22	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Proposal

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

Decision

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	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	87.75
-----------------	-------

2149 Ramshead Approach, Seacroft

Nearest train station	(Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance	(m)	2379.89
Nearest bus s	top	7283
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	49.30
Agricultural classificat	tion	Urban
Overlaps S	SSI	
Overlaps S	EGI	
Overlaps I	NA	
Overlaps I	NR	
Overlaps Conservation A	rea	
Overlaps Listed Build	ling	
Overlaps Strat. Employment bu	ffer	
Overlaps Public Right of V	Vay	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Z	one	
Overlaps EA Flood Z	one	
Overlaps HSE Major Haz	ard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipe	line	
Overlaps Pot. Contamina	tion	
Overlaps Minerals Safego	uard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	100)m 🗸

2149 Ramshead Approach, Seacroft

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site within urban area. Majority of the site is designated greenspace (N1) in the existing UDP. Suitable in principle for residential development, subject to greenspace consideration. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - N1 greenspace and greenfield site. Minor negative - waste. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Anti

greenspace in inner-city areas of Leeds needs the fullest protection possible, for the future health of the residents of Leeds.

Pro

Support the allocation of site for housing and deletion of N1 greenspace designation. An overarching view must be taken across the area to ensure that open space is effectively reduced and reconfigured and that the remaining greenspace is of high quality and relates well to new and existing housing areas.

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Primary Health

157 5 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Retain as greenspace

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	434580	Northing	435728	Site area ha	1.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Dwellings

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Cleared brownfield land surrounded by residential and other cleared areas. Land appears to have no current amenity value.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
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

2150A South Parkway and Brooklands, Seacroft 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) 4bph and good access to services 5 Access comments various options for acceptabel access 5 Local network comments No known issues with capacity 4 Total score Mitigation measures 14 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact **Network Status 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			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
	_		
Telecoms			7
Other			
English Heritage			
	_		
Natural England			
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
		200101011	

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	S
------------------	---

ODI Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.04	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	
'		

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

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 %	98.93
Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2131.61
Nearest bus stop	9395
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	229.04
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSS	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	2
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 10	0m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site within the main urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant positive - access to greenspace, brownfield site, greenhouse emissions, flood risk and accessibility. Minor positive - transport network and local distinctiveness (improving appearance of site).

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Primary Health

225 12 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site within the main urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development.

2150B South Parkway / Brooklands Avenue

Site Deta	Site Details						
Easting	434858	Northing	435676	Site area ha	5.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area Ward Killingbeck and Seacroft		and Seacroft					

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Vacant building

Neighbouring land uses

Vacant land

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Cleared brownfield land surrounded by residential and other cleared areas. Land appears to have no current amenity value.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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

2150B South Parkway / Brook	lands Avenue	!		
Overall Conclusion from assessment agacharacteristics of openness and perman	ainst all 4 purpo nence	oses of green belt a	and essential	
SHLAA conclusions				
Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)	
Summary of infrastructure provide	r comments			
LCC Highways Comments				
Public transport accessibility comments				Rank (1-5)
4buses per hour and good access to services				
				5
Access comments				
various options for acceptabel access	+			
				5
Local network comments				
No known issues with capacity				
				4
Mitigation measures				Total score
				14
				14
Highways site support				
yes				
	_			
Contingent on other sites				
Contingent on other sites				
ooningen on one one				
Highways Agency				
Impact Net	work Status			
Network Rail				
Yorkshire Water				
Treatment Works				
Environment Agency				
Constraints				
LCC				
Ecology support				
55				

Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Other English Heritage

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site				
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site		
13/03680/EXT	Extension of time period for planning permission 10/02225/LA Outline application for residential development to vacant site	Α	100		
10/02225/LA	Outline application for residential development to vacant site	Α	100		

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	18.07	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

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	
	0.00	

2150B South Parkway / Brooklands Avenue

Other Spatial Relationship

Nearest bus stop 9395 Nearest bus stop distance (m) 205.61 Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building		
Pearest train station distance (m) Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop distance (m) Agricultural classification Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps LNR Overlaps Listed Building Perlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination	LCC ownership	% 99.68
Nearest bus stop 9395 Nearest bus stop distance (m) 205.61 Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps LNR Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination	Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Agricultural classification Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Nearest train station distance (n	n) 1882.59
Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Nearest bus sto	op 9395
Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Nearest bus stop distance (n	n) 205.61
Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Agricultural classification	on Urban
Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps SS	SI
Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps SE	GI
Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps LN	IA
Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps LN	IR
erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps Conservation Are	ea
Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps Listed Buildin	ng
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps Strat. Employment buff	er
Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps Public Right of Wa	ay
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps SFRA Flood Zor	ne
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps EA Flood Zor	ne
Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps HSE Major Haza	rd
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps HSE Gas Pipelii	ne
·	Overlaps Pot. Contamination	on 🗸
verlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	Overlaps Minerals Safegua	arded
	Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 1	100m

2150B South Parkway / Brooklands Avenue

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 de	velopment accepted

Site Deta	Site Details							
Easting	434558	Northing	435495	Site area ha		2.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area					Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Dwellings

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Vacant land

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Cleared brownfield land surrounded by residential and other cleared areas. Land appears to have no current amenity value.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound	daries 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

2150C	South Parkway a	nd Brooklands, Seac	roft	
	clusion from assessn tics of openness and	nent against all 4 purpo permanence	oses of green be	elt and essential
SHLAA cond	clusions			
Availability	: Short (=<5 yrs)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)
Summary	of infrastructure p	provider comments		
Highways A	Agency			
Impact	igency	Network Status		
Impact		Network States		
Network R	ail			
Yorkshire \	Vater			
Treatment W	orks Knostrop			
co-ordinated the site. The with YW's in take into acc	with Yorkshire Water's e forthcoming AMP(6) w vestment. It is particula ount available sewerage	Asset Management Plans (rill run from April 2015 to N rly important that sites whi e and WwTW capacity. If a	AMP) to ensure the March 2020. Phasich represent a 10 developer wants	velopment that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be he necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve ing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line 0% or greater increase in population served by the works should to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned e amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility
Environme Constraints	nt Agency			
	a See comments in ma	ain text of our response.		
121 OVCI 111	u. See comments in the	an text of our response.		
LCC				
Ecology supp	oort			
Ecology bour	ndary			
Education co	mments			
Flood Risk				
LIMITE				
Utilities Gas				
Gus				
EL				
Electric				
Fire and Reso	cue			
	· 			
Telecoms				
Other				
English Herit	age			

150C South Parkw	ay and	Brooklands,	Seacroft		
atural England					
lanning History Applicati	ons since	1/1/2009, coveri	ng more than 50% of the site		
pp Number Propo		,		Decision	% of site
patial relationships					
UDP Designations			Core Strategy		
UDP Designations N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap	Core Strategy Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
	0.00	% overlap	-	100.00	% overlap
N32 Greenbelt		% overlap	Main Urban Area		·
N32 Greenbelt N34 PAS	0.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area Major Settlement	0.00	·
N32 Greenbelt N34 PAS RL1 Rural Land	0.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area Major Settlement Minor Settlement	0.00	·
N32 Greenbelt N34 PAS RL1 Rural Land N1 Greenspace N1A Allotments N5 Open Space	0.00 0.00 1.92	% overlap	Main Urban Area Major Settlement Minor Settlement Overlaps Urban Extension	0.00	·
N32 Greenbelt N34 PAS RL1 Rural Land N1 Greenspace N1A Allotments N5 Open Space N6 Playing Pitch	0.00 0.00 1.92 0.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area Major Settlement Minor Settlement Overlaps Urban Extension Regeneration Areas	0.00 0.00	
N32 Greenbelt N34 PAS RL1 Rural Land N1 Greenspace N1A Allotments N5 Open Space N6 Playing Pitch N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00 0.00 1.92 0.00 0.00 0.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area Major Settlement Minor Settlement Overlaps Urban Extension Regeneration Areas Inner South RA	0.00 0.00	·
N32 Greenbelt N34 PAS RL1 Rural Land N1 Greenspace N1A Allotments N5 Open Space N6 Playing Pitch N8 Urban Green Corridor CC Shopping Quarter	0.00 0.00 1.92 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area Major Settlement Minor Settlement Overlaps Urban Extension Regeneration Areas Inner South RA LB Corridor RA	0.00 0.00	
N32 Greenbelt N34 PAS RL1 Rural Land N1 Greenspace N1A Allotments N5 Open Space N6 Playing Pitch N8 Urban Green Corridor CC Shopping Quarter UDP City Centre	0.00 0.00 1.92 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area Major Settlement Minor Settlement Overlaps Urban Extension Regeneration Areas Inner South RA LB Corridor RA EASEL RA	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00	% overlap
N32 Greenbelt N34 PAS RL1 Rural Land N1 Greenspace N1A Allotments N5 Open Space N6 Playing Pitch N8 Urban Green Corridor CC Shopping Quarter UDP City Centre S2S6 Town Centre	0.00 0.00 1.92 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area Major Settlement Minor Settlement Overlaps Urban Extension Regeneration Areas Inner South RA LB Corridor RA EASEL RA Aire Valley RA	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00 0.00	% overlap
N32 Greenbelt N34 PAS RL1 Rural Land N1 Greenspace N1A Allotments N5 Open Space N6 Playing Pitch N8 Urban Green Corridor CC Shopping Quarter UDP City Centre S2S6 Town Centre Proposed Local Centre	0.00 0.00 1.92 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area Major Settlement Minor Settlement Overlaps Urban Extension Regeneration Areas Inner South RA LB Corridor RA EASEL RA	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00	% overlap
N32 Greenbelt N34 PAS RL1 Rural Land N1 Greenspace N1A Allotments N5 Open Space N6 Playing Pitch N8 Urban Green Corridor CC Shopping Quarter UDP City Centre S2S6 Town Centre	0.00 0.00 1.92 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area Major Settlement Minor Settlement Overlaps Urban Extension Regeneration Areas Inner South RA LB Corridor RA EASEL RA Aire Valley RA	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 100.00 0.00	% overlap

	LCC ownersnip) %	99.91
Near	est train station	(Cross Gates
Nearest train	station distance	(m)	2019.68
	Nearest bus s	top	9840
Nearest bu	ıs stop distance	(m)	113.95

Agricultural classification Urban

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

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site within the main urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development. A small part of the site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP, however this will not affect the development potential of the majority of the site.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant positive - access to greenspace, brownfield site, greenhouse emissions, flood risk and accessibility. Minor positive - transport network and local distinctiveness (improving appearance of site).

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

225 12 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield site within the main urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development.

Easting 434452 Northing 435527 Site area ha 1.2 SP7 Main Urban Area Infill	Site Details								
	Easting	434452	Northing	435527	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA Inner Area Ward Killingbeck and Seacroft	HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Killingbeck and Seacroft		

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Prownfield
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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary	
Does the site provide acces	
Does the site include local/	
Areas of protected/unprote	
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	
Does the site contain buildi	
Are these buildings used fo	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to		
Can development pres		
Character Conclusion		

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

2150D South Parkway and Brooklands, Seacroft **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
10/04368/LA	Outline Application to layout access and erect residential development	Α	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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy	

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

% overlap

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 %	98.92
Nearest train station (Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2127.38
Nearest bus stop	9841
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	148.61
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
	ed

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Easting 427971 Northing 431853 Site area ha 1.2 SP7 Main Urban Area Infill HMCA Inner Area Ward Beeston and Holbeck Site Characteristics Site type Brownfield On-site land uses Wholesale distribution Neighbouring land uses Indoor sport facility Other Other land uses MOT garage/car dealership Topography Flat Landscape No Tree Cover Boundaries Existing well defined Road front Yes	Site Deta	ils							
HMCA Inner Area Ward Beeston and Holbeck Site Characteristics Site type Brownfield On-site land uses Wholesale distribution Neighbouring land uses Indoor sport facility Other Other land uses MOT garage/car dealership Topography Flat Landscape No Tree Cover			Northing	431853	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
Site type Brownfield On-site land uses Wholesale distribution Neighbouring land uses Indoor sport facility Other Other Other land uses MOT garage/car dealership Topography Flat Landscape No Tree Cover	_								
Site type Brownfield On-site land uses Wholesale distribution Neighbouring land uses Indoor sport facility Other Other land uses MOT garage/car dealership Topography Flat Landscape No Tree Cover									
On-site land uses Wholesale distribution Neighbouring land uses Indoor sport facility Other Other land uses MOT garage/car dealership Topography Flat Landscape No Tree Cover	Site Chara	acteristic	S						
Wholesale distribution Neighbouring land uses Indoor sport facility Other Other land uses MOT garage/car dealership Topography Flat Landscape No Tree Cover	Site type	Brownfield							
Neighbouring land uses Indoor sport facility Other Other land uses MOT garage/car dealership Topography Flat Landscape No Tree Cover	On-site land	uses							
Indoor sport facility Other Other land uses MOT garage/car dealership Topography Flat Landscape No Tree Cover	Wholesale d	istribution	_						
Other land uses MOT garage/car dealership Topography Flat Landscape No Tree Cover	Neighbouring land uses								
Other land uses MOT garage/car dealership Topography Flat Landscape No Tree Cover									
MOT garage/car dealership Topography Flat Landscape No Tree Cover	Other								
MOT garage/car dealership Topography Flat Landscape No Tree Cover	Other land u	ISES							
Boundaries Existing well defined Road front Yes	Topography Flat Landscape No Tree Cover								
Description									
Site is private waste gound with no amenity value. Overgrown brownfield land.									

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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

•	0 0	
Would development lead t	to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries to contain the development?	
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

Overall Conclusion from assessment a characteristics of openness and perma		ses of green belt ar	nd essential	
SHLAA conclusions				
Availability: Unknown	Suitability:	Unsuitable	Achievability: Uncertain	
Summary of infrastructure provid	ler comments			
LCC Highways Comments				
Public transport accessibility comments				Rank (1-
Good accessibility				5
Access comments				
Access achievable	_			
				5
Local network comments				_
spare capacity but some cumulative issues				4
Mitigation measures				Total sco
				14
Highways site support yes				
Contingent on other sites				
Contingent on other sites				
Highways Agency				
Impact No material impact N	etwork Status	No objection		
Network Rail				
Yorkshire Water				
Treatment Works Knostrop				
co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset I the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run with YW's investment. It is particularly imp take into account available sewerage and V	Management Plans (from April 2015 to N ortant that sites whi VwTW capacity. If a	AMP) to ensure the ne March 2020. Phasing is ch represent a 10% or developer wants to br	ment that will connect to the public sewer syscessary infrastructure and capacity can be proone method used to ensure sites are brought greater increase in population served by the ing a site forward before YW have completed bunt would be determined by a developer fundament.	ovided to serve forward in line works should any planned
Environment Agency				
Environment Agency				

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
	NIGO O I I

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	70 Overlap
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	
Sch. Afficient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

Nearest train station Nearest train station Nearest train station distance (m) Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop distance (m) S55.55 Agricultural classification Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overla
Nearest train station distance (m) 1876.48 Nearest bus stop 9863 Nearest bus stop distance (m) 55.55 Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps STrat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Nearest bus stop 9863 Nearest bus stop distance (m) 55.55 Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps LNR Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps STrat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Nearest bus stop distance (m) 55.55 Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps LNR Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlans Minerals Safeguarded
O veriaps iviirierais earegaaraea
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Not within residential area. Site better suited for employment use.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required

but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

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

311 7 Yes Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Not within residential area. Site better suited for employment use.

3015 Benyon House

Site Details									
Easting 431170 Northing 428283 Site area ha 2.5 SP7 Main Urban Area Infill									
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Middleton F	Park				

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Office

Storage

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Cleared site except for tower to front of site with mobile communication equiipment affixed. Site has excellent access onto a roundabout and an ASDA and local retail centre nearby. Across the road is residential.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

•		
Would development lead	ements?	
Do features provide bound	ent?	
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

3015 berryon nouse						
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)					
4buses per hour, 100% primary, 100% health, 0% secondary	4					
	4					
Access comments						
access achievable						
	5					
Local network comments						
Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites						
	4					
Mitigation measures	Total score					
	13					
Highways site support	1					
yes						
	I					
Contingent on other sites no						
Contingent on other sites						
no						
Highways Agency						
Impact No material impact Network Status No objection						
n/a						
Network Rail						
Yorkshire Water Tractment Works Knoctron						
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 syste	m needs to be					
co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provi	ded 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 for with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the will be a site of the site.						
take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed ar	ny planned					
improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funde study.	d feasibility					
Environment Agency Constraints						
Constraints F71 over 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response						

3015 **Benyon House** 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			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/05148/DEM	Determination for demolition of warehouse and offices	Α	95
09/01727/FU	Single storey retail store, with service yard, car parking and landscaping	R	95
10/04652/FU	Single storey retail store with service yard, car parking and landscaping	W	95
11/04785/EXT	Extension of time of planning application 08/06735/FU for replacement 25m high lattice telecommunications mast to chimney of offices	w	100

Spatial	rela	itior	ıshi	ins

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

3015 Benyon House

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

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership % 3.51

Nearest train station	Cottingley
Nearest train station distance (m	1) 4186.46
Nearest bus sto	p 5609
Nearest bus stop distance (m	n) 87.31

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	V

Overlaps Minerals Safegu	arded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	100m

3015 Benyon House

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

In existing employment use, suitable in principle for residential development or mixed use, as residential area adjacent.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

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

76 5 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation with mixed uses

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is suitable for residential or mixed use. Agreed with members.

Site Details								
Easting	432369	Northing	427859	Site area ha		14.2	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA	Inner Area, Outer South			Ward	Ardsley and	Robin Hood		

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Outdoor sport facility

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Green Belt site. The site is well connected to the urban area. It is a flat site with a long road frontage providing easy access for residential development. It is agricultural land.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons	titue ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an i	solated development?	No
Is the site well connected to the I	built up area?	Yes
Would development round off the	Partial	
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	No
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	Low potential to lead to unrestrict	ed sprawl

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

•	3 3	
Would development lead	to physical connection of settlements?	Yes
Do features provide boun	daries to contain the development?	No
Coalescence Conclusion	No merging of settlements	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	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 t	conservation area/listed building/historical features?	No	
Can development pre	serve this character?		
Character Conclusion	No effect on the setting and special character of histor	ic features	

Environment Agency

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

Constraints

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

It is considered that the separation of settlements function of Green Belts is maintained by the adjacent field (site B) and the motorway

SHLAA conclusions					
Availability: Unknow	vn	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs)	
Summary of infra	structure prov	ider comments			
LCC Highways Com	ments				
Public transport access					Rank (1-5)
4buses per hour, 40%	primary, 0% health	n, 40% secondary			4
Access comments					
access achievable onto	o wakefield road				
					5
Local network comme	nts				
Potential cumulative in	mpact with adjacent	sites			_
					4
Mitigation measures					Total score
					13
Highways site support					
yes					
Contingent on other si	tes				
no					
Contingent on other si	tes				
no					
Highways Agency]				
0 0 0		Nietonado Ctatora			
Impact		Network Status			
Likely to require signif	ilcant priysical mitty	alion			
Network Rail					
	1				
Yorkshire Water					
Treatment Works	Lemonroyd				
ordinated with Yorksh site. The forthcoming YW's investment. It is into account available	ire Water's Asset M J AMP(6) will run fro particularly importa sewerage and Ww	anagement Plans (AN om April 2015 to Marc ant that sites which ro FW capacity. If a devo	MP) to ensure the nec ch 2020. Phasing is of epresent a 10% or gr eloper wants to bring	nat will connect to the public sewer system needs the sarry infrastructure and capacity can be provided the method used to ensure sites are brought forware eater increase in population served by the works so a site forward before YW have completed any plan mount would be determined by a developer funder	to serve the rd in line with hould take nned

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
3081A+3445A+3085 primary school requi	5+129B+129AB+1365A+1261+3088+3085 = 1025 houses generates 256 primary and 102.5 secondary children. New 1FE ired.
Flood Risk	
Flood Zone 1	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Eine and December	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site
App Number	Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.94	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.01	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	1.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	✓	

% overlap

_		_
D	eration	A
Keuen	erannn	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 Woo	dlesford
Nearest train station distance (m)	4614.96
Nearest bus stop	10715
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	235.60
Agricultural classification Gr	ade 3
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. The site is well connected to the urban area. It is a flat site with a long road frontage providing easy access for residential development. The larger site has been split in two and it is considered that the separation of settlements function of Green Belts is maintained by the adjacent field (site B) and the motorway. Part of the site is within Outer South area, part in adjacent Inner Area (3.60ha, 94 capacity in adjacent area).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - access to health facilities and pollution. Minor positive - access to greenspace, flood risk and highway network.

Summary of reps

Anti

The area does not need more housing. The schools already are overcrowded. The truck road is too busy. This should not be allowed to go ahead. We need green space.

This site abuts the M1 motorway and on that basis it is not considered that the fullness of the site can be delivered primarily to noise issues. This designation should be reduced in half in order to protect the future amenity of occupiers.

No residents consulted or informed until 2 days ago! Why no meetings? Communication?

Utter disgust at this proposal. The land was for sale as agricultural only. Some back hand tactics have been in action. At no stage have we been consulted. We don't want to look out at a housing estate. The Council are rubbish!

By making Middleton Ave a through road would increase the traffic and thus make it unsafe environment for the numerous young children we have living in this street, thus putting them at risk of being injured.

Extensive housing on this planned site would seriously erode the split between Middleton/Rothwell/Robin Hood,

The development is in a rural location and is not sustainable.

Site is within the Rhubarb triangle

The Lofthouse site lies in the centre of the world

famous Rhubarb Triangle, a rural location that adds to the rural image when visitors come to see the Rhubarb fields and view the forced rhubarb growing in the forcing sheds. The surrounding fields of crops growing is what needs to be seen not a huge field covered with boxy houses. I feel that the development will be harmful to the character of the area as the land sits in an area that still has a rural feel and if the land is on Green Belt then this should be kept as such.

We appear to be losing the rural element to the area which would restrict dog walkers , family walks etc

Issues around emergency services coverage as 'there has been talk of the Rothwell Fire Station and the Hunslet Fire Station both to be closed down'.

The utility providers struggle already with current demand, we endure numerous power cuts and reduced water pressure on a regular basis which will be exacerbated with any potential increase in housing

The agricultural land in this area absorbs huge amounts of rain fall. Concreting over the acres of land in the proposal will place a HUGE QUANTITY of rain water into the already stressed, inadequate drainage systems and could lead to floodings and water table effects.

Consider the effect on Angel Row (built 1890s), whose gardens face directly onto the site. New buildings would ruin the character of the area and properties. The view and privacy these houses have is a vital USP for the property. I feel that the loss of both of these aspects would cause a significant depreciation in their value at great cost to the residents. I also have other concerns regarding the properties. I would like to make it clear that there is an access right at the back of the properties. My property extends past the fence at the end of the garden

Up to 400 homes suggests that at least 300 children will need schooling and play areas. There is already an issue in our area concerning children hanging around on the streets.

There are nationwide concerns about the miles our food travels before it arrives in our shops so it is outrageous that productive farmland is being considered as building plots.

The old lead works on Leadwell Lane has currently been demolished and the land is an eyesore it attracts anti social behaviour such as quadding, motor biking, fires, travellers and is currently no use for anything. Why commit land which is used to grow food and obviously

3081A Robin Hood West

keeps people in work to do this when you could use the above derelict land.

there would be no separation between Robin Hood and Middleton .

Pros

I would support smaller developments of 30-35 houses, but not huge housing developments as they are not sustainable as the infrastructure is only coping at the moment. Another idea I might support for the Lofthouse site is that if it was appropriate or if there was a need for it from the community, it would be for Lofthouse to have its own Junior and Infants School and possibly a Community Centre. If there is a need for school places this would help alleviate the lack of places in this area and would give Lofthouse more of its own identity whereby the children would go to their own school in their own area. All the schools in the area are very good schools. This use of the land for a school would not be as intrusive or unattractive as 234 modern boxy houses looking very much the same.

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

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

180 12 Yes Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is not required to meet the housing numbers due to local preference for alternative sites. There is a possibility for a 2FE primary school on the site.

Site Details							
Easting	432133	Northing	427853	Site area ha	8	SP7	Smaller Settlement Extension
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Ardsley and	Robin Hood		

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Transport tracks and ways

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is flat and level and predominantly used for agriculture.

Greenbelt Assessment

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	Yes	
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?		No
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	No
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	No
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	No
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	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 pres	erve this character?			
Character Conclusion No effect on the setting and special character of historic features				

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

Green Belt site. Not well related to the urban area and no existing defensible boundary. Development would constitute urban sprawl.

SHLAA conclusions						
Availability: Unknow	vn	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability	: Longterm (11+yrs)	
Summary of infra	structure provi	ider comments				
LCC Highways Com	ments					
Public transport access	sibility comments					Rank (1-5)
western part of 3081 r	not as good as easte	ern side				3
Access comments						
access achievable onto	wakefield road					5
Local network commer	nts					
Potential cumulative in	npact with adjacent	sites				4
Mitigation measures						Total score
						12
Highways site support						
yes						
Contingent on other si	tes					
Contingent on other si	tes					
Highways Agency						
Impact		Network Status				
Likely to require signif assess as part of Roth	icant physical mitiga well/Oulton cluster.	ation - Potential for c	umulative impact in	combination with other sites.	If site still included at	next sift
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 coordinated 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			
Utilities	1		
Gas			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
	7		
Telecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			
3 3 .			
	1		
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

ODI Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	99.94	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.06	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.06
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	~

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %		0.00
Nearest train station	V	/oodlesford
Nearest train station distance ((m)	4844.88
Nearest bus s	top	9329
Nearest bus stop distance ((m)	356.94
Agricultural classificat	ion	Grade 3
Overlaps S	SSI	
Overlaps SE	EGI	
Overlaps L	NA	
Overlaps L	NR.	
Overlaps Conservation Area		
Overlaps Listed Build	ing	
Overlaps Strat. Employment but	ffer	
Overlaps Public Right of V	Vay	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zo	one	
Overlaps EA Flood Zo	one	
Overlaps HSE Major Haza		
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline		
Overlaps Pot. Contamination		✓
Overlaps Minerals Safegu	ıard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Green Belt site. Not well related to the urban area and no existing defensible boundary. Development would constitute urban sprawl.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - greenfield site. Minor negative - access to education and health facilities and pollution. Minor positive - access to greenspace, flood risk and transport network.

Summary of reps

Pro

NPPF - We strongly support the authority's assessment that the site has low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl. The development of the site will not result in the merging of Robin Hood with another settlement. The site also benefits from readily recognisable and permanent physical boundaries that define the western extent of the site. It is therefore our view that the development of the site will not lead to coalescence. As demonstrated above and in the accompanying Vision Document [see representation], the site is not subject to any technical or environmental constraints that would prevent it from coming forward and is achievable without significant adverse environmental impacts (NPPF, para 152). Its allocation would be in conformity with the spatial development strategy in the Core Strategy and would ensure the long term sustainable growth of Robin Hood/Lofthouse.

Anti

Agricultural land, The land has been a farm for over 100 years, I find it totally irresponsible that you think it is your place to destroy what has been built up for 100's ofyears for the sake of a housing estate that no one in the local area wants.

Size/scale of proposal detrimental to character of village,

Greenbelt land should be preserved

Volume of houses (373 houses) unsustainable by local amenities and and infrastructure

Conservation/Heritage, this area forms part of the rhubarb triangle,

Crime, there is already a problem with youths coming through the motorway tunnel from Middleton LS10 to Middleton Lane/Avenue LS26 to commit petty crimes i.e shed break ins- so the extra new houses will be like a honey pot to them.

Traffic congestion and pollution

Lack and disregard of consultation, This is given the complete and absolute disregard for consultation and notification of the proposed plans them-self, by giving LESS THAN 3 DAYS notice to object.

I would kindly like to have a list of newspapers, circulars, internet web addresses, posters, advertisers etc and dates of listings together with examples of all media used by the council, to advise citizens about this development as NO ONE had seen or heard anything about the proposal until yesterday around 3pm.

Brownfield firs

Safety, Junction of Sharp Lane, Copley Lane and Wakefield Road are a black spot and adding 373 vehicles to this will not make things any better

Eyesore

Lack of emergency services, there has been talk of both Rothwell and Hunslet Fire Stations to be closed down

Access rights, I would like to make it clear that there is an access right at the back of the properties. My property extends past the fence at the end of the garden.

There are other new developments in Robin Hood but they are not selling with any speed because nobody has the money to buy them. Why will this development prove to be any

different?

Extensive housing on this planned site would seriously erode the split between Middleton/Rothwell/Robin Hood Wildlife/ biodiversity impact

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

180

12

Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

Inner Area

3081B Robin Hood West

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Green Belt site. Not well related to the urban area and no existing defensible boundary. Development would constitute urban sprawl.

3137 Leeds Girls High School

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	428691	Northing	435547	Site area ha	2.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Headingley	

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor sport facility

Education

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Office

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site of old School. A mixture of exisiting buildings, sports areas, open space, trees and access roads and parking. Site very much intact from the previous use. Internally sloping.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound	daries 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

3137 Leeds Girls High School Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Public Transport Core Strategy standards met schools/health/rail, some local services distant 5 Access comments No vehicle access from Headingley Lane, mitigation to TROs on Victoria Road Local network comments Local congestion but brownfield site with mitigation measures 4 Total score Mitigation measures Alterations to waiting restrictions on Victoria Road 13 Highways site support yes with mitigation Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection n/a **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be

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

Environment Agency

Constraints

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

Inner Area

3137 Leeds Girls High School

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported - but bat	roost on site.		
Ecology boundary			
Education comment	5		
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

This site lies within the Headingley Conservation Area and includes the former Leeds High School for Girls which is a Grade II Listed Building. In view of the duty on the Council to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of its Conservation Areas, there will need to be some assessment of what contribution this plot of land and the buildings on it make to the character of the Conservation Area.

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

If the open area at the southern end of this site makes an important contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, then that too should be retained.

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.

Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/04318/TWA	New Generation Transport routes		100
12/01236/FU	Outline planning application including layout, scale and means of access for 48 dwellings (C3 Use Class) and full application for conversion and extension of the main school building and stable block to form 36 dwellings (C3 Use Class).	A	93
14/02073/OT	Outline planning application for the amendments to the layout of extant planning permission 12/01236/FU for demolition and partial demolition of former school buildings and to provide 50 Townhouses, 19 Apartments and 1 dwelling at Rose Court Lodge	A	93

3137 Leeds Girls High School

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	51.24	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

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 Bu	ırley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	872.70
Nearest bus stop	4495
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	63.02
Agricultural classification U	rban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	✓
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	~
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	I 🗆

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

3137 Leeds Girls High School

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Outline planning application for 48 dwellings and conversion approved Dec 2012 (12/01236/FU).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Pro

General support. Has current planning permission

Anti

Conservation/Heritage. Traffic congestion. Loss of greenspace. This site is in a deprived inner-city area of Leeds which is desperate for sports provision and greenspace for the health of its residents who on average die ten years younger than people living in the outer areas of Leeds.

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 Schools

Primary Health

Access to Primary Schools

Yes

Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Identified housing site

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site on edge of large residential area to south. Goof public transport access. Line of NGT. Suitable for housing.

3142 Malvern Rise, LS11

Site Details								
Easting	429439	Northing	431539	Site area ha		0.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Beeston an	d Holbeck		

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/const		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?				
Do features provide bound				
Coalescence Conclusion				

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to		
Can development pres		
Character Conclusion		

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

Inner Area

3142 Malvern Rise, LS11 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status Network Rail **Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009 covering more than 50% of the site

Plaining History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50 % of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
13/02227/FU	External works including hard and soft landscaping; infilling of undercroft; elevational cladding treatment to front/entrance elevations	Α	70	

Inner Area

3142 Ma	Ivern Rise, LS11			
10/02777/LA	Variation of condition number 7 of application no. 08/04272/LA (provision of public transport improvements)	Α	99	
10/02778/LA	Removal of conditions 3 and 4 and variation of conditions 5 and 6 of application no. 08/04272/LA (3, affordable housing provision, 4, amended number of dwellings, 5, provision of additional educational facilities and 6, provision of green space and leisure facilities.)	A	99	
10/02952/EXT	Extension of time application for application number 08/04272/LA, Outline application for residential development	Α	99	

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	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

% overlap

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
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	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1671.11
Nearest bus stop	1480
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	158.15
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	~

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

3142 Malvern Rise, LS11

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	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3143 Cambrian Street, LS11

Site Details								
Easting	429356	Northing	431813	Site area ha		0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Beeston and	d Holbeck			

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

A large green area between in a residential area and to the south of the east-west M621. Overlaps with and N1 area to the north. The are is green and slightly undulating.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

=		
Would development lead		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to		
Can development pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		•

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

3143 Cambrian Street, LS11

SHLAA conclusions							
	oorh ()	Suitability:	Suitable		Achievability: Sh	ort (= <5\rc)	
Availability: Short (earry)	Sultability:	Suitable		Achievability: 5n	ort (=<5yrs)	
Summary of infra	astructure provider	comments					
LCC Highways Com	ments						
Public transport acces	sibility comments						Rank (1-5)
Good accessibility							5
Access comments							
Access from Normanto	on Place						5
Local network comme	nts						
spare capacity but sor							
							4
Mitigation measures							Total score
							14
Highways site support							
Yes							
Contingent on other si	ites						
Contingent on other of	itaa						
Contingent on other si	ites						
Highways Aganay							
Highways Agency Impact No material i	mnact Note	vork Status	No objection				
Impact No material I	inipact ivetv	VOIR Status	No objection				
	1						
Network Rail							
Yorkshire Water							
Treatment Works	Knostrop						
co-ordinated with Yor the site. The forthcor with YW's investment take into account avail	w Level are large works kshire Water's Asset Marming AMP(6) will run from the particularly import lable sewerage and Wwibe possible for the deve	nagement Plans of m April 2015 to I ant that sites wh TW capacity. If a	(AMP) to ensur March 2020. Ph iich represent a i developer wai	te the necessary infr nasing is one method a 10% or greater inc nts to bring a site fo	astructure and capacidused to ensure sites rease in population sometimes are the second to the secon	ty can be provid are brought for erved by the wor e completed any	ed to serve ward in line ks should planned
Environment Agend	су						
Constraints							
FZ1 under 1 ha. See	comments in main text of	of our response.					
LCC	1						
Ecology support	Supported						
Supported	- 1						

Inner Area 3143 Cambrian Street, LS11 Ecology boundary **Education comments** Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage

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

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

Natural England

UDP Designations N32 Greenbelt 0.00 % overlap N34 PAS 0.00 **RL1 Rural Land** 0.00 N1 Greenspace 9.49 N1A Allotments 0.00 N5 Open Space 0.00 N6 Playing Pitch 0.00 N8 Urban Green Corridor 0.27 CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 **UDP City Centre** 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00

Core Strategy	

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	100.00	% overla
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
-----------------	--------

3143 Cambrian Street, LS11

Nearest train station	Leeds City	
Nearest train station distance (m)	1418.62	
Nearest bus stop	3591	
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	221.21	
Agricultural classification	Urban	
Overlaps SSSI		
Overlaps SEGI		
Overlaps LNA		
Overlaps LNR		
Overlaps Conservation Area		
Overlaps Listed Building		
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer		
Overlaps Public Right of Way		
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone		
Overlaps EA Flood Zone		
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard		
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline		
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m	

3143 Cambrian Street, LS11

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site within urban area. Currently open space but not designated as greenspace on the existing UDP. Suitable in principle for residential development.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - openspace (not)/access to greenspace and greenfield. Minor negative - pollution. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities and flood risk.

Summary of reps

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

131

8

Yes

Yes

Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is a green wedge between a motorway and large resdiential area. Site does not include N1 to the north. Suitable for housing.

3144 Fairfax Road, LS11

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	429156	Northing	431500	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Beeston an	d Holbeck

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/const	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an is	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the I	ouilt up area?	
Would development round off the	e settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries 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 acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote	cted woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	e 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildi	ngs	
Are these buildings used fo	r agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

3144 Fairfax Road, LS11 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status Network Rail **Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/05218/RM	Reserved matters application for residential development of 21 dwelling houses, public open space, highways works, car parking and landscaping	Α	100

Inner Area

3144 Fairfax Road, LS11

10/02949/EXT	Extension of time application for application number 08/04335/LA, Outline application for residential development	Α	100
10/02784/LA	Removal of conditions 3 and 5 and variation of conditions 4 and 6 of application no. 08/04335/LA (3, affordable housing provision, 4, amended number of dwellings, 5, provision of additional educational facilities and 6, provision of green space and leisure facilities.)	A	100
10/02781/LA	Removal of condition number 7 of application no. 08/04335/LA (provision of public transport improvements)	A	100

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00
N34 PAS	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.00
N1 Greenspace	28.53
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.02
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00
Overlaps N37 SLA	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

Core Strategy

% overlap

80.30

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	99.79	
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)		1774.38
Nearest bus stop		10170

Nearest bus stop distance (m)

Agricultural classification Urban

rigi ioditarar olasoiriodilori	
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	✓
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	\Box
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	d

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

3144 Fairfax Road, LS11

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Cummary of rone	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details							
Easting	429953	Northing	431560	Site area ha	1.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and H	unslet

Site Characteristics

and the second s	
0.1	D 6 11
Site type	Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ntion
DUSUIT	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons		
Would development result in an i		
Is the site well connected to the I		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the 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

3145 Bismarck Street, LS11 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Good accessibility 5 Access comments Existing access points adequate 5 Local network comments spare capacity 4 Total score Mitigation measures 14 Highways site support Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Supported **Ecology support** Supported Ecology boundary **Education comments**

Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	
· ·	

Planning History	anning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site				
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site		
10/05220/RM	Reserved matters application for residential development comprising 40 flats in 2 and 3 storey blocks and 30 dwelling houses, highways works, car parking and landscaping	Α	99		
10/02787/LA	Removal of condition number 7 of application no. 08/04334/LA (provision of public transport improvements)	Α	99		
10/02951/EXT	Extension of time application for application number 08/04334/LA , Outline application for residential development	Α	99		
10/02788/LA	Removal of conditions 3 and 5 and variation of conditions 4, and 6 of application no. 08/04334/LA (3, affordable housing provision, 4, amended number of dwellings, 5, provision of additional educational facilities and 6, provision of green space and leisure facilities.)	Α	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	5.52	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core	Strategy	

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

Req	enera	ation	Areas
J			

Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

Nearest train station Leeds City arest train station distance (m) Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop distance (m) 131.69
arest train station distance (m) 1651.98 Nearest bus stop 13795
arest train station distance (m) 1651.98 Nearest bus stop 13795
Nearest bus stop distance (m) 131.69
Agricultural classification Urban
Overlaps SSSI
Overlaps SEGI
Overlaps LNA
Overlaps LNR
Overlaps Conservation Area
Overlaps Listed Building
rlaps Strat. Employment buffer
Overlaps Public Right of Way
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone
Overlaps EA Flood Zone
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline
Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
erlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

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. Princi	iple of residential development accepted

3146 Holbeck Towers, LS11

Site Details							
Easting	429320	Northing	432172	Site area ha	2.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA City Centre, Inner Area		Ward	Beeston an	d Holbeck		

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Prownfield
Site type	Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption
2 23011	

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an i		
Is the site well connected to the		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

Inner Area

3146 Holbeck Towers, LS11 **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

Flairing History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
10/05214/RM	Reserved matters application for residential development (up to 7 storeys) of 74 flats and 34 dwelling houses, public open space, associated highways work, car parking and	Α	99	

Inner Area

3146 Holbeck Towers, LS11 landscaping 10/02887/EXT Extension of time application for application number Α 99 08/03018/LA, Outline application for residential development 14/02519/COND Consent, agreement or approval of conditions 3, 6, 10, 11, 99 INT 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34 of Planning Application 10/02780/LA 10/02779/LA Removal of condition number 7 of application no. Α 99 08/03018/LA (provision of public transport improvements) 14/02422/COND Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 2, Α 99 3 and 4 of Planning Application 10/05214/RM 10/00028/LA Demolition of 5 blocks of flats and associated garage blocks NR 99 10/02780/LA Removal of conditions 3 and variation of conditions 4, 5, 6, Α 99 18,19, of application no. 08/03018/LA (3, affordable housing provision, 4, amended number of dwellings, 5, provision of additional educational facilities and 6, provision of green space and leisure facilities, 18, land contamination investigation, 19, submission of remediation statement.)

Spatial relationships

\mathbf{I}		nations
UIII	116/10	namons

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

Core	Strategy
0010	Juliance

	-
Irban Area 100.00	% overlap
Settlement 0.00	
Settlement 0.00	
Extension	
_	

Regeneration Areas

	Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
	LB Corridor RA	0.00	
	EASEL RA	0.00	
	Aire Valley RA	0.00	
Ī	West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC owne	99.96	
Nearest train sta	tion	Leeds City
Nearest train station dista	nce (m)	1084.96
Nearest I	ous stop	5957
Nearest bus stop dista	207.77	

Agricultural classification Urban

3146 Holbeck Towers, LS11

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<u> </u>
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<u></u>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	ī —
-	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	1

3146 Holbeck Towers, LS11

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamazinty ourinnary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3147 Waverley Garth, LS11

Site Details								
Easting	429716	Northing	431523	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and Hu	unslet	

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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	
Do features provide bound	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary	between site and urban area	
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the 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

3147 Waverley Garth, LS11 **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
10/02955/EXT	Extension of time application for application number 08/04274/LA, Outline application for residential development	Α	99

3147	Waverley Garth, LS11			
10/02783/LA	Removal of conditions 3 and 4 and variation of conditions 5 and 6 of application no. 08/044274/LA (3, affordable housing provision, 4, amended number of dwellings, 5, provision of additional educational facilities and 6, provision of green space and leisure facilities.)	Α	99	
13/02228/FU	External works including hard and soft landscaping; infilling of undercrofts; elevational cladding treatment to front/entrance elevations	Α	77	
13/04874/FU	Amendment to approval 13/02228/FU involving creation of parking bays and alterations to highway layout including changes to levels		77	
10/02782/LA	Variation of condition number 7 of application no. 08/04274/LA (provision of public transport improvements)	Α	99	
13/05918/FU	Amendment to approval 13/02228/FU involving creation of parking bays and alterations to highway layout including changes to levels	Α	77	

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	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

% overlap

Core Strategy	

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
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	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1668.60
Nearest bus stop	1140
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	105.59

Agricultural classification Urban

3147 Waverley Garth, LS11

ĪĒ
led
0m
1

3147 Waverley Garth, LS11

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamazinty ourinnary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3148 Oatland Lane, LS7

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	430352	Northing	434767	Site area ha	1.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Hyde Park	and Woodhouse

Site Characteristics

Cita tima	Brownfield
SHE IVDE	Browniieia

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the settlement?		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
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 acces		
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to		
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

3148 Oatland Lane, LS7 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Unknown Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Uncertain Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

Flaming mistory	Applications since 1/1/2005, covering more than 50 /0 of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/02950/EXT	Extension of time application for application number 08/02852/LA, Outline application for 7 retail units, 1	Α	99

3148	Oatland Lane, LS7			
	development			
14/01572/FU	2 storey building to form enlarged school and single storey community centre and housing office.	Α	51	
10/05213/RM	Reserved matters application for 7 retail units, 1 housing office, 1 community centre and residential development	Α	99	
10/02790/LA	Removal of conditions 4 and 6 and variation of condition 5, of application no. 08/02852/LA (4, affordable housing provision, 6, provision of educational facilities, 5, amended number of dwellings.)	Α	99	
10/02789/LA	Variation of condition no. 8 of application no. 08/02852/LA (Provision of highways and transport improvements)	Α	99	

Spatial relationships

UDP	Design	nations

		_
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	32.62	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	
227111010111111110111	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

99.98
Leeds City
1708.72
6855
111.18

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	_

3148	Oatland Lane, LS7					
Ove	erlaps Minerals Safeguarded					
Overlaps	Minerals Safeguarded 100m					

3148 Oatland Lane, LS7

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
, and the state of	
Summary of reps	
Summary or reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Not proposed as housing allocation	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
Site no longer available - permission	office and school

3149 Carlton Gate, LS7

Site Details							
Easting	430304	Northing	434551	Site area ha	3.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Hyde Park	and Woodhouse	

Site Characteristics

Cita tuma	Brownfield
Site type	Browniieid

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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							
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside						
Does the site include local/	Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs						
Areas of protected/unprote	Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?						
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?						
Does the site contain buildings							
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?							
Encroachment Conclusion							

4. Preserve the 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

3149	Carlton	n Gate, LS7							
SHLAA con	clusions								
Availability	: Short (ea	arly)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievabilit	y: Short (=<5yrs)			
Summary	Summary of infrastructure provider comments								
Highways	Agency								
Impact	3 ,		Network Status						
Network R	ail								
Yorkshire \									
Treatment W	/orks								
Environme	nt Agenc	у							
Constraints									
	1								
LCC	aart								
Ecology supp	JOIL								
Ecology bou	ndary								
Ecology both	ridai y								
Education co	mments								
Flood Risk									
Utilities									
Gas									
Electric									
Fire and Res	cue								
Telecoms									
Other									
English Herit	tage								
Natural Engl	and								

Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site						
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site			
14/00826/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35 of Planning Application 10/02792/LA		96			

3149 Carlton Gate, LS7						
09/05620/LA	Demolition of 2 blocks of flats and 3 blocks of maisonettes	NR	98			
14/02976/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3 and 8 of Planning Application 10/05212/RM	Α	97			
10/02791/LA	Variation of condition no. 8 of application no. 08/02857/LA (Provision of highways and transport improvements)	Α	97			
14/00829/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 of Planning Application 10/05212/RM	SPL	97			
10/05212/RM	Reserved matters application for residential development of 68 flats and 45 dwelling houses, public open space, associated highways work, car parking and landscaping	Α	97			
10/02792/LA	Variation of conditions numbers 4, 5, 6, 7, 17, 18 of application number 08/02857/LA (4, affordable housing provision, 5, amended number of dwellings, 6, provision of additional educational facilities, 7, provision of green space and leisure facilities, 17, provision of a land contamination report and 18, commencement of remedial works.)	A	96			
14/9/00103/MOD	Reserved matters application for residential development of 68 flats and 45 dwelling houses, public open space, associated highways work, car parking and landscaping NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to: 10/05212/RM: Block 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8 and 9	M01	97			
10/02886/EXT	Extension of time application for application number 08/02857/LA, Outline application for residential development	Α	97			

Spatial relationships

N32 Greenbelt
N34 PAS
RL1 Rural Land

% overlap

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

UDP Designations					
N32 Greenbelt	0.00				
N34 PAS	0.00				
RL1 Rural Land	0.00				
N1 Greenspace	9.75				
N1A Allotments	0.00				
N5 Open Space	0.00				
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00				
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00				
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00				
UDP City Centre	0.00				
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00				
Proposed Local Centre	0.00				
Overlaps N37 SLA					
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00				

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

Regeneration Areas

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	99.91	
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance	1491.31	
Nearest bus s	3846	
Nearest bus stop distance	174.37	

Agricultural classification Urban

3149 Carlton Gate, LS7

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	П
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	П
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	П
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	~
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	∌d
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	m

3149 Carlton Gate, LS7

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamazinty ourinnary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3150 Leicester Place, LS7

Site Details									
Easting	430089	Northing	434792	Site area ha		0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area					Ward	Hyde Park a	and Woodhouse	

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

The site is used as open space and provides a buffer between the housing estate and highway. It is Green flat land surrounding the residentuial units.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
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 pres	erve this character?			
Character Conclusion				

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

characteristics of openiness and permanence						

Ecology support

Supported

Supported

3150 Leicester Place, LS7 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Unsuitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Core Strategy standards close to Blenheim Terrace and city centre 5 Access comments Access from Hawkins Drive may require improvements to junction 4 Local network comments Possible cummulative impact but ok for 31 units 5 Total score Mitigation measures none 14 Highways site support Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact Network Status No objection **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response. LCC

3150	Leicester Place, LS7
Ecology bou	indary
Education c	omments
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Re	scue
Telecoms	
Other	
English Her	itage .
Lingiisii i ioi	
Natural Eng	land

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/04037/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required for conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 17 and 18 for Planning Application 10/05208/FU	SPL	99
12/9/00128/MOD	Refurbishment of dwelling houses (including some recladding) new boundary walls, alley gates and landscaping NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 10/05208/FU: Change to bin store siting and increase in car parking provision	M01	99
10/05208/FU	Refurbishment of dwelling houses (including some recladding) new boundary walls, alley gates and landscaping	Α	99

Spatial	relations	hips
---------	-----------	------

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

3150 Leicester Place, LS7

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

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
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	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1649.16
Nearest bus stop	8509
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	65.41
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	m

3150 Leicester Place, LS7

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Although not designated as greenspace on the existing UDP, the site is used as open space and provides a buffer between the housing estate and highway.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Anti

Lack of infrastructure to support further housing development . Provides greenspace in a densely populated area

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 Schools

Primary Health

Yes

Yes

Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is used as open space and provides a buffer between the housing estate and highway. It is Green flat land surrounding the residentuial units.

3153 Seacroft Crescent, LS14

Site Details								
Easting	435645	Northing	436185	Site area ha		0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area		Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft				

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Car Parks

Neighbouring land uses

Vacant building

Medical and Health care services

Shops

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is a combination of Car Park and and landscaped land next to health facility. Part of the site also appears to be a thoroughfare connecting the Tescos to parts of Seacroft. A mature tress also populate the site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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

	•	•	0 0		
Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?					
	Do features provide boun	daries to contair	n 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

3153 Seacroft Crescent, LS14 Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Good accessibility 5 Access comments Access ok from Seacroft Crescent 5 Local network comments congestion issues 3 **Total score** Mitigation measures 13 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works 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.

3153	Seacroft Crescent, L	S14				
LCC						
Ecology supp	ort Supported					
Supported						
Ecology boun	dary					
Education cor	mments					
Flood Risk						
Utilities						
Gas						
Electric						
LICCUIC						
Fire and Reso	ue					
Telecoms						
Other						
English Herita			· /TI 0		10 1 5	
Arms).	ree Grade II Listed Buildings	s to the east and south of th	nis area (The Grange	e, its Coach Hou	se and Service Range	e and the Cricketer's
There is a re-	quirement in the 1990 Act the	hat "special regard" should I	be had to the desiral	bility of preservi	ng Listed Buildings o	r their setting or any
that those ele	pecial architectural or histor ements which contribute to	the significance of these as	ess. Consequently, It ssets are not harmed	r allocated, rede 1.	velopment proposals	would need to ensure
Natural Engla	nd					
Ivaturai Erigia	ilu					
Planning Hi	story Applications since	1/1/2009, covering more tha	an 50% of the site			
	-	., ., <u></u>		D. alalaa	04 -6 -11 -	
App Numbe	r Proposal			Decision	% of site	
-						
Spatial rela	tionships					
UDP Des	ignations	Core S	Strategy			

3153 Seacroft Crescent, LS14

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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
s Urban Extension	~	
_		

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 %	8.51
Nearest train station Cr	oss Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1852.63
Nearest bus stop	2040
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	72.38
Agricultural classification U	Jrban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	П
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	d
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100n	n _

3153 Seacroft Crescent, LS14

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Previous permission for care home so principle of residential use has been established and is acceptable.

Site affects others?

S106 signed to only allow development approved by 08/05000/OT after redevelopment of The Grange (site 292). Site to be used as enabling development, C3 care home additional properties for The Grange.

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Pro

The RPT supports the proposed change to Seacroft Centre Boundary along the northern section of Seacroft Crescent and along North Parkway and York Road. However over the coming years there is potential for Seacroft Centre to change further through the possibility of service colocation which may reduce the land demand for 'town centre uses' particularly to the west of Seacroft Crescent.

Alternative

Seacroft CrescentSupport the allocation of site for housing, although could also be consider as a site for the colocation of services at Seacroft Centre.

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

112 8 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is a combination of Car Park and and landscaped land next to health facility. Part of the site also appears to be a thoroughfare connecting the Tescos to parts of Seacroft. A mature tress also populate the site. Not suitable.

3165 66 to 68 Victoria Road Headingley

Site Details							
Easting	428185	Northing	435453	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Headingley	
Site Characteristics							

Site Characteristics

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

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

Descri	ntion
DUSUIT	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
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 acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs		
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the 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

App Number

10/00478/FU

Proposal

4 storey side extensions to form 6 two bedroom flats

3165 66 to 68 Victoria Road Headingley **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Summary of infrastructure provider comments **Highways Agency** Network Status Impact **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

Decision

Α

% of site

100

3165	66 to 68 Victoria Road Headingley		
13/04823/FU	Two 4 storey side extensions to provide 6 flats with parking	Α	100
14/02822/FU	Amendments to previous planning permission 13/04823/FU to substitute 2No. maisonettes at first and second floor levels with 4No. flats; additional window to fourth floor rear elevation	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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

_			_
Dag	IODOTO	tion	Areas
LCC	ici ici a	LIOII	AI Cas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %		0.00
Nearest train station		Burley Park
Nearest train station distance	(m)	395.83
Nearest bus stop		506
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	99.67

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	~
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Over laps will let als Safequal ded	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

3165 66 to 68 Victoria Road Headingley

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3191 Meynell Heights, LS11

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	429201	Northing	432346	Site area ha		0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Beeston an	d Holbeck		

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Dwellings

Neighbouring land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is an occupied tower block.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Can development pres		
Character Conclusion		

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

3191 Meynell Heights, LS11

SHLAA conclusions Availability: Unavailable Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Good accessibility 5 Access comments Access ok from Meynell Approach 5 Local network comments spare capacity but some cumulative issues 4 Total score Mitigation measures 14 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response. LCC Supported with mitigation **Ecology support** Supported with mitigation to plant a native species-rich hedgerow/band of native scrub along the boundary with St. Matthews Churchyard LNA.

3191 Meynell Heights, LS11 Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/04032/COND	Consent, agreement or approval of conditions 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 14 of Planning Application 10/05225/FU	Α	100
10/05225/FU	Refurbishment of dwelling houses and flats (including some recladding) new boundary walls, alley gates and landscaping	Α	100

Spatial relationships

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	7.61	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	7.61	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy	

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

3191 Meynell Heights, LS11

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.98
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	977.33
Nearest bus stop	14268
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	65.59
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

3191 Meynell Heights, LS11

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site within urban area. Suitable in principle for housing.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - ecology mitigation. Significant positive - brownfield site, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities and greenspace and community participation.

Summary of reps

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

175 6 Yes Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is an occupied tower block. Not suitable.

3193 Folly Lane, LS11

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	429722	Northing	431679	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and Hu	ınslet

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/const		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the I		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to		
Can development pres		
Character Conclusion		

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

3193 Folly Lane,	LS11			
SHLAA conclusions				
Availability: Short (=<5 yrs	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability:	Short (=<5yrs)
Summary of infrastruc	cture provider comments			
Highways Agency	N			
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 Applica	ations since 1/1/2009, covering mor	e than 50% of the site		

Flairling History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50 % of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
10/02786/LA	Removal of conditions 3 and 5 variation of conditions 4 and 6 of application no. 08/03012/LA (3, affordable housing provision 4 amended number of dwellings 5 provision of	Α	100	

3193 Folly	Lane, LS11			
	additional educational facilities and 6, provision of green space and leisure facilities.)			
10/02947/EXT	Extension of time application for application number 08/03012/LA , Outline application for residential development	Α	100	
10/05227/RM	Reserved matters application for residential development of 12 dwelling houses 6 flats, car parking and landscaping	Α	100	
13/05749/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions, 1, 2 and 4 of Planning Application 10/05227/RM	Α	100	
10/02785/LA	Removal of condition number 7 of application no. 08/03012/LA (provision of public transport improvements)	Α	100	
13/05805/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 of Planning Application 10/02786/LA	Α	100	
14/9/00040/MOD	Reserved matters application for residential development of 12 dwelling houses 6 flats, car parking and landscapingNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT of 10/05227/RM to removal of one ground floor window, and relocation of one first floor window, on side elevation of plot 15.	M01	100	

Spatial relationships

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

Caro Stratogy	
Core Strategy	

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.98
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1512.63
Nearest bus stop	255
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	57.67
Agricultural classification	Urban

3193 Folly Lane, LS11

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	1 🗆
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	1 6
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	Ī
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
•	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	led

3193 Folly Lane, LS11

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Summary of Teps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3194 Malvern Road, LS11

Site Details							
Easting	429589	Northing	431589	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	A Inner Area			Ward	City and Hu	unslet	

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons		
Would development result in an i		
Is the site well connected to the built up area?		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

App Number

10/02954/EXT

Proposal

Extension of time application for application number

08/04276/LA, Outline application for residential development

3194 Malvern Road, LS11 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Suitability: Suitable 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

Decision

Α

% of site

100

3194 Ma	alvern Road, LS11			
10/02776/LA	Removal of conditions 3 and 5 and variation of conditions 4 and 6 of application no. 08/04276/LA (3, affordable housing provision, 4, amended number of dwellings, 5, provision of additional educational facilities and 6, provision of green space and leisure facilities.)	Α	100	
13/05866/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 of Planning Application 10/02776/LA	Α	100	
10/05217/RM	Reserved matters application for residential development of 15 dwelling houses and 6 flats, car parking and landscaping	Α	100	
10/02775/LA	Removal of condition number 7 of application no. 08/04276/LA (provision of public transport improvements)	Α	100	
13/05750/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3 and 4 of Planning Application 10/05217/RM	Α	100	

Spatial relationships

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

Core	Strategy	

% overlap

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overla
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	~	

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.87
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m	1605.41
Nearest bus stop	5660
Nearest bus stop distance (m	27.93

Agricultural classification Urban

3194 Malvern Road, LS11

Overlaps SSS	1
Overlaps SEG	I
Overlaps LN	4
Overlaps LN	R
Overlaps Conservation Are	а
Overlaps Listed Buildin	g
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffe	r
Overlaps Public Right of Wa	y
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zon	е
Overlaps EA Flood Zon	e
Overlaps HSE Major Hazar	e [d [
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipelin	
Overlaps Pot. Contaminatio	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguar	ded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 10)0m

3194 Malvern Road, LS11

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamazinty ourinnary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3195 St Luke's Green, LS11

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	429458	Northing	431706	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area		Ward	Beeston an	d Holbeck		

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Prownfield
Site type	Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ntion
DUSUIT	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

3195	St Luke	's Green, LS1	1				
SHLAA cond	lusions						
Availability:	Short (ear	ly)	Suitability:	Suitable	•	Achievability:	Short (=<5yrs)
Summary	of infrast	tructure prov	rider comments				
Highways A	gency						
Impact			Network Status				
Network Ra	ail						
Yorkshire V							
Treatment W	orks						
Environmer	nt Agency						
Constraints							
LCC							
Ecology supp	ort						
Ecology boun	dary						
Education cor	mments						
Flood Risk							
Utilities Gas							
Electric							
Fire and Resc	ue						
Telecoms							
Other English Herita	age						
Natural Engla	nd						

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site						
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site				
14/02865/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,13, 16, 19, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 of	Α	100				
	Planning Application 10/02774/LA						

3195 St	Luke's Green, LS11			
10/05219/RM	Reserved matters application for residential development of 19 dwelling houses, public open space, highways works, car parking and landscaping	A	100	
10/02774/LA	Removal of conditions 3 and 5 and variation of conditions 4 and 6 of application no. 08/04066/LA (3, affordable housing provision, 4, amended number of dwellings, 5, provision of additional educational facilities and 6, provision of green space and leisure facilities.)	A	100	
14/02778/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 2 and 4 of Planning Application 10/05219/RM	Α	100	
10/02773/LA	Removal of condition number 7 of application no. 08/04066/LA (provision of public transport improvements)	Α	100	
10/02957/EXT	Extension of time application for application number 08/04066/LA, Outline application for residential development	Α	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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	
- 1		

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	%	99.99
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (r	n)	1503.26
Nearest bus sto	5660	
Nearest bus stop distance (r	n)	201.33
Agricultural classification	on	Urban

3195 St Luke's Green, LS11

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	П
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	€a
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	m [

3195 St Luke's Green, LS11

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamazinty ourinnary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3197 Cambridge Road, LS6

Site Details								
Easting	430158	Northing	435109	Site area ha		0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area					Ward	Hyde Park	and Woodhouse

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

This is green flat land that is effectively a buffer/landscaping between the existing residential units and the road. Opposite the site (across the road) is an area of N1 Greenspace.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound				
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?	
F 1 10 1 1	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?			
Can development pres			
Character Conclusion		,	

Supported

3197 Cambridge Road, LS6

SHLAA conclusions					
Availability: Short (e	early)	Suitability:	Unsuitable	Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)
Summary of infra	structure provide	r comments			
Public transport access	sibility comments				Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy s	tandards but lacking sor	me local services	and rail		4
Access comments Adequate frontage Car	mbridge Road]			5
Local network comme Previous approval on t	nts he site some mitigation				4
Mitigation measures previously approved so	cheme]			Total score
Highways site support yes with mitigation]			
Contingent on other si	tes				
Contingent on other si	tes				
no					
Highways Agency			la		
Impact No material i	mpact Net	work Status	No objection		
]				
Network Rail					
Yorkshire Water	1				
Treatment Works	Knostrop				
co-ordinated with Yor the site. The forthcor with YW's investment take into account avai	kshire Water's Asset Ma ning AMP(6) will run fro . It is particularly impor lable sewerage and Ww	inagement Plans om April 2015 to l tant that sites wh oTW capacity. If a	(AMP) to ensu March 2020. P nich represent a developer wa	Development that will connect to the public sewer syre the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brough a 10% or greater increase in population served by that to bring a site forward before YW have complete. The amount would be determined by a developer further than the control of the service of the control of	rovided to serve nt forward in line e works should d any planned
Environment Agend	су				
Constraints					
FZ1 under 1 ha. See	comments in main text	of our response.			
LCC					
Ecology support	Supported				

3197 Cambridge Road, LS6 Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Other English Heritage

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site				
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site		
10/05221/FU	Refurbishment of dwelling houses and flats (including some recladding) new boundary walls, alley gates and landscaping	Α	100		

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.94

3197 Cambridge Road, LS6

Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1973.18
Nearest bus stop	14121
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	69.21
Agricultural classification	Urban
9	
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m
	-

3197 Cambridge Road, LS6

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Site is adjacent a fairly densely built up residential area is sloping and performs an important function as greenspace.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N1 greenspace and greenfield site. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Metro

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required

but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

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

128 10 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

This is green flat land that is effectively a buffer/landscaping between the existing residential units and the road. Not suitable.

3204 Coupland Road, LS11

Site Details								
Easting	429643	Northing	431695	Site area ha		0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area					Ward	City and Hu	inslet

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption
2 23011	J J

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti	itue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an is	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the b	ouilt up area?	
Would development round off the	settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries 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	ss to the countryside	
· ·	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote	cted woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	le 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildi	_	
Are these buildings used fo	r agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion	3 1 1	L

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

3204 Coupland Road, LS11 **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

Flairing Flistory	Applications since 1/1/2005, covering more than 50 /0 of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
14/01588/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 19, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 of	INT	100	

3204 Cou	oland Road, LS11			
10/02956/EXT	Extension of time application for application number 08/04065/LA , Outline application for residential development	Α	100	
10/02770/LA	Removal of condition no. 7 of application no. 08/04065/LA, (Public transport provision)	Α	100	
14/01587/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1 and 2 of Planning Application 10/05215/RM	Α	100	
10/02772/LA	Removal of conditions 3 and 5 and variation of conditions 4 and 6 of application no. 08/04065/LA (3, affordable housing provision, 4, amended number of dwellings, 5, provision of additional educational facilities and 6, provision of green space and leisure facilities.)	Α	100	
10/05215/RM	Reserved matters application for residential development of 10 dwelling houses, car parking and landscaping	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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

		Regeneration Areas
% overlap	100.00	Inner South RA
	0.00	LB Corridor RA
	0.00	EASEL RA
	0.00	Aire Valley RA
	0.00	West Leeds Gateway

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	100.00	
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)		1496.52
Nearest bus stop		255
Nearest bus stop distance (m)		38.45
Agricultural classificat	tion	Urban

3204 Coupland Road, LS11

Overlaps SSS	
Overlaps SEG	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNF	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	1 7
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	IП
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
'	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguar	led
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 10	0m
zaranan zaran z	

3204 Coupland Road, LS11

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
comments on priasing	
DDD All II	1
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
Site with current or recently expired	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3206 Din Buildings, Roundhay Road, LS8 3QD

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	432016	Northing	435811	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Gipton and	Harehills		

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

3206 Din Buildings, Roundhay Road, LS8 3QD **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Unavailable 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

Flairing History	Applications since 1/1/2005, covering more than 50/0 of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
12/02962/FU	Extension to form enlarged shop at first floor; change of use and extension of former bed and breakfast to form nine flats at second floor	Α	100	

3206 Din Buildings, Roundhay Road, LS8 3QD 10/00397/FU Change of use of second floor bed and breakfast to 8 flats A 97 and 2 storey rear extension

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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	100.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	
,		

Other Spatial Relationship

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

3206 Din Buildings, Roundhay Road, LS8 3QD

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
ouotamaziiti ouminary	
C	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3306 Scott Hall Square, Chapel Allerton

Site Details								
Easting	430281	Northing	436191	Site area ha	0.8		SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward Chapel Allerton			

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topogra	phy	Landscape	
Bounda	ies	Road front	No

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?				
Do features provide bound				
Coalescence Conclusion				

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary			
Does the site provide acces			
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs		
Areas of protected/unprote			
Site includes Grade 1, Grad			
Does the site contain buildings			
Are these buildings used fo			
Encroachment Conclusion			

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

App Number

11/03883/COND

Proposal

Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 3 of

Planning Application 10/03984/FU

3306 Scott Hall Square, Chapel Allerton **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Suitability: Suitable 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

Decision

Α

% of site

100

3306 Scot	t Hall Square, Chapel Allerton			
11/9/00240/MOD	7 bungalows and 17 houses with landscaping and public open space NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 10/03984/FU Additional obscure glazed windows to plots 1, 2, 3, 13, 16 and 17	M01	100	
11/05075/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5 and 6 of Planning Application 10/03984/FU	Α	100	
10/03984/FU	7 bungalows and 17 houses with landscaping and public open space	Α	100	
11/9/00139/MOD	7 bungalows and 17 houses with landscaping and public open spaceNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 10/03984/FU: Raise cill height of kitchen windows by 150mm (and any window adjacent) to house types D, D1, E, E*, E1, E2, F1 & K and handing of plot 15 to reflect site plan.	M01	100	
11/9/00125/MOD	7 bungalows and 17 houses with landscaping and public open space NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 10/03984/FU: Incorporation of step in floor levels to Plots 11/12 and 16/17 to provide level access to Lifetime Homes Standards	M01	100	
11/9/00188/MOD	7 bungalows and 17 houses with landscaping and public open spaceNON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 10/03984/FU - Amendment of car port roof to disabled bungalow type J to match main roof	M01	100	
11/02197/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21 and 22 of Planning Application 10/03984/FU	SPL	100	

Spatial relationships

UDP	Daci	\sim	~+i	anc
UDP	Desi	un	au	UI 15

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

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	100.00	
Nearest train station		Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (2587.39
Nearest bus s	4862	
Nearest bus stop distance ((m)	181.13

Agricultural classification Urban

3306 Scott Hall Square, Chapel Allerton

Overlaps SSSI
Overlaps SEGI
Overlaps LNA
Overlaps LNR
Overlaps Conservation Area
Overlaps Listed Building
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer
Overlaps Public Right of Way
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone
Overlaps EA Flood Zone
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline
Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

3306 Scott Hall Square, Chapel Allerton

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamazinty ourinnary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3342 LS9 6PQ

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	433672	Northing	434777	Site area ha		0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Gipton and	Harehills			

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Prownfield
Site type	Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

App Number

11/03254/FU

Proposal

Change of use 24 flats to provide 12 semi detached houses

3342	LS9 6PQ				
SHLAA cond	lusions				
Availability	: Short (=<5	yrs) Suital	bility: S	Suitable	Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)
Summary	of infrastı	ucture provider comme	ents		
Highways A	Agency				
Impact	-gy	Network Statu	IS		
Network Ra	ail				
Yorkshire V	Vater				
Treatment W	orks				
Environmer Constraints	nt Agency				
CONSTIAINTS					
LCC					
Ecology supp	ort				
Ecology boun	dary				
Education cor	mmonts				
Education col	Tillichts				
Flood Risk					
Utilities					
Gas					
E					
Electric					
Fire and Reso	eue				
Telecoms					
Other					
English Herita	age				
Natural Engla	ind				
Planning Hi	story App	lications since 1/1/2009, cover	ing more t	than 50% of the site	

Decision

Α

% of site

100

12/00254/COND Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 6, A 100 7 and 8 of Planning Application 11/03254/FU

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy

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

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 (2633.19	
Nearest bus s	4552	
Nearest bus stop distance (80.40	
Agricultural classificat	Urban	

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlans Minerals Safeguarded	1 -

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

3342 LS9 6PQ

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamazinty ourinnary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3343 Belle Isle, Leeds

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	430835	Northing	429950	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	MCA Inner Area			Ward	Middleton	Park	

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to		
Can development pres		
Character Conclusion		

App Number

13/01044/COND

Proposal

Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 10 of Planning Application 11/02629/FU

3343	Belle Isl	le, Leeds				
SHLAA concl	usions					
Availability:	Short (=<	5 yrs)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability:	Short (=<5yrs)
Summary o	of infrast	ructure provider c	comments			
111-1						
Highways Ag	gency	Nistro				
Impact		INELWO	rk Status			
Network Rai	il					
Yorkshire W	ater					
Treatment Wo	rks					
Environment	t Agency					
Constraints	Agency					
LCC						
Ecology suppo	ort					
Ecology bound	lary					
Education com	nments					
Flood Risk						
Utilities						
Gas						
Electric						
Fire and Rescu	ie					
Telecoms						
011						
Other English Heritag	70					
English Henta(ye					
Natural Englan	nd					
Diam's transfer		ulications - 1 1/1/035	2	no them 500/ of the "		
Planning His	tory Ap	plications since 1/1/2009	e, covering moi	re than 50% of the site		

Decision

Α

% of site

100

3343 Belle Isle, Leeds

12/9/00258/MOD

Ten houses and six bungalows to vacant site NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 11/02629/FU: 1 Blue brick to window surrounds on front elevations of Plots 1-16 from red brick; 2 - buff brick omitted adjacent to front doors of Plots 4 & 5; 3- blue brick above head to rear access door to rear elevations of Plots 1-5 & 12-16; 4 - buff brick stack bond feature omitted adjacent to window on front elevation of bungalows (plots 6-11); 5 - indicative outline for proposed PV panels amended to accurately reflect necessary areas; 6 - amendment to areas/extent of block paviours and paving slabs to plot driveways; 7 - Plot 6 driveway access amended so that access is gained from Salamenca Court and not West Grange Road; 8 - paved path between front of electric substation and new road omitted, access down sides of substation retained; 9 - areas of shrubbery omitted adjacent to Plots 5 & 12, replaced with paving slabs; 10 - south side boundary adjacent to the BITMO land fronting the MUGGA, dense, defensive shrubbery on BITMO land omitted, boundary treatment amended to low level brickwork wall with brick piers and brickwork infill panels, min 1.8m high to BITMO side; 11 - boundary to rear of Plots 1-5 amended to 2m high timber fence, omitting no low level wall; 12 boundary to front of Plots 1-5 amended to 1.2m high hoop top fence, omitting low level wall; 13 - section of the west site boundary treatment adjacent to the rear of Plot 13 and parking area of Plot 11, being 2m high wired and stapled hit and miss timber fencing, extended north and south to corners of site in place of 1.8m high hit and miss timber fence; 14 - boundary to side of Plot 6 fronting West Grange Road amended to 1.1m high hit and miss fence on 900mm brickwork wall with piers, 2m high overall

M01 100

12/02068/COND

Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of Planning Application 11/02629/FU

100

% overlap

11/02629/FU Ten houses and six bungalows to vacant site

100

Α

Α

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	100.00	
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (3437.20	
Nearest bus st	5251	
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	233.84

3343 Belle Isle, Leeds

Agricultural classification	Urban			
Overlaps SSSI				
Overlaps SEGI				
Overlaps LNA				
Overlaps LNR				
Overlaps Conservation Area				
Overlaps Listed Building				
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer				
Overlaps Public Right of Way				
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone				
Overlaps EA Flood Zone				
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard				
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline				
Overlaps Pot. Contamination				
Overland Minanala Cafeevand				
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded				
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m			

Inner Area

3343 Belle Isle, Leeds

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamasmity ourminary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3345 Servia Road, Leeds LS7 1NJ

Site Details								
Easting	429929	Northing	435118	Site area ha	(0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	CA Inner Area				Ward	Hyde Park a	and Woodhouse	

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

_	
Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

4. Preserve the 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

3345 Servia Road, Leeds LS7 1NJ **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site				
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site		
11/05195/FU	Erection of two part 6 storey and part 7 storey blocks of 72 student cluster flats (300 bedrooms) with landscaping and car parking	Α	100		

Inner Area

3345 Serv	via Road, Leeds LS7 1NJ			
14/01581/FU	Variation of conditions 2, 17 and 22 of previous approval 12/04687/FU relating to approved plans, highway works and number of students	A	100	
14/01432/DEM	Determination for demolition of vacant industrial storage buildings	Α	100	
14/04315/FU	Variation of conditions 2 (approved plans) and 22 (no. of students) of approval 14/01581/FU to provide an extra 6 one bedroom flats and a single storey side extension to each block		100	
12/04687/FU	Variation of condition 2 and 17 of planning application 11/05195/FU, resiting of accommodation blocks and amend internal layout	Α	100	
13/05255/FU	Variation of conditions 2, 17 and 22 of previous approval 12/04687/FU relating to approved plans, highway works and number of students	R	100	

Spatial relationships

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

Core	Strategy	

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

3.72
Leeds City
1941.44
14272
) 111.87

Agricultural classification Urban

3345 Servia Road, Leeds LS7 1NJ

Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	J 🗆
Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
<u> </u>	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	1 🗖
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	I F
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 10	0m

3345 Servia Road, Leeds LS7 1NJ

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
ouotamaziiti ouminary	
C	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Topography

3346 Former Bricklayers Arms, Low Close Street, Woodhouse

Site Details									
Easting	429386	Northing	435165	Site area ha	0.1		SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				Wa	rd	Hyde Park and Woodhouse		
Site Characteristics									
Site type Brownfield									
On-site land uses - None									
Adjacent land uses - None									
Other land uses - None									

Boundaries	Road front	No
Description	1	

Landscape

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound			
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 pres		
Character Conclusion		

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

3346 Former Bricklayers Arms, Low Close Street, Woodhouse **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status Network Rail **Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/00307/FU	Change of use of public house to form six flats; alterations including part three storey, part first and second floor extensions, dormer windows to front and rear	R	100

Former Bricklayers Arms, Low Close Street, Woodhouse				
12/03445/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by Planning Application 11/03581/FU	Α	100	
11/03581/FU	Change of use of public house to form six flats; alterations including part three storey, part first and second floor extensions, dormer windows to front and rear	Α	100	
12/9/00163/MOD	Change of use of public house to form six flats; alterations including part three storey, part first and second floor extensions, dormer windows to front and rear NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 11/03581/FU: Dormer widths built slightly wider than indicated by the original approved plans. Detail showing smoke vent fitted on the 1st floor at the rear of the building. Reinstatement of existing ground floor window on Low Close Street. Inclusion of rear 1st floor window missing from rear elevation but included in the 1st floor plan layout. Minor changes to internal floor plan layout.	M01	100	

Spatial relationships

UDP	Desig	ınati	ions
יטט	DCSIG	mat	0113

0.00	% overlap
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %		
	Burley Park	
Nearest train station Nearest train station distance (m)		
Nearest bus stop		
Nearest bus stop distance (m)		
	(m) top	

Agricultural classification Urban

3	1
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	

Inner Are

3346	Former Bricklayers A	rms, Low Close Street, Woodhouse
	laps Minerals Safeguarded linerals Safeguarded 100m	

3346 Former Bricklayers Arms, Low Close Street, Woodhouse

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

3354 Oak Road, Armley

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	428187	Northing	433236	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Armley	

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 unresticted 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 pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		

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

Inner Area

App Number

11/01362/OT

Proposal

landscaping

Residential development of nine houses with access and

3354 Oak Road, Armley **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **Highways Agency** Network Status Impact **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

Decision

Α

% of site

100

3354 Oak Road, Armley

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.01	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core	Strategy

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

% overlap

Reg	en	er	ati	on	Ar	eas

Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	100.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	100.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %
Nearest train station
Nearest train station distance (m)
Nearest bus stop
Nearest bus stop distance (m)
Agricultural classification
0 1 0001
·
Overlaps SEGI
Overlaps LNA
Overlaps LNR
Overlaps Conservation Area
Overlaps Listed Building
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer
Overlaps Public Right of Way
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone
Overlaps EA Flood Zone
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline
Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard
Nearest train station arest train station distance (m) Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop distance (m) Agricultural classification Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building rlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

Inner Area

3354 Oak Road, Armley

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Summary of Teps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details							
Easting	428422	Northing	433907	Site area ha	2.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	City and Hu	unslet		

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Wholesale distribution

Neighbouring land uses

Storage

Wholesale distribution

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is partially occupied with various businiesses. The site is in the middle of an indistrial area.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 conne	ction of settlements?	
Do features provide boun	daries 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

Constraints

runs to the south of the site. See comments in main text of our response.

3390 Washington Street and Kirkstall Road, Leeds Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable physical Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Core Strategy standards but distant from rail 5 Access comments Adequate frontage Kirkstall Road 5 Local network comments Congestion on A65 3 **Total score** Mitigation measures Kirkstall Road adjacent Quality Bus Initiative 13 Highways site support yes with mitigation Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **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**

Part of site is in FZ3 (ii) as shown on LCC SFRA - recommendation that no 'more vulnerable use' be permitted in FZ3a (ii). Main river (River Aire)

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
this site could result in	tion. This site lies adjacent to the River Aire an important wildlife corridor for birds, bats, otters and fish. The development of increased levels of disturbance the river. Set back development a minimum of 20 metres from the river bank and provide the impact of light spillage and provide feeding habitat for bats. Direct any external lighting away from the river.
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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core	Strategy

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

% overlap

Rec	ieneratio	on Areas
1760	ici ici atit	JII AI Cas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	1373.10
Nearest bus stop	9924
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	97.62
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	~
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

In existing employment use, suitable in principle for residential development or mixed use with residential on upper floors.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

89 18 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation with mixed uses

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Suitable site for offices and high density housing on the fringes of the city centre. Needs to be properly masterplanned with similar nearby sites.

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	428598	Northing	433781	Site area ha	2.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and Hu	unslet

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Storage

Vacant land

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is cleared brownfield area. In the middle of a predominantly industrial area although housing has been granted on land to the south.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 t		
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

study.

3393 Kirkstall Road, Leeds Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable physical Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Core Strategy standards but distant from rail 5 Access comments Adequate frontage Kirkstall Road 5 Local network comments Congestion on A65 3 **Total score** Mitigation measures Kirkstall Road adjacent Quality Bus Initiative 13 Highways site support yes with mitigation Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **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

Environment Agency

Constraints

FZ3 but note that site is surroundedby FZ3a(ii). Main river (River Aire) runs to South of the site. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported with mitigation
this site could result	ation. This site lies adjacent to the River Aire an important wildlife corridor for birds, bats, otters and fish. The development of in increased levels of disturbance the river. Set back development a minimum of 20 metres from the river bank and provide ce the impact of light spillage and provide feeding habitat for bats. Direct any external lighting away from the river.
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	1
English Heritage	
Natural England	
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site
App Number	Proposal Decision % of 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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

overlap

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1242.98
Nearest bus stop	8114
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	146.54
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
<u> </u>	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	V
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<u> </u>
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

In existing employment use, suitable in principle for residential development or mixed use with residential on upper floors.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

eme. The site fronts onto Kirkstall Road (the A65) has enhanced bus lanes and accessibility measures known as the Kirkstall Road Quality Bus Initiative (QBI) that were completed in 2012. The site is an easy 10-12 minute walk from the core of the city centre and is surrounded by a mix of office, commercial, hotel and retail/sales accommodation. To the east is a vacant site with planning permission for mixed use development including residential, offices and retail floorspace. The depot building on the site is currently being demolished making the land ready for short term regeneration. The site represents a brownfield opportunity in a highly accessible location within an easy walk of a vast array of city centre uses and attractions. The site is an ideal candidate for a mixed use regeneration including residential, retail and student accommodation.

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site)

Buses Per Hour

Access to Primary Schools

Access to Secondary Schools

Access to Primary Schools

Access to Secondary Schools

Access to Secondary Schools

Yes

Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation with mixed uses

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Suitable site for offices and high density housing on the fringes of the city centre. Needs to be properly masterplanned with similar nearby sites.

3399 Premises at Roseville Road Leeds LS8 5DR

Site Det	ails							
Easting	430958	Northing	434558	Site area ha	1.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and H	unslet	
Site Cha	racteristi	cs						
Site type	Brownfield							
On-site lan	d uses							
Wholesale	distribution							
Neighbouri	ng land uses	i						
Wholesale	distribution							
Manufactu	ring and Who	olesale						
Other land	uses - None							
Topograph	ny Flat				Landscape	No Tree Cov	er	
Boundarie	es Existing v	well defined			Road front	Yes		1

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

Current series of car showrooms.

Description

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	1
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	1
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide boun		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

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

3399 Premises at Roseville Road Leeds LS8 5DR

SHLAA conclusions							
Availability: Short (6	early)	Suitability:	Unsuitable		Achievability:	Medium (6-10yrs)	
Summary of infra	structure prov	ider comments					
LCC Highways Com	ments						
Public transport access	sibility comments						Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy st	tandards but lackinç	g some local services	and rail				4
Access comments							
Adequate frontage to	Benson Street						5
Local network commer	nts						
Congestion on A61							3
Mitigation measures							Total score
none							12
Highways site support							
yes		'					
Contingent on other si	tes						
no							
Contingent on other si	tes						
no							
	1						
Highways Agency Impact No material i	mnact	Network Status	No objection				
impact its material.		Network States	110 02,000.011				
Network Rail							
Yorkshire Water	1						
Treatment Works	Knostrop						
Knostrop High and Lov co-ordinated with Yorl the site. The forthcon with YW's investment. take into account avai improvements it may study.	kshire Water's Asse ning AMP(6) will ru . It is particularly im lable sewerage and	t Management Plans on from April 2015 to Naportant that sites who WwTW capacity. If a	(AMP) to ensure th March 2020. Phasii iich represent a 10 i developer wants	ne necessary infra ng is one method % or greater inc to bring a site fo	astructure and ca I used to ensure s rease in population rward before YW	pacity can be provi- sites are brought fo on served by the wo have completed ar	ded to serve brward in line orks should by planned
Environment Agend	·v						
Constraints	· y						
Part FZ3 to west of sit	te . See comments	in main text to our re	esponse.				
LCC							
Ecology support	Supported						
Supported							

Inner Area

3399	Premises at Roseville Road Leeds LS8 5DR
Ecology bou	ndary
Education co	omments
Flood Risk	
TIOOU NISK	
Utilities Gas	
Od3	
Electric	
Fire and Res	cue
Telecoms	
Other English Heri	tage
Natural Engl	and

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site $\frac{1}{1}$		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
12/03595/ADV	Two illuminated signs and one non illuminated sign to car dealership	Α	79
10/02863/ADV	2 externally illuminated fascia signs, 1 externally illuminated freestanding double sided sign and 3 non illuminated wall mounted signs to car dealership	Α	100
09/00430/ADV	Retrospective application for 2 internally illuminated individual letter fascia signs, 1 internally illuminated entrance statement sign and 1 internally illuminated freestanding totem sign to car dealership	Α	99

Spatial relationships	Spatia	relat	ionsh	ips
-----------------------	--------	-------	-------	-----

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

3399 Premises at Roseville Road Leeds LS8 5DR

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

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	100.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.07
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1862.89
Nearest bus stop	5616
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	88.94
Agricultural classification L	Jrban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<u></u>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	d \square
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100r	n _

3399 Premises at Roseville Road Leeds LS8 5DR

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Existing employment site, not within residential area. Employment considered more appropriate use.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required

but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

Distance to Core Network (Centre of site) Buses Per Hour Primary Health

253 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

In current use as car showrooms. Not suitable.

3408 Wellington Road, Leeds

Site Deta	Site Details							
Easting	428776	Northing	433449	Site area ha		2.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area				Ward	City and Hu	inslet		

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Wholesale distribution

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is currntly an industrial estate with partial occupancy. To the north west is some land that has recently been given permission for 113 residential units. Good public transport networks nearby.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

	•	•	
Strong defensible boundary	between si	te and urban area	
Does the site provide acces	s to the cou	ntryside	
Does the site include local/	national nati	ure conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote	cted woodla	nd/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	e 2 or Grade	e 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildi	ngs		
Are these buildings used fo			
Encroachment Conclusion			

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

Constraints

FZ2 site. Main River (River Aire) runs to NE of site. See coments in main text of our reply

3408 Wellington Road, Leeds Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Core Strategy standards close to city centre 5 Access comments Adequate frontage but high percentage commercial vehicles 3 Local network comments Possible cummulative impact but ok for 48 units 4 **Total score** Mitigation measures none 12 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection 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 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**

Inner Area

3408 Wel	ington Road, Leeds
LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (RED otters and fish - and for the river and car). This site lies between the River Aire and Leeds Liverpool Canal SEGI which is an important wildlife corridor for birds, bats, I will form part of the Leeds Habitat Network. Residential development of this site could result in increased levels of disturbance ital. Opportunity should be taken to remove all development from this area of land as a long-term objective - in the short-term it onsider some re-development of this site if it delivers remediation of the land to benefit biodiversity.
Ecology boundary	
protect and enhance with tree planting to waterways). Mitigat	gation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is ammended as per Drawing RM/3408. Mitigation will be required to a the boundary with the River Aire and Canal by providing a minimum 30 metre buffer to the River Aire and canal banks together a reduce the impact of light spillage and provide feeding habitat for bats (directing any external lighting away from the ion should also include remediation of the non-developed area to the west to enhance it for biodiversity - to become part of an a stretching further west that could be used as POS for this allocation and others on the adjacent banks of the River Aire (SHLAA 8).
Education comment	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	ions 2004069 and CFSM041 and housing allocation 3408 are all adjacent to the Leeds-Liverpool Canal local nature conservation
site	ions 2004009 and Cr Sivio41 and housing anocation 3400 are an adjacent to the Leeds-Liverpoor Canal local nature conservation
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

3408 Wellington Road, Leeds

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	98.60	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

•	
LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	_eeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	951.59
Nearest bus stop	11060
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	158.23
Agricultural classification U	Irban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	✓
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	b
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100n	n

3408 Wellington Road, Leeds

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

In existing employment use. Residential uses exist the other side of Wellington Road. Suitable in principle for residential development or mixed use with residential on upper floors.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - employment and economic growth, ecology mitigation, transport network and pollution.

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

119 40 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation with mixed uses

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Suitable site for offices and high density housing on the fringes of the city centre. Needs to be properly masterplanned with similar nearby sites.

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	432380	Northing	433908	Site area ha	1.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Burmantoft	s and Richmond Hill

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor sport facility

Car Showroom

Other land uses - None

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

Description

A C shaped site that surrounds a disused social club (although seemed to be in partial use - Site Visit Q4 2014). Many of the other units occupied. Henerally surrounded by residneital with N6 greenspace to the north west. A large Car Showroom opposite.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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	o physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries 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

3411 Torre Road, Leeds Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Good accessibility 5 Access comments Access ok from Torre Road or Lupton Avenue 5 Local network comments congestion issues / cumulative issues 3 **Total score** Mitigation measures 13 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works 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	1		
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
LIECTITO			
Fire and Rescue			
	7		
Telecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			
Natural England			
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site $\frac{1}{1}$		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP D	esign	ations
-------	-------	--------

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

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			
No second trade stations and other				
Nearest train station	Leeds City			
Nearest train station distance (m)	2782.24			
Nearest bus stop	9879			
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	81.96			
Agricultural classification	Urban			
Overlaps SSSI				
Overlaps SEGI				
Overlaps LNA	H			
<u>'</u>				
Overlaps LNR				
Overlaps Conservation Area				
Overlaps Listed Building				
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer				
Overlaps Public Right of Way				
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone				
Overlaps EA Flood Zone				
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard				
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$			
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<u></u>			
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed			
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	m			

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Within residential area. The site is in existing employment use but residential development acceptable in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Primary Health

180 Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

iite in occupied employment use. Not suitable for residential.

3425 Armley Road, Leeds

Site Details							
Easting	427953	Northing	433558	Site area ha	2.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Armley	

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Shops

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

There is residential to the south and west of the site. It is adjacent to a main distributor road. Currently derelict. Has had considerable retail interest on the site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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	ements?	
Do features provide bound	ent?	
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

3425 Armley Road, Leeds Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets CS accessibility standards but lacking in local services 4 Access comments Adequate frontage/s for suitable access/es and visibility splays within site / adopted highway 5 Local network comments possible cummulative impact in local area 4 Total score Mitigation measures access improvements 13 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Good 5 Access comments Access from Canal Road possible 4 Local network comments Armley Gyratory congestion 2 Total score Mitigation measures Contribution to Armley Gyratory capacity improvement 11 Highways site support Yes with mitigation

3425	Armley Road, Leeds
Contingen	it on other sites
Contingen	t on other sites
	/s Agency
Impact N	No material impact Network Status No objection
Network	Rail
Yorkshire	
Treatment	t Works 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-ordinate the site. with YW's take into a	ted with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve 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 investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned nents it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility
Environn	ment Agency
Constraint	
FZ1 over	1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.
LCC	
Ecology su	
Supported	
Ecology bo	oundary
Education	comments
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and R	descue
Telecoms	
Other	
English He	eritage

Armley Road, Leeds ral England Ining History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site Number Proposal Decision % of site Decision % of site	
Ining History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site Number Proposal Decision % of site	
Number Proposal Decision % of site Core Strategy	
Number Proposal Decision % of site Core Strategy	
Tital relationships OP 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 CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 UDP City Centre 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 her Spatial Relationship LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	
N32 Greenbelt 0.00 N34 PAS 0.00 RL1 Rural Land 0.00 N15 Open Space 0.00 N6 Playing Pitch 0.00 CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 UDP City Centre 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park Main Urban Area 100.00 Major Settlement 0.00 Minor Settlement 0.00 Minor Settlement 0.00 Minor Settlement 0.00 Minor Settlement 0.00 Verlaps Urban Extension ✓ **Overlaps Urban Extension ✓ **Westlemant 0.00 We overlap **Overlaps Urban Extension ✓ **Westlemant 0.00 **Westlemant 0.00 **Overlaps Urban Extension ✓ **Westlemant 0.00 **Westlemant 0.00 **Westlemant 0.00 **Overlaps Urban Extension ✓ **Westlemant 0.00 **Westlemant 0.00	of site
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 CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 UDP City Centre 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 Nain Urban Area 100.00 Major Settlement 0.00 Minor Settlement 0.00 Minor Settlement 0.00 Minor Settlement 0.00 Negeneration Areas Regeneration Areas Nearest train station Burley Park	
N34 PAS 0.00 RL1 Rural Land 0.00 N1 Greenspace 0.00 N1A Allotments 0.00 N5 Open Space 0.00 N6 Playing Pitch 0.00 CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 UDP City Centre 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 Major Settlement 0.00 Minor Settlement 0.00 Némor Settlement 0.00 Negrous Urban Extension Regeneration Areas Nearest train station Major Settlement 0.00 Minor Settlement 0.00 Overlaps Urban Extension	
N34 PAS 0.00 RL1 Rural Land 0.00 N1 Greenspace 0.00 N1A Allotments 0.00 N5 Open Space 0.00 N6 Playing Pitch 0.00 CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 UDP City Centre 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 Major Settlement 0.00 Minor Settlement 0.00 Némor Settlement 0.00 Negrous Urban Extension Regeneration Areas Nearest train station Major Settlement 0.00 Minor Settlement 0.00 Overlaps Urban Extension	rlap
RL1 Rural Land 0.00 N1 Greenspace 0.00 N1A Allotments 0.00 N5 Open Space 0.00 N6 Playing Pitch 0.00 CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 UDP City Centre 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 LCC ownership % 2.15 Mearest train station Burley Park	· F
N1 Greenspace 0.00 N1A Allotments 0.00 N5 Open Space 0.00 N6 Playing Pitch 0.00 8 Urban Green Corridor 0.00 CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 UDP City Centre 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 her Spatial Relationship LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	
N1A Allotments 0.00 N5 Open Space 0.00 N6 Playing Pitch 0.00 8 Urban Green Corridor 0.00 CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 UDP City Centre 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	
N6 Playing Pitch 0.00 8 Urban Green Corridor 0.00 CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 UDP City Centre 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	
N6 Playing Pitch 0.00 8 Urban Green Corridor 0.00 CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 UDP City Centre 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	
8 Urban Green Corridor 0.00 CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 UDP City Centre 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 LB Corridor RA 100.00 EASEL RA 0.00 Aire Valley RA 0.00 West Leeds Gateway 100.00 West Leeds Gateway 100.00 LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	
CC Shopping Quarter 0.00 UDP City Centre 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 LB Corridor RA 100.00 EASEL RA 0.00 Aire Valley RA 0.00 West Leeds Gateway 100.00 West Leeds Gateway 100.00 her Spatial Relationship LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	rlap
UDP City Centre 0.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	- 1
S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 her Spatial Relationship LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	
Proposed Local Centre 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 her Spatial Relationship LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	
Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 her Spatial Relationship LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	
Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 her Spatial Relationship LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	
her Spatial Relationship LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	
LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	
LCC ownership % 2.15 Nearest train station Burley Park	
Nearest train station Burley Park	
earest train station distance (m) 1619.65	
Nearest bus stop 13113	
Nearest bus stop distance (m) 141.61	
Agricultural classification Urban	
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building erlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
erlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	

Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone

Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

3425 Armley Road, Leeds

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Within residential area. The site is in existing employment use but residential development acceptable in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Primary Health

57 31 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

In employment use. Not appropriate for allocation for housing.

Site Deta	Site Details						
Easting	430496	Northing	434997	Site area ha	2.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area			1	Ward	Chapel Alle	erton
Site Cha	racteristic	cs					
Site type	Brownfield						
On-site lan	d uses						
Manufactur	ing and Who	olesale					
Wholesale	Wholesale distribution						
Storage	Storage						
Neighbouring land uses							
Manufactur	Manufacturing and Wholesale						
Other							
Other land	Other land uses						
car dealers	car dealership						

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

Description

Large areas of the site currently in employment use. Site adjacent to main distributor road. Generally in indutrial area.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons		
Would development result in an i		
Is the site well connected to the I		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

=		
Would development lead t		
Do features provide bound		
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

FZ2 & FZ 3. See comments in main text of our response.

3426 Barrack Street, Leeds Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable physical Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Good accessibility 5 Access comments Existing access points adequate 5 Local network comments local congestion issues but site has a fallback 4 **Total score** Mitigation measures some local mitigaton may be required 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 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 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

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 Desi	ignations
----------	-----------

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

Inner Sc	outh RA	0.00	% overlap		
LB Corri	LB Corridor RA				
EA	SEL RA	0.00			
Aire Va	lley RA	0.00			
West Leeds G	ateway	0.00			

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.05
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1976.70
Nearest bus stop	11958
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	105.56
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	✓
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m 🗸

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Adjacent to residential area (to west). In use as employment but residential development acceptable in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - pollution. Minor negative - employment and economic growth and waste. Significant positive - brownfield site, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education, health and leisure facilities and greenspace and community participation.

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

120 9 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

In indutrial area. Currently in employment use. Officer and members agree not suitable for housing.

•	Site Details								
	Easting	429709	Northing	435901	Site area ha		0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
	HMCA	Inner Area					Ward Chapel Allerton		

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Dwellings

Other land uses

part of site is grassed

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

Description

Predominantly an industrual area. A large park backs onto the site with residential and woodlanmd across the road. Some office on site as well.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 t	
Do features provide bound	
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?	
Engraphment Canalysian	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development preserve this character?	
Object to the Control of the Control	

Character Conclusion

3427 Cliffdale Road, Leeds Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Good accessibility 5 Access comments Cliffdale Road is ok for access subject to visibility 5 Local network comments congestion issues / cumulative issues 3 **Total score** Mitigation measures 13 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works 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 FZ 3 - Small part to the North. Main River (Meanwood Beck) runs to the north of site. See our comments in main text of our response.

UDP Designation	ons	ore Strategy	
Spatial relationship	S		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering mo	ore than 50% of the site	
Natural England			
should be had to the o	esirability of preserving Listed Buildings	s or their setting or any features of sp	quirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" ecial architectural or historic interest which they nents which contribute to the significance of this
English Heritage			
Other			
Telecoms			
Fire and Rescue			
Electric			
Gas			
Utilities			
Flood Risk			
Education comments			
Leology Bourlaary			
Ecology boundary	surveys to inform the management and	remancement of this burier zone.	
Meanwood Valley. The including White Clawe Meanwood Beck which	Meanwood Beck forms the northern bod Crayfish, Otter and Water Vole. Most	oundary of this proposed allocation - a of the site has existing development, be buffer to be provided along the nort	art of an important wildlife corridor along the and is used by a number of protected species however there is a small area adjacent to the hern boundary to be protected and enhanced -
Ecology support	Supported with mitigation		
LCC			

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

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

•	
LCC ownership %	0.02
Nearest train station B	urley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	1947.75
Nearest bus stop	14274
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	115.03
Agricultural classification U	Irban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	d

Overlaps N	linerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals	s Safeguarded 100m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Within residential area. The site is in existing employment use but residential development acceptable in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Primary Health

74 13 Yes

Yes Yes

English Heritage

The Lanier Business Centre to the south-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, if allocated, redevelopment proposals would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of this asset are not harmed.

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is in an industrial area. Some residential nearby but current use coupled with adjacent uses suggest the site is not suitable for residential allocation.

Site Details							
Easting	428517	Northing	434119	Site area ha	9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area		Ward	City and Hu	unslet			

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Office

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Wholesale distribution

Neighbouring land uses

Office

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is current employment use. Part of site is a TV studio. Appears to be some vacancy across the site but still a realtivel high level of occupancy and use. Surrounding area is in general employment type uses.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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	
Do features provide bound	
Coalescence Conclusion	14

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

Inner Area

3432 Kirkstall, Leeds Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 5 Access comments Access from Studio Road Local network comments West St / Wellington Road concerns 3 **Total score** Mitigation measures Contribution to West St/ Wellington Road improvement 12 Highways site support yes with mitigation Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ2 & FZ 3 - to south east of site, Note that Kirkstall Rd in FZ 3a (ii). See comments in main text of our response.

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Ecology Souridary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
The dia Resede			
Telecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			
z.igiion riomago			
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 D)esiç	gna	tions
-------	-------	-----	-------

ODI 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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	
'		

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.06
Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	1224.30
Nearest bus stop	497
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	115.87
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m 🗸

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Adjacent to residential area to north. The site is in existing employment use but residential development acceptable in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

121 18 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site predominantly used for employment use. Past and current uses in area reflect an emplyment based area. Not considered suitable for housing allocation.

Site Details							
Easting	429970	Northing	435453	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area Ward Hyde Park and Woodhouse			and Woodhouse			

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is opposite some student accomodation and adjacent to a residentia area. Site is a series of small units for employment uses. Although not entirely occupied the site does have a reasonable level of occupancy.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 t		
Do features provide bound		
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?	
Francisch was at Osmalius's a	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

Environment Agency

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

Constraints

3433 Meanwood Road/Cross Chancellor Street, Leeds 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) Meets Core Strategy standards but lacking some local services and rail 4 Access comments Adequate frontage Cross Chancellor Street 5 Local network comments Congestion on A61 3 **Total score** Mitigation measures none identified 12 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection 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 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.

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
riodd Risk			
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
E: 15	1		
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			J
Other			
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 Sch. Ancient Mon.

0.00

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	12.52
Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)	2087.61
Nearest bus stop	11899
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	68.43
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	Ī 🗖
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	led
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 10	0m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Within residential area. The site is in existing employment use but residential development acceptable in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

Primary Health

44 13 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Currently in employment use. Not considered suitable for housing allocation.

3454 Land off Holdforth Place

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	428291	Northing	433115	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Armley	
Site Cha	racteristic	cs					
Site type	Brownfield						

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

On-site land uses

Dwellings

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

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitue ribbon development?	1
Would development result in an isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion	

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?				
Do features provide bound				
Coalescence Conclusion				

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary			
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside		
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs		
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?			
Site includes Grade 1, Grad			
Does the site contain buildi	ngs		
Are these buildings used fo	r agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion			

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

	· .	
Site within/adjacent to	conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
Can development pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		

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

Supported

3454 Land off Holdforth Place

SHLAA conclusions Availability: Medium (6-10yrs) Suitability: Suitable physical Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Core Strategy standards but lacking some local services and rail 4 Access comments Access via Holdsforth Place constrained but low level acceptable 4 Local network comments Congestion adjacent gyratory junction 3 Total score Mitigation measures means to improve vehicular access 11 Highways site support yes with mitigation Contingent on other sites no Contingent on other sites no **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works 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

Inner Area

3454 Land off Holdforth Place

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	
09/05156/DEM	Determination application to demolish flats and houses	Α	64	

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	74.99
-----------------	-------

3454 Land off Holdforth Place

Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance	(m)	1402.81
Nearest bus s	stop	2064
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	164.16
Agricultural classifica	tion l	Jrban
Overlaps S	SSSI	
Overlaps S	EGI	
Overlaps	LNA	
Overlaps	LNR	
Overlaps Conservation A	Area	
Overlaps Listed Build	ding	
Overlaps Strat. Employment but	iffer	
Overlaps Public Right of \	Nay	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Z	one	
Overlaps EA Flood Z	one	
Overlaps HSE Major Haz	ard	✓
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipe	line	
Overlaps Pot. Contamina	tion	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeg	uarde	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	100	m

3454 Land off Holdforth Place

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Allocated housing site in West Leeds Gateway Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Suitable for residential development in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - pollution. Major positive - derelict brownfield site and flood risk. Minor positive - access to schools and health facilities and greenspace, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility.

Summary of reps

National Grid

Site Ref: 3454/1340. New Wortley. Crosses VR underground cable route (275kV).

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

158 6 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site in largely residential area.

3459 Land adjacent St Hildas Church, Knowsthorpe Crescent/Cross Green Lane

Site Details							
Easting	431780	Northing	432501	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	East Leeds,	Inner Area			Ward	Burmantof	ts 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 unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

3459 Land adjacent St Hildas Church, Knowsthorpe Crescent/Cross Green Lane **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) Good accessibility 5 Access comments Adequate existing access provision 4 Local network comments spare local capacity 4 Total score Mitigation measures 13 Highways site support Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Supported **Ecology support** Supported Ecology boundary **Education comments**

Spatial relationships

App Number

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

Proposal

Core Strategy	

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

% of site

% overlap

Decision

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	99.91
Aire Valley RA	100.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	21.23	
Nearest train station	Leeds City	
Nearest train station distance (2198.70	
Nearest bus s	13004	
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	62.56

3459 Land adjacent St Hildas Church, Knowsthorpe Crescent/Cross Green Lane

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

3459 Land adjacent St Hildas Church, Knowsthorpe Crescent/Cross Green Lane

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Aire Valley identified	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	

4027 Newhall Gate, Newhall Crescent, Middleton

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	430985	Northing	429166	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Middleton F	Park

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

An area of green land adjacent to housing. The area is 'infil' surrounded on three sides by residential. Opposite is green land.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 t		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the 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

4027 Newhall Gate, Newhall Crescent, Middleton

SHLAA conclusions					
Availability: Medium	ı (6-10yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Medium (6-10yrs)
Summary of infra	structure prov	rider comments			
LCC Highways Com	ments				
Public transport access					Rank (1-5)
4buses per hour 100%	employment, prim	nary, secondary and h	nealth		5
Access comments					
Access available from	Newhall Gate or W	inrose Drive			5
Local network commer No known issues with					5
Mitigation measures					Total score
Highways site support					
Yes					
Contingent on other si	tes				
Contingent on other si	tes				
Highways Agency					
Impact No material i	mpact	Network Status	No objection		
Network Rail Yorkshire Water					
Treatment Works	Knostrop				
Knostrop High and Lov co-ordinated with Yorl the site. The forthcon with YW's investment. take into account avail	. w Level are large w kshire Water's Asse hing AMP(6) will ru It is particularly in lable sewerage and	et Management Plans In from April 2015 to I Inportant that sites wh I WwTW capacity. If a	(AMP) to ensure the ne March 2020. Phasing is nich represent a 10% or a developer wants to br	cessary infrastructure and ca one method used to ensure s greater increase in population ing a site forward before YW	public sewer system needs to be pacity can be provided to serve sites are brought forward in line on served by the works should have completed any planned a developer funded feasibility
Environment Agence	: y				
Constraints					
FZ1 under 1 ha. See of	comments in main	text of our response.			
LCC					
Ecology support	Supported				
Supported					

4027 Newhall Gate, Newhall Crescent, Middleton 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** % of site **Proposal** Decision

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy	
NA-la Halana Ana	100.00

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

F	egeneration	Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.98
-----------------	-------

4027 Newhall Gate, Newhall Crescent, Middleton

Nearest train station	Cottingley
Nearest train station distance ((m) 3712.96
Nearest bus s	top 12673
Nearest bus stop distance ((m) 92.11
Agricultural classificat	tion Urban
Overlaps S	SSSI
Overlaps SI	EGI
Overlaps L	_NA
Overlaps L	_NR
Overlaps Conservation A	rea
Overlaps Listed Build	ding
Overlaps Strat. Employment but	ffer
Overlaps Public Right of V	Way
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zo	one
Overlaps EA Flood Zo	one
Overlaps HSE Major Haz	ard
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipel	line
Overlaps Pot. Contaminat	tion 🗸
Overlaps Minerals Safegu	uarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	100m

4027 Newhall Gate, Newhall Crescent, Middleton

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Located within the urban area adjacent to Middleton Park. The site is not a designated greenspace site on the existing UDP, but is currently used as open space. Residential development acceptable in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Pro

Support allocation of site for housing. The loss of open space is not a primary concern given the proximity to Middleton Park.

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

308 12 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is an 'infill' area, with road frontage, surrounded on three sides by housing. Suitable for housing allocation.

4060 Former Shaftesbury PH, York Road

Site Deta	Site Details						
Easting	433144	Northing	434078	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Burmantoft	s and Richmond Hill

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Shops

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is in a predominantly residential area with some office space on the opposite side of the road. Site is a cleared pub. It currenlt is a mixture of hard standing, trees and overgrown vegetation.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound	daries 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?	
Francisch was at Osmalius's a	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the 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 a	gainst all 4 purposes of green belt a	nd essential
characteristics of openness and perma	anence	
SHLAA conclusions		
Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)	Suitability: Suitable	Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)
Summary of infrastructure provid	er comments	
CC Highways Comments Public transport accessibility comments		Rank (1-
Meets all standards		
		5
ccess comments		
access not ideal, but fallback of previous us	e and consented care home	4
ocal network comments		
mall dev negligible impact on network		4
		Total score
litigation measures		
		13
lighways site support		
'es		
Contingent on other sites		
Contingent on other sites		
Highways Agency		
	etwork Status No objection	
Network Rail		
Yorkshire Water		
reatment Works Knostrop		
co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Ne site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run to with YW's investment. It is particularly impeake into account available sewerage and W	Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the ne from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is ortant that sites which represent a 10% o /wTW capacity. If a developer wants to be	oment that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be ecessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve so one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line or greater increase in population served by the works should ring a site forward before YW have completed any planned mount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility
Environment Agency		
Constraints		

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

Inner Area

4060 Former Shaftesbury PH, York Road LCC Supported Ecology support 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			
09/00423/OT	Outline application to erect part one, part two and part three storey 78 bed care home with car parking	W	100			
11/02883/OT	Part one, part two and part three storey 84 bed care home with car parking	A	100			

Sı	patia	l re	lati	ons	hips

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

4060 Former Shaftesbury PH, York Road

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

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
s Urban Extension	~	
_		

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

Other Spatial Relationship)
LCC ownership %	0.01
Nearest train station Cr	ross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3161.61
Nearest bus stop	1298
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	55.23
Agricultural classification L	Jrban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	Ī
Overlaps LNA	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps LNR	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	d
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100r	m 🗆

4060 Former Shaftesbury PH, York Road

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site located within the main urban area. The site has a valid outline planning permission for an 84 bed care home (11/02883/OT). Housing is considered to be a suitable alterative option in principle.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

53 7 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Considerable interest in recent years for residential use. Location and adjacent uses make this ideal for housing allocation.

4063 Butterfield Manor & Richmond Court, Walter Crescent

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	431533	Northing	433239	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Burmantoft	ts and Richmond Hill
	racteristic 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 unresticted 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 bound		
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 pres		
Character Conclusion		

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

Butterfield Manor & Richmond Court, Walter Crescent 4063 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (early) Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Short (=<5yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact No objection **Network Status Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Supported Supported Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
10/02506/FU	Erection of temporary 2.4m high perimeter security fence with gates to nursing home	Α	50

Inner Area 4063 **Butterfield Manor & Richmond Court, Walter Crescent** 10/03904/FU Α 50 Erection of temporary 2.4m high perimeter security fence with 4.8m wide gates to nursing home Spatial relationships **UDP Designations Core Strategy** N32 Greenbelt 0.00 % overlap Main Urban Area 100.00 % overlap N34 PAS 0.00 0.00 Major Settlement RL1 Rural Land 0.00 Minor Settlement 0.00 N1 Greenspace 0.00 Overlaps Urban Extension **~** N1A Allotments 0.00 N5 Open Space 0.00 **Regeneration Areas** N6 Playing Pitch 0.00 N8 Urban Green Corridor 0.00 Inner South RA 0.00 % overlap **CC Shopping Quarter** 0.00 LB Corridor RA 0.00 **UDP City Centre** 0.00 EASEL RA 100.00 S2S6 Town Centre 0.00 Aire Valley RA 100.00 Proposed Local Centre 0.00 West Leeds Gateway 0.00 Overlaps N37 SLA Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 Other Spatial Relationship 99.06 LCC ownership % Nearest train station Leeds City Nearest train station distance (m) 1841.76 Nearest bus stop 9561

Nearest bus stop distance (m)

Overlaps Conservation Area

Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer
Overlaps Public Right of Way
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone
Overlaps EA Flood Zone
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline
Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

Overlaps Listed Building

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR 67.98

4063 Butterfield Manor & Richmond Court, Walter Crescent

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	434646	Northing	435909	Site area ha	3.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	MCA Inner Area		Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft		

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Education

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor sport facility

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is cleared and is currently cleared land with cap parking and some building to the westen edge of the site. Residential to the south and to the east of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

•	•			
Would 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

4090 East Leeds Family Learning Centre (Former) 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) Site mostly meets all standards 4 Access comments Access road requires widening and junction alterations which may require land from adjacent greenspace 4 Local network comments Spare capacity in local network 4 **Total score** Mitigation measures 12 Highways site support Yes with mitigation Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works 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 over1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Site 4090 – East Lee	ds Family Learning Centre. Please note that this site has been transferred to Children's Services for potential educational use.
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	1
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	1
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 L)esigr	nations
-------	--------	---------

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	17.37	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	17.37	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	~

% overlap

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 %	99.95
Nearest train station (Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2196.04
Nearest bus stop	9395
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	377.57
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site within the main urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development. Some modular buildings currently exist on part of the site, however these buildings are of a temporary nature.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant positive - derelict brownfield site and flood risk. Minor positive - access to greenspace, greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport

network) From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service

frequency levels.

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

365 6 Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Although suitable in principle for housing Childrens Services have identified the site for future school provision.

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	435016	Northing	437758	Site area ha	1.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

A large strip of green 'buufer' land land between the ring road at housing. Site is sloping.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/const	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an is	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the I	ouilt up area?	
Would development round off the	e settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to	conservation area/listed building/historical features?	
,	~	
Can development pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		

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

4098 Seacroft Ring Road **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) 4buses per hour, 100%employment, primary and secondary 5 Access comments Access via Monkswood Rise 5 Local network comments May have cumulative impact with adjacent sites 3 Total score Mitigation measures 13 Highways site support Yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact Network Status No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works 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 over1 ha. See comments in main text of our response. LCC

Not supported (RED) - grassland has low ecological value but trees should be retained which would result in a small, linear developable area. The site would be better retained for its landscape value with more individual trees planted to soften the interface between the housing and ring road could also have wildflower meadow establishment and management to reduce ongoin costs of regular mowing.

Not supported

Ecology support

Inner Area

4098	Seacroft Ring Road
Ecology bound	ary
Education com	ments
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescu	e
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritag	ge
Natural Englan	d d
Planning His	tory 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	9
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	99.91	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

overlap

100.00	% overlap
0.00	
	100.00

Main Urban A	rea 100.00	% (
Major Settleme	ent 0.00	
Minor Settleme	ent 0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extens	ion	

0.00	% overlap
0.00	
100.00	
0.00	
0.00	
	0.00 100.00 0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

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

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3546.38
Nearest bus stop	1663
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	126.35
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSS	I 🗆
Overlaps SEG	
Overlaps LNA	\
Overlaps LNF	₹
Overlaps Conservation Area	ì
Overlaps Listed Building	<u> </u>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	r 🗆
Overlaps Public Right of Way	y
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone)
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline)
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	1
Overlaps Minerals Safeguar	ded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 10	00m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is open land and a green corridor (not designated on the existing UDP). Not much plot depth to allow development.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Metro

From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required

but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

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

103 6 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is open area of green that acts as a 'buffer' to existing resdential. Depth of green area not suitable for development. Not suitable for allocation.

Site Details							
Easting	435499	Northing	437195	Site area ha	3.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft	

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Storage

Wholesale distribution

Other land uses - None

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

Description

The site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and provides a buffer to industrial land. Highway concerns re parking provision for adjacent industrial units & shared residential / industrial access provision.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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				
Do features provide boun	daries to contai	in the developme	nt?	
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

O		d accounting
Overall Conclusion from assessment Characteristics of openness and perr	against all 4 purposes of green belt and nanence	a essentiai
SHLAA conclusions		
Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)	Suitability: LDF to determine	Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs)
tvaliability. Short (= 30 yis)	Suitability. Est to determine	Actine valuity. Integratin (e 10910)
Summary of infrastructure prov	der comments	
CC Highways Comments		
Public transport accessibility comments		Rank (1-
lbuses per hour 100% employment, prim	ary secondary and health	<u> </u>
Access comments Access via Service Road - concerns over c	onflict with service vehicles, retention of park	ing/servicing areas
		3
ocal network comments		
May have cumulative impact with adj sites	; ;	3
Mitigation measures		Total sco
		11
lighways site support		
Yes		
Contingent on other sites		
Contingent on other sites		
Highways Agency		
Impact No material impact	Network Status No objection	
Network Rail		
Yorkshire Water		
reatment Works Knostrop		
co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asse he site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will ru with YW's investment. It is particularly im ake into account available sewerage and	Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the nece from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is o portant that sites which represent a 10% or o WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to brin	tent that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be essary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line greater increase in population served by the works should ag a site forward before YW have completed any planned unt would be determined by a developer funded feasibility
Environment Agency		
Constraints		

LCC

Ecology support Not supported

Not supported (RED) - The north-western end of this proposed allocation would result in development on and between Lime Pits and Ramshead Wood LNA and Hawthorn Farm Ponds LNA increasing the fragmentation of habitats within this area. Both habitats support lowland mixed deciduous woodland a UK BAP priority habitat.

Ecology boundary

Supported with mitigation (Amber) provided that Red area shown on Drawing RM/4099 is removed. This will help retain connectivity between valuable woodland habitats, and provide retention of trees along the ring road frontage. There are other trees within the remaining site that should also be retained.

also be retained.	· '	 	<u> </u>
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	98.55	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	3.39	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overla
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	✓	

R	eg	en	er	at	ion	Ar	eas
---	----	----	----	----	-----	----	-----

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	

4099 **Seacroft Ring Road** Sch. Ancient Mon. 0.00 Other Spatial Relationship LCC ownership % 75.94 Nearest train station Cross Gates Nearest train station distance (m) 2858.27 7721 Nearest bus stop 38.18 Nearest bus stop distance (m) Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI **~** Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone

Overlaps HSE Major Hazard
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline
Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

~

V

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and provides a buffer to industrial land. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. Highway concerns re parking provision for adjacent industrial units & shared residential / industrial access provision.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N1 greenspace and greenfield site. Minor negative - waste site and landscape. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network annd accessibility. Minor positive - access to schools and health facilities and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Metro

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

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

436 14 Yes Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and provides a buffer to industrial land. Highway concerns re parking provision for adjacent industrial units & shared residential / industrial access provision. Not suitable for housing allocation.

4100 Ramshead Drive, Seacroft

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	435015	Northing	437419	Site area ha	1.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Wholesale distribution

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and as a Local Nature Area (LNA 072) and green corridor.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
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

4100 Ramshead Drive, Seacroft Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% employment, primary and secondary 5 Access comments Access via Ramshead Drive 5 Local network comments May have cumulative impact with adj sites 3 **Total score** Mitigation measures 13 Highways site support Yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works 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 over1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

4100 Pares	hand Duive Consumt
4100 Rams	head Drive, Seacroft
LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
Not supported (RED)	- Loss of LNA and threat to ancient woodland.
Ecology boundary	
Pits and Ramshead W The woodland has a v 20m buffer for the and	intion (Amber) provided that Red area shown on Drawing RM/4100 is removed. This proposed development lies within Lime cood LNA. Part of this proposed allocation lies on land which appears to be semi-improved grassland with limited wildlife value. The rate of the connecting an area of semi-natural ancient woodland adjacent to the site to other woodland habitat. Provide a cient woodland. Retain the woodland within the LNA and an additional 20m buffer to strengthen the corridor. Establish the rescrub to form a graded woodland edge.
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Gus	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
English Heritage	
Natural England	
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site
App Number	Proposal Decision % of site

Core Strategy

4100 Ramshead Drive, Seacroft

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	99.75	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	99.75	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

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

Other Spatial Relationshi	р
LCC ownership %	99.78
Nearest train station (cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	3232.32
Nearest bus stop	12013
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	162.79
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	✓
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	ed 🗸

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

4100 Ramshead Drive, Seacroft

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and as a Local Nature Area (LNA 072) and green corridor. Given these environmental constraints residential development is considered to be inappropriate.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N1 greenspace, greenfield site and ecology objection. Minor negative - waste site and landscape. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to schools and health facilities and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti

Retained for greenspace

All greenspace in inner-city areas of Leeds needs the fullest protection possible, for the future health of the residents of Leeds.

Metro

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable forallocation 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

158 6 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and as a Local Nature Area (LNA 072) and green corridor. Given these environmental constraints residential development is considered to be inappropriate.

4101 Ramshead Wood

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	435238	Northing	436993	Site area ha	4.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Wholesale distribution

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and as a Local Nature Area (LNA 072) and green corridor. Mature tree cover across the majority of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

•		
Would development lead	to physical connection of settle	ements?
Do features provide bound	daries to contain the developm	ent?
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

4101 Ramshead Wood Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% employment, primary and secondary 5 Access comments Various access options 5 Local network comments May have cumulative impact with adj sites 3 Total score Mitigation measures May require alterations to existing traffic calming 13 Highways site support Yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works 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 over1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Inner Area

4101 Ramshead Wood

7101 110	misheda Wood
LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
	ED) - Loss of LNA and threat to ancient woodland. Lowland mixed deciduous woodland a UK priority habitat covers most of this ning grassland serves to buffer the site or provide potential future links for ancient woodland (Policy G2).
Ecology boundary	
Lime Pits and Rar proposed allocation planting as part of which could include	itigation (Amber) provided that Red area shown on Drawing RM/4101 is removed. This proposed development site lies within the ashead Wood LNA. Most of the site is Lowland mixed deciduous woodland a UK BAP Priority Habitat. Other grassland within the on lies between the above woodland and a block of ancient woodland and needs to be reserved for potential future woodland f a wildlife habitat network - see 3 new woodland areas on Drawing RM/4101. Acceptable development area in southern corner -de new woodland creation planting in the 3 areas shown as part of the mitigation for the potentiall adverse impacts of increased ure on the existing ancient woodland from new housing.
Education comme	nts
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	
Planning Histor	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

Spatial relationships

App Number

UDP Designations

Proposal

Core Strategy

Decision

% of site

4101 Ramshead Wood

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	85.81	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	84.45	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	100.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

-	•
99.89	LCC ownership %
Cross Gates	Nearest train station
2753.06	Nearest train station distance (m)
13702	Nearest bus stop
199.95	Nearest bus stop distance (m)
Urban	Agricultural classification
	Overlaps SSSI
	Overlaps SEGI
✓	Overlaps LNA
	Overlaps LNR
	Overlaps Conservation Area
	Overlaps Listed Building
	Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer
✓	Overlaps Public Right of Way
	Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone

Overlaps EA Flood Zone
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline
Overlaps Pot. Contamination

✓

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

4101 Ramshead Wood

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and as a Local Nature Area (LNA 072) and green corridor. Mature tree cover across the majority of the site. Given these environmental constraints residential development is considered to be inappropriate.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N1 greenspace, greenfield site and ecology objection. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to schools and health facilities and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti

Retained for greenspace

All greenspace in inner-city areas of Leeds needs the fullest protection possible, for the future health of the residents of Leeds.

Metro

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable forallocation 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 Schools

Primary Health

271

9

Yes

Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and as a Local Nature Area (LNA 072) and green corridor. Mature tree cover across the majority of the site. Given these environmental constraints residential development is considered to be inappropriate.

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	435136	Northing	436829	Site area ha		2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area		Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft				

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Education

Other land uses - None

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

Description

This site is a Wood known as Ramshead Wood. It is sloping and has some mature tree cover. Significant industrial to the east of the site and residential to the west of the site.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound	daries 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?	
F 1 10 1 1	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

4102 Ramshead Drive Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% employment, primary and secondary 5 Access comments Access via Ramshead Drive 5 Local network comments May have cumulative impact with adj sites 3 Total score Mitigation measures 13 Highways site support yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works 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 over1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC	Cupported
Ecology support	Supported neer of mature trees present that should be retained (which may also be suitable for bat roosting).
Supported but a fluit	iber of mature trees present that should be retained (which may also be suitable for bat roosting).
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
. 6.6666	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	
3	
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site
App Number	Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

UDP Desi	ignations
----------	-----------

obi besignations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	92.85	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	1.91	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	99.76	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

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)	2645.08
Nearest bus stop	13702
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	89.31
Agricultural classification	Urban
1222 analysis (
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m 🗸

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. Suitable for residential in principle subject to greenspace considerations.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N1 greenspace and greenfield site. Minor negative - waste site. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network annu accessibility. Minor positive - access to schools and health facilities and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Pro - Apply appropriate safeguards and policy constraints to retain green corridor

Anti - Retained for greenspace

Metro

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

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

157 9 Yes Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

This site is a wood known as Ramshead Wood. It is sloping and has some mature tree cover. Not suitable for housing allocation.

Site Details							
Easting	434295	Northing	436266	Site area ha	1.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Medical and Health care services

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and as part of a green corridor. The site is surrounded by residntial to the east and west and has a cycle route passing through the middle of it.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound	daries 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?	
F 1 10 1 1	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

4107 North Parkway / Asket Walk Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets CS standards but no primary school and lacks local services 5 Access comments Access from Manor Road as existing 5 Local network comments cumulaive impact concern 4 Total score Mitigation measures 14 Highways site support 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 over1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC	
Ecology support	Not supported
will create a pinch poi	- The Wyke Beck Valley is an extremely important wildlife habitat corridor within a dense urban area. The proposed allocation nt in this corridor influencing the passage of plants and animals along the valley. This is particularly important for maintaining fildlife Sites (SEGIs) and Local Nature Reserves. Need to set back the proposed allocation away from the Wyke Beck and Wyke
Ecology boundary	
species enhancement	tion (Amber) provided that Red area shown on Drawing RM/4107 is removed. Enhance the excluded area through grassland and positive long-term management of the natural green space. The Wyke Beck supports an important population of native, d crayfish - ensure that development of the site does not increase sediment load within the beck.
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
English Heritage	
Natural England	
	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site
App Number	Proposal Decision % of site
Spatial relationship	s
UDP Designation	ons Core Strategy

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	87.83	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	87.83	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

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

Other Spatial Relationship	
LCC ownership %	99.97
Na areat train station Cre	oo Cotoo
	oss Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2695.70
Nearest bus stop	7604
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	114.46
Agricultural classification U	ban .
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	Ħ
Overlaps LNA	ī
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and as part of a green corridor. It may be possible to develop a very small part of the site adjacent to the neighbouring dwelling, however this would result in a site too small to allocate (under the 0.4ha threshold).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N1 greenspace and greenfield site. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to education and health facilities and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Pro - Apply appropriate safeguards and policy constraints to retain green corridor

Anti - Retained for greenspace

Metro

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

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

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

438 9 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and as part of a green corridor. The site is surrounded by residential to the east and west and has a cycle route passing through the middle of it. Considered unsuitable for housing allocation.

Site Details							
Easting	435489	Northing	436140	Site area ha	0.8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area			Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft	

Site Characteristics

Site type Mix 50:50

On-site land uses

Other

Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

General

Other land uses

former social club

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

Description

Site is split into two halves. The western edge is a green area whilst the rest of the site is the dub building.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

	Would development lead		
	Do features provide bound		
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?	
Francolmont Conclusion	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

4110 **Brooklands Avenue** Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: Suitable Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% employment, primary and secondary 5 Access comments Access via Brooklands Ave or The Green 5 Local network comments May have cumulative impact with adj 3 Total score Mitigation measures May require alterations to existing traffic calming 13 Highways site support Yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works 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 over1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
	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 Desi	ignations
----------	-----------

ODI 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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

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 %		99.81	
Nearest train station	C	Cross Gates	
Nearest train station distance (r	m)	1870.71	
Nearest bus st	ор	11325	
Nearest bus stop distance (r	m)	43.88	
Agricultural classification	on	Urban	
Overlaps SS	SSI		
Overlaps SE	GI		
Overlaps Ll	NA		
Overlaps Ll	NR		
Overlaps Conservation Ar	ea		
Overlaps Listed Buildi	ng		
Overlaps Strat. Employment buff	fer		
Overlaps Public Right of W	/ay		
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zo	ne		
Overlaps EA Flood Zo	ne		
Overlaps HSE Major Haza	ard		
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeli	ne		
Overlaps Pot. Contaminati	on	✓	
Overlaps Minerals Safegua	ard	ed	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	100	m	

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Former social club. Eastern half of the site lies within the defined Seacroft town centre. Suitable in principle for residential development or mixed use with residential on upper floors.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Minor negative - employment and economic growth. Major 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 - Support the allocation of site for housing or mixed use development given its location within the district centre. There is potential for the colocation of services already provided in the centre which may release more land in the area for housing or other mixed uses

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 Schools

Primary Health

250

5

Yes

Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site is split into two halves. The western edge is a green area whilst the rest of the site is the club building. The site is considered suitable in principle for residential development.

4113 Bishops Way

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	434440	Northing	435946	Site area ha	2.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring land uses

Education

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

The eastern part of the site forms part of the David Young Academy and is designated protected playing pitch (N6) on the existing UDP. The western half of the site is designated as greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and there would be difficultly achieving safe access without prejudicing with the existing school access.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
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

4113 **Bishops Way** Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour 100% employment, primary secondary and health 5 Access comments Access difficult without conflicting with school/bus access to David Young Academy and retained bus link 1 Local network comments Possible cumulative issues with adj school 3 Total score Mitigation measures 9 Highways site support No Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works 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 over1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Inner Area

4113 Bishops Way

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

	- The Wyke Beck Valley is an extremely important wildlife habitat corridor within a dense urban area. The proposed allocation pint in this corridor influencing the passage of plants and animals along the valley. This is particularly important for maintaining
links between Local V Beck Way cycleway.	Wildlife Sites (SEGIs) and Local Nature Reserves. Need to set back the proposed allocation away from the Wyke Beck and Wyk
Ecology boundary	
Buffer through grassl Beck Valley at this loo	pation (Amber) provided that Red area shown on Drawing RM/4113 is removed. Enhance the excluded 20 metre Biodiversity land species enhancement and positive long-term management - this buffer could create a new physical boundary to the Wyke cation. The Wyke Beck supports an important population of native, protected white clawed crayfish - ensure that development ncrease sediment load within the beck.
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	
Gas	
Electric	
F: 15	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
relecting	
Other	
English Heritage	
3 3	
Natural England	
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site
App Number	Proposal Decision % of site

Core Strategy

4113 Bishops Way

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	70.64	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	29.35	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

Otrici Spatiai Kelationsi	ıιρ
LCC ownership %	100.00
Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2377.03
Nearest bus stop	10244
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	265.50
Agricultural classification	Urban
222 amalmar (2	
Overlaps SSS	_ =
Overlaps SEG	_ =
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNF	2
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	<u> </u>
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	V
Overlaps Minerals Safeguar	ded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 10	0m

4113 Bishops Way

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The eastern part of the site forms part of the David Young Academy and is designated protected playing pitch (N6) on the existing UDP. The western half of the site is designated as greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and there would be difficultly achieving safe access without prejudicing with the existing school access. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

Anti - Retained for greenspace, Health and environmental benefits

Metro

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

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

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

Yes

12

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The eastern part of the site forms part of the David Young Academy and is designated protected playing pitch (N6) on the existing UDP. The western half of the site is designated as greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and there would be difficultly achieving safe access without prejudicing with the existing school access. Not suitable for housing allocation.

4114 Lambrigg Crescent

Site Details							
Easting	435256	Northing	435793	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area Ward Killingbeck and Seacroft						

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

The site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and is closely overlooked, being surrounded by existing residential properties. The site has a narrow access point and a public right of way running across it (east-west).

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

•	•	
Would development lead to/const		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the built up area?		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

=		
Would development lead		
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to		
Can development pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		,

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

Inner Area 4114 Lambrigg Crescent **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Rank (1-5) Public transport accessibility comments 4buses per hour 100% employment, primary secondary and health 5 Access comments Access via Lambrigg Crescent 5 Local network comments No known issues with capacity 5 Total score Mitigation measures 15 Highways site support Yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Knostrop Treatment Works 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.

LCC	
Ecology support	Supported
Supported	

Environment Agency

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

Constraints

Inner Area

4114 Lami	origg Crescent		
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other English Heritage			
Natural England			
ratarar 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	91.79	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy				
Main Urban Area	100.00	%		
Major Settlement	0.00			

overlap 0.00 Minor Settlement Overlaps Urban Extension **~**

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 %	99.99
-----------------	-------

4114 Lambrigg Crescent

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (r	1694.39
Nearest bus sto	p 5045
Nearest bus stop distance (r	121.99
Agricultural classification	urban Urban
Overlaps SS	SI
Overlaps SE	GI 🗌
Overlaps LN	Α
Overlaps LN	IR
Overlaps Conservation Are	ea 🗌
Overlaps Listed Buildin	ng 🗌
Overlaps Strat. Employment buff	er
Overlaps Public Right of W	ay 🗸
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zo	ne
Overlaps EA Flood Zon	ne 🗌
Overlaps HSE Major Haza	rd 🔲
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipelii	ne
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	on _
Overlaps Minerals Safegua	rded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 1	00m

4114 Lambrigg Crescent

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and is closely overlooked, being surrounded by existing residential properties. The site has a narrow access point and a public right of way running across it (east-west).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N1 greenspace and greenfield site. Major positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to schools and health facilities 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 Schools

Primary Health

Yes

Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and is closely overlooked, being surrounded by existing residential properties. The site has a narrow access point and a public right of way running across it (east-west). Unsuitable for residential allocation.

4115 Foundry Mill Street

Site Details							
Easting	435008	Northing	435482	Site area ha	1.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	ICA Inner Area Ward Killingbeck and Seacroft			and Seacroft			

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring land uses

Education

Other

Places of worship

Other land uses

community centre

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

Description

The site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and there is a playing pitch on site. It is a flat site (although at a lower level than Foundry Mill Street) within the main urban area, with a road frontage

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/const	itue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b	ouilt up area?	
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

-		
Would development lead t		
Do features provide bound	daries 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

4115 **Foundry Mill Street** Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour 100% employment, primary secondary and health 5 Access comments Access via Foundry Mill Street 5 Local network comments No known issues with capacity 5 Total score Mitigation measures Alterations may be required to existing traffic calming to facilitate access 15 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 over1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

4115 Foundry Mill Street

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
	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

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

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	

4115 Foundry Mill Street

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership % 100	0.00
Nearest train station Cross G	ates
Nearest train station distance (m) 164	3.58
Nearest bus stop 12	2079
Nearest bus stop distance (m) 13	5.93
Agricultural classification Urban	
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

4115 Foundry Mill Street

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and there is a playing pitch on site. It is a flat site (although at a lower level than Foundry Mill Street) within the main urban area, with a road frontage. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative -loss of N1 greenspace and greenfield site. Significant positive - greenhouse emissions, transport network and accessibility. Minor positive - access to schools and health facilities and flood risk.

Summary of reps

Anti- Retained for greenspace

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

110 12 Yes

Yes Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

The site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP and there is a playing pitch on site. It is a flat site (although at a lower level than Foundry Mill Street) within the main urban area, with a road frontage. Not suitable as a housing allocation.

4117 Moresdale Lane

Site Details							
Easting	434696	Northing	435315	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	A Inner Area		Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft		

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site is an area of overgrown green area of little amneity value. To the south, west and north are areas of residential whilst to the east is a green amenity area.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
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?	
Francisch was at Osmalius's a	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

4117 Moresdale Lane Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Unknown Suitability: Suitable Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour 100% employment, primary secondary and health 5 Access comments Access via Moresdale Lane or Foundry Mill Mount 5 Local network comments No known issues with capacity 5 **Total score** Mitigation measures 15 Highways site support Yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ1 under 1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Inner Area

4117 Moresdale Lane LCC Supported Ecology support 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		
10/03537/EXT	Extension of time period for planning permission 07/02525/FU (Laying out of access road and erection of 3 storey block of 12 two bedroom flats and 8 three bedroom houses)	W	100		
10/02427/FU	2 storey 79 bedroom care home, with car parking	Α	100		
10/02194/EXT	Extension of time for Planning Application 07/02525/FU (Laying out of access road and erection of 3 storey block of 12 two bedroom flats and 8 three bedroom houses)		100		
13/03493/EXT	Extension of time period for planning permission 10/02427/FU for 2 storey 79 bedroom care home, with car parking	Α	100		

Spatial relationships

Core Strategy

UDP Designations

4117 Moresdale Lane

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

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	, a a voriap
•		
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	✓	

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

Other Spatial Relationship	
LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station Cro	ss Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	1809.75
Nearest bus stop	9840
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	199.93
Agricultural classification Ur	ban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	H
Overlaps SLOT	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
•	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

4117 Moresdale Lane

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Site has a current planning permission for a 79 bed care home. The principle of housing on the site is considered to be acceptable if the care home is not constructed.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

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 Schools

Access to Secondary Schools

Access to Secondary Schools

Access to Primary Schools

Access to Secondary Schools

Access to Primary Schools

Access to Secondary Schools

Access to Secondary Schools

Access to Primary Schools

Access to Secondary Schools

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Greenfield site in the Main Urban Area, previously had residential development, therefore principle of development acceptable.

4120 Hawkshead Crescent

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	435162	Northing	435170	Site area ha	3.0	8	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area		W	Vard	Killingbeck	and Seacroft		

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Area of Green Land between two sets of houses. Surrounded area devoted to resdential.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/const	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an is	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the I	ouilt up area?	
Would development round off the	e settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide bound	daries 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 pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		

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

LCC

Ecology support
Supported

Supported

4120 **Hawkshead Crescent 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) 4buses per hour 100% employment, primary secondary and health 5 Access comments Access via Hawkshead Crescent or Tarnside Drive 5 Local network comments No known issues with capacity 5 Total score Mitigation measures 15 Highways site support 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.

Inner Area

4120 Haw	kshead Crescent		
Ecology boundary			
Education comment	3		
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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	100.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

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

4120 Hawkshead Crescent

Ne	arest train station (Cross Gates
Nearest train	n station distance (m)	1334.82
	Nearest bus stop	7182
Nearest	bus stop distance (m)	79.32
Agı	ricultural classification	Urban
	Overlene CCCI	
	Overlaps SSSI	
	Overlaps SEGI	
	Overlaps LNA	
	Overlaps LNR	
	aps Conservation Area	
O	verlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Stra	at. Employment buffer	
Overlar	os Public Right of Way	
Over	laps SFRA Flood Zone	
O	verlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overla	aps HSE Major Hazard	
Over	laps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overla	ps Pot. Contamination	
Overla	nps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Mir	nerals Safeguarded 100)m

4120 Hawkshead Crescent

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Brownfield site within the main urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

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

Summary of reps

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

352 4 Yes Yes

Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Brownfield (former cleared housing site) in the Main Urban Area. Suitable in principle for residential development.

Inner Area

4122 Seacroft Hall

Site Det	ails						
Easting	435681	Northing	435384	Site area ha	7.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Education

Allotment and city farm

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Part of the site also contains a designated allotment site (N1A). Site slopes significantly in parts. Sites to the east and South west are residential. Criss crossed by paths and includes a playing pitch. This space has significant amenity value.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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

•	5 5 5	
Would development lead t	o physical connection of se	ttlements?
Do features provide bound	daries to contain the develo	pment?
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

Inner Area

4122 Seacroft Hall Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour 100% employment, primary secondary and health 5 Access comments Access via Inglewood Drive 5 Local network comments No known issues with capacity 5 **Total score** Mitigation measures 15 Highways site support Yes Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Knostrop Knostrop High and Low Level are large works which serve the bulk of Leeds. Development that will connect to the public sewer system needs to be co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset Management Plans (AMP) to ensure the necessary infrastructure and capacity can be provided to serve the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run from April 2015 to March 2020. Phasing is one method used to ensure sites are brought forward in line with YW's investment. It is particularly important that sites which represent a 10% or greater increase in population served by the works should take into account available sewerage and WwTW capacity. If a developer wants to bring a site forward before YW have completed any planned improvements it may be possible for the developer to provide contributions. The amount would be determined by a developer funded feasibility study. **Environment Agency** Constraints FZ1 over1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

4122 Seacroft Hall

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities	1		
Gas			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
	7		
Telecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			
3 3 .			
	1		
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	93.00	
N1A Allotments	0.05	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.83	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	~

% overlap

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	

4122 Seacroft Hall

Other Spatial Relationship

Nearest train station		
Nearest train station distance (m) Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop distance (m) Agricultural classification Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps LNR Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination	LCC ownership %	98.63
Nearest train station distance (m) Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop Nearest bus stop distance (m) Agricultural classification Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps LNR Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination	Nearest train station	ross Gates
Nearest bus stop 7582 Nearest bus stop distance (m) 259.63 Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps LNR Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded		
Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	` '	
Agricultural classification Urban Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	'	
Overlaps SSSI Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	ivearest bus stop distance (iii)	237.03
Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SEGI Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded		_
Overlaps LNA Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps LNR Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps Conservation Area Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps Listed Building Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer Overlaps Public Right of Way Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone Overlaps EA Flood Zone Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$
	Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	ed
	Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	m

4122 Seacroft Hall

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

Designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Part of the site also contains a designated allotment site (N1A). Site slopes significantly in parts. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. There could be potential for consideration of some residential development, with allotments protected within any overall design (subject to the greenspace analysis).

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N1 greenspace and greenfield site. Minor negative - landscape. Signicant positive -

Summary of reps

Pro -Apply appropriate safeguards and policy constraints to retain green corridor

Anti - Retained for greenspce

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 Secondary Schools

Access to Primary Health

Yes

Yes

Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Part of the site also contains a designated allotment site (N1A). Site slopes significantly in parts. Sites to the east and South west are residential. Criss crossed by paths and includes a playing pitch. This space has significant amenity value. Unsuitable for housing allocation.

Site Details								
Easting	434018	Northing	434090	Site area ha		0.9	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	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 unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		14

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?	
	9

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

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 Rank (1-5) 4buses per hour, 100% employment, primary, secondary and health 5 Access comments Access not ideal however, given existing previous use of site a small development would be ok. However, alterations to signals 4 required to facilitate access Local network comments No known issues with capacity 5 **Total score** Mitigation measures Alterations to signals to facilitate access. 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 mitigate Bridge access road) to trees.	ation (Amber) provided that a scheme is brought forward to protect and enhance the eastern 20 metres of the site (Killingbeck or include deculverting the Wyke Beck - and plant the adjacent 20 metre buffer from the Wyke Beck with native shrubs and
Ecology boundary	
Education comments	
Flood Risk	
Utilities	1
Gas	
Electric	
Fire and Rescue	
Telecoms	
Other	
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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	100.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

Other Spatial Relationship					
LCC ownership %	4.63				
Nearest train station Cro	oss Gates				
Nearest train station distance (m)	2294.16				
Nearest bus stop	8659				
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	76.96				
Agricultural classification U	rban				
Overlaps SSSI					
Overlaps SEGI					
Overlaps LNA					
Overlaps LNR					
Overlaps Conservation Area					
Overlaps Listed Building					
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer					
Overlaps Public Right of Way					
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	V				
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓				
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard					
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline					
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓				
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded					
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m					

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)

Primary Health

55

Yes

Buses Per Hour Access to Primary Schools Access to Secondary Schools Access to Primary School Access to Primary School Access to Primary School Access to Primary School Access to Pri

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	430518	Northing	430273	Site area ha	4.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	A Inner Area			Ward	Middleton F	Park	

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring land uses

Education

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Site appears to be well used and has significant amenity value. To the west is a large indutrial estate with residential to the east and a school to the south. It should be noted that the site has a rail track along the western edge and is subject to significant level changes.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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				
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

4124 John Charles Approach, Middleton Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Short (=<5 yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium (6-10yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) 1buses per hour, 100% primary, secondary. 3 Access comments Access via Old Run Road away from roundabout - or possible alterations to roundabout to provide 4th arm. 5 Local network comments May have cumulative impact with school opposite/john charles centre traffic 4 **Total score** Mitigation measures May require alterations to existing traffic calming/roundabout. 12 Highways site support Yes with mitigation Contingent on other sites Contingent on other sites **Highways Agency** Impact No material impact **Network Status** No objection **Network Rail** Yorkshire Water Treatment Works 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 over1 ha. See comments in main text of our response.

Not supported Not supported	LCC	
grassland of unknown diversity. Quality unknown. Needs assessing before allocation. Likely that a significant proportion of the site should be retained for woodland creation and acidic grassland management - the emerging Leeds Habitat Network is likely to support the need to link op grassland and woodland habitats in this area (from Middleton Woods to the south to the M621 to the north). Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Telecoms Other English Heritage	Ecology support	Not supported
Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage	grassland of unknown retained for woodland	n diversity. Quality unknown. Needs assessing before allocation. Likely that a significant proportion of the site should be diversity. It creation and acidic grassland management - the emerging Leeds Habitat Network is likely to support the need to link open
Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage	Ecology boundary	
Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage	Education comments	
Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage	Flood Risk	
Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage	Likilikiaa	
Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage		
Telecoms Other English Heritage	Electric	
Telecoms Other English Heritage	Fire and Decoue	1
Other English Heritage	rife and Rescue	
English Heritage	Telecoms	
	Other	
Natural England	English Heritage	
	Natural England	
Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site	Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site
App Number Proposal Decision % of site	App Number	Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

0.00	%
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
99.99	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 99.99 0.00 0.00

Core Strategy

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

Rec	ieneratio	on Areas
1760	ici ici atit	JII AI Gas

overlap

Inner 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 I	Mon.	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

Other Spatial Relationshi	р
LCC ownership %	75.48
	1 1 0"
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	3033.33
Nearest bus stop	13915
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	139.13
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	✓
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	▽
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is not designated as greenspace on the existing UDP, but is currently an open space site. The site contains part of a green corridor on the western boundary, which should be retained if the site were to be considered suitable.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - access to greenspace and greenfield site. Minor negative - access to health facilities. Minor positive - access to schools and flood risk.

Summary of reps

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

Number of buses per hour Access to Primary School

Access to Secondary School

Access to Primary Healthcare

Yes

12

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

546

Yes

Not proposed as housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Site appears to be well used and has significant amenity value. It should be noted that the site has a rail track along the western edge and is subject to significant level changes. Not suitable for housing allocation.

HMCA

4125 Winrose Drive, Middleton

Site Deta	ails						
Fasting	130021	Northing	120102	Site area ha	0.4	SD7	Main Urhan Δrea Infill

Ward

Middleton Park

C:+ - Ol + ! - + !	
Site Characteristics	

Inner Area

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Outdoor amenity and open space

Neighbouring land uses

Education

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

This site is adjacent to residential development and next to a playground. It isopen green land. It is understood that a long term vision is to use the money gained from developing the land as residential to imporve the play facilities.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

_		
Would development lead	No	
Do features provide bound	No	
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

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

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

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

The site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See greenspace section, page 35, question G28. Site slopes down towards Winrose Drive. Residential use acceptable

SHLAA conclusions					
	Suitabilitus	I DE to dotormino	Ashiovahility	Modium (6.10ura)	
Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)	Sultability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Medium (6-10yrs)	
Summary of infrastructure provide	er comments				
LCC Highways Comments					
Public transport accessibility comments					Rank (1-5)
2buses per hour 100% employment, primary	, secondary and h	ealth			
					4
Access comments					
Access from Winrose Drive ok					5
Local network comments					
No know issues with capacity					_
					5
					Total score
Mitigation measures May require alterations to existing traffic call	ming along Winros	on Drive to facilitate access			Total Score
may require afterations to existing traffic can	Tilling along withos	se Drive to racilitate access			14
Highways site support					
Yes					
Contingent on other sites					
Contingent on other sites					
Highways Agency					
Impact No material impact Ne	twork Status	No objection			
Network Rail					
Yorkshire Water					
Treatment Works Knostrop		hadla et la al-	Lakandi a sanati	and the a	
Knostrop High and Low Level are large work co-ordinated with Yorkshire Water's Asset M the site. The forthcoming AMP(6) will run fr with YW's investment. It is particularly impo take into account available sewerage and W improvements it may be possible for the dev study.	anagement Plans of the April 2015 to I read that sites who wTW capacity. If a	(AMP) to ensure the necessar March 2020. Phasing is one m lich represent a 10% or great a developer wants to bring a s	y infrastructure and ca nethod used to ensure : er increase in populatio ite forward before YW	pacity can be provide sites are brought forw on served by the work have completed any	d to serve vard in line as should planned
Environment Agency					
Constraints					

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
	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

3		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	92.46	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	92.36
Nearest train station	Cottingley
Nearest train station distance (m)	3587.09
Nearest bus stop	10822
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	123.07
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100)m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is designated greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See greenspace section. Site slopes down towards Winrose Drive. Residential use acceptable in principle subject to greenspace considerations.

Site affects others?

Sustainability summary

Significant negative - loss of N1 greenspace and greenfield site. Minor positive - access to schools and health facilities, greenhouse emissions, flood risk, transport network and accessibility.

Summary of reps

Pro - Environment, Social and economic benefits i.e. Development of this site would allow the opportunity to create natural surveillance and overlooking of the adjoining play area which currently suffers from anti social behaviour and vandalism.

Anti - Retained for greenspace

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 Schools

Primary Health

12

Yes

Yes

Comments on phasing

DPP Allocation

Yes

Preferred housing allocation

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Designated as N1 greenspace in the UDP. Consideration of greenspace in the round and local preference to allocate for housing.

4178 6 Grosvenor Mount, Leeds

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	428904	Northing	435695	Site area ha		0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area		Ward	Headingley				

Site Characteristics

Site type Mix 70:30

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/const		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the I		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

App Number

12/04774/CA

Proposal

Conservation Area application for demolition of outbuildings

4178 6 Grosvenor Mount, Leeds **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

Decision

Α

% of site

100

Inner Area

4178	6 Grosvenor Mount, Leeds			
13/00508/FU	Removal of condition number 6 (Unallocated Parking) of planning permission 12/04773/FU (Laying out of access and erection of 7 houses with associated landscaping and alterations to existing house including two storey side extension to form attached house)		100	
13/02742/FU	Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) and removal of condition 6 (car parking spaces) of previous approval 12/04773/FU for Laying out of access and erection of 7 houses with associated landscaping and alterations to existing house including two storey side extension to form attached house	Α	100	
12/04773/FU	Laying out of access and erection of 7 houses with associated landscaping and alterations to existing house including two storey side extension to form attached house	Α	100	

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations	
N32 Greenbelt	0.00
N34 PAS	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.00
N1 Greenspace	0.01
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00
Overlaps N37 SLA	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

Core Strategy

% overlap

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	% (0.00
Nearest train station		Burley Park
Nearest train station distance	(m)	1128.81
Nearest bus s	top	10821
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	186.98

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	✓
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	

4178	6 Grosvenor Mount,	Leeds
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m		

4178 6 Grosvenor Mount, Leeds

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details								
Easting	434371	Northing	436644	Site area ha		0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area			Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft		

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Agriculture

Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture

Dwellings

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Appears to be a green area sloping downward south-south-west. Little tree cover. Does not appear to be used for agricultural use.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound				
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?	
F 1 10 1 1	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the 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

Ecology boundary

4185 Boggart Hill Gardens, Seacroft

SHLAA conclusions				
Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)	
Availability. Short (=<5 yis)	Sultability.	Suitable	Achievability. Short (=<5yis)	
Summary of infrastructure provide	der comments			
LCC Highways Comments				
Public transport accessibility comments				Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Standards				5
				3
Access comments				
Access on to Boggart Hill Gardens OK				
				5
Local network comments OK				
OK .				4
Mitigation measures				Total score
				14
Highways site support				
Yes				
Contingent on other sites				7
Contingent on other sites				_
Contingent on other sites				
Highways Agency	lation of Chaton	No objection	no mitigation required	
Impact No material impact No n/a	letwork Status	No objection,	no mitigation required	
Network Rail				
Yorkshire Water				
Treatment Works				
Environment Agency				
Constraints				
FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previ	ous I&O consultatio	n		
LCC Not comparted				
Ecology support Not supported Not supported (Red) - the Wyke Beck Valle	w Management Den	ort 2010 rocog	nised that this area of grassland was moderately specie	s_rich with
locally abundant birdsfoot trefoil, red clove within any future development of the form in the report. It would isolate a small grass	r, meadow vetchling er school site. This p sland area to the eas	g, common veto proposed site ro st. It is likely th	this area of grassland was moderately species and yellow oat grass. It recommended that this should be approximately one third of the more speciesat the more species rich areas will be linked to more stay to be one of the more diverse grassland areas.	ıld be retained rich grassland

55
ducation comments
lood Risk
Flood Zone 1
Jtilities
Sas Sas
lectric
ire and Rescue
elecoms
Other
inglish Heritage
latural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site				
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site		
12/04961/FU	Erection of 18 flats and associated works	Α	100		

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

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

Core Strategy

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

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 %	2.32
-----------------	------

Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance	(m) 2913.61
Nearest bus s	stop 4003
Nearest bus stop distance	(m) 180.38
Agricultural classifica	tion Urban
Overlaps S	SSSI
Overlaps S	SEGI
Overlaps	LNA
Overlaps	LNR
Overlaps Conservation A	Area
Overlaps Listed Build	ding
Overlaps Strat. Employment bu	ıffer
Overlaps Public Right of V	Way
Overlaps SFRA Flood Z	Zone
Overlaps EA Flood Z	Zone
Overlaps HSE Major Haz	zard
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipe	eline
Overlaps Pot. Contamina	tion 🗸
Overlaps Minerals Safeg	uarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	d 100m

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Falls within assesment for site 2147	B. Please refer to this site.
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	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Site Details							
Easting	428778	Northing	432647	Site area ha	2.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area		Ward	Beeston an	d Holbeck		

HMCA Inner Area Ward Beeston and Holbeck Site Characteristics Site type Brownfield On-site land uses Manufacturing and Wholesale Wholesale distribution

Neighbouring land uses	
Neighbouring land uses Shops	
Car Showroom	

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Two sites straddling a four lane road. Predominantly in a light industrial area although some shops and car show rooms around. The site is comprised of two areas split by Dometic Street in holbeck. The sites are populated with light industrial and storage and distribution uses. In the main the sites are occupied. Other uses in the area such as retail and car showrooms. There is no residential adjacent. Given these factors it is difficult to see how these areas can be considered suitable for housing schemes.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

Inner Area 4225 **Domestic Street, Holbeck** 4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features? Can development preserve this character? Character Conclusion Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Unknown Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Longterm (11+yrs) Summary of infrastructure provider comments **LCC Highways Comments** Public transport accessibility comments Rank (1-5) Meets Standards except Secondary Education, however much of the city centre is within 2km walk. 4 Access comments Existing access points can be reused 5 Local network comments Close to city centre, so suffes peak hour congestion, particularly Ingram Distributor and Domestic Street, but likely to be a low 4 traffic generator. Total score Mitigation measures Yes, local capacity improvements 13 Highways site support Yes with mitigation Contingent on other sites

Highways	Agency
-----------------	--------

Contingent on other sites

	Impact	No material imp	oact	Network Status	No objection, no mitigation required
Assessment of cumulative impact with other sites needed			e impact with oth	ner sites needed	

Network Rail

Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

Surface water should drain to SuDS/watercourse. Further investigation will be required regarding capacity at Garforth waste water treatment works

Environment Agency

Constrai	nts

Within FZ3. See comments in our previous I&O consultation.

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
	I in Flood Zone 3A (i). The NW corner is in Flood Zones 1 and 2.		
Utilities			
Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other	1		
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 Designat	ions
--------------	------

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	~

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	1.36
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1064.14
Nearest bus stop	19
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	21.38
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	m

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site is comprised of two areas split by Dometic Street in holbeck. The sites are populated with light industrial and storage and distribution uses. In the main the sites are occupied. Other uses in the area such as retail and car showrooms. There is no residential adjacent. Given these factors it is difficult to see how these areas can be considered suitable for housing schemes.

these factors it is difficult to see new these areas can be considered suitable for fieldship schemes	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Not proposed as housing allocation	

DPP Allocation Conclusion

Two sites straddling a four lane road. Predominantly in a light industrial area although some shops and car show rooms around. The site is comprised of two areas split by Dometic Street in Holbeck. The sites are populated with light industrial and storage and distribution uses. In the main the sites are occupied. Other uses in the area such as retail and car showrooms. There is no residential adjacent. Not suitable for housing allocation.

4235 Leslie Terrace, Woodhouse

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	429450	Northing	435364	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	CA Inner Area		Ward	Hyde Park	and Woodhouse		

Site Characteristics

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	No

Descri	ntion
DESCH	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti				
Would development result in an is				
Is the site well connected to the b				
Would development round off the				
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?				
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion				

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	
Do features provide bound	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary	
Does the site provide acces	
Does the site include local/	
Areas of protected/unprote	
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	
Does the site contain buildi	
Are these buildings used fo	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

Inner Area

4235	Leslie	Terrace, Woodhouse	
SHLAA cor	nclusions		
Availabilit	y:	Suitability:	Achievability:
Summary	y of infra	structure provider comments	
Highways	Agency	Network Status	
Impact		Network Status	
Network F	Dail		
Network	Kali		
Yorkshire	Water		
Treatment \			
Environmo	ent Agenc	y	
Constraints			
LCC			
Ecology sup	port		
Ecology bou	undary		
Education c	omments		
Flood Risk			
1 1000 KISK			
Utilities Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Re	scue		
Telecoms			
Other			
English Her	itage		
Natural Eng	land		
			1 500 (1) 9

Flatiling History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 30% of the site					
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site			
12/02712/FU	Part three storey part four storey block of 18 cluster flats (112 rooms), retail store at ground floor, associated parking and landscaping	R	95			

4235 Leslie Te	errace, Woo	dhouse			
1 <i>F</i>	2/02712/FU (a	llowed at Appea 3/2192201), ap	of previous application al Ref: proved plans and travel plan,	R	95
patial relationships					
UDP Designation	S		Core Strategy		
N32 Greenk	oelt 0.00	% overlap	Main Urban Area	100.00	% overla
N34 F	PAS 0.00		Major Settlement	0.00	
RL1 Rural La	and 0.00		Minor Settlement	0.00	
N1 Greenspa	ace 0.00		Overlaps Urban Extension	✓	
N1A Allotme	nts 0.00		•	V	
N5 Open Spa	ace 0.00				
N6 Playing Pi	tch 0.00		Regeneration Areas		
N8 Urban Green Corri	dor 0.00	-	Inner South RA	0.00	% overla
CC Shopping Quar	ter 0.00		LB Corridor RA	0.00	
UDP City Cen	tre 0.00		EASEL RA	0.00	
S2S6 Town Cen	tre 0.00	-	Aire Valley RA	0.00	
Proposed Local Cen	tre 0.00	-	West Leeds Gateway	0.00	
Overlaps N37 S	SLA 🔲	_	5 (
Sch. Ancient M	on. 0.00				
Other Spatial Rel	lationship	0.02			
Nearest train	ctation Du	clov Dark			
Nearest train station d		1560.22			
	est bus stop	13161			
Nearest bus stop d		63.22			
Nearest bus stop u	istance (III)	03.22			
Agricultural cl	assification Ur	ban			
Ov	erlaps SSSI				
Ove	erlaps SEGI				
Ov	erlaps LNA				
Ov	erlaps LNR				
Overlaps Conser	vation Area				
Overlaps List	ed Building				
Overlaps Strat. Employr	ment buffer				
Overlaps Public Ri	ight of Way	✓			
Overlaps SFRA	Flood Zone				
Overlaps EA	Flood Zone				
Overlaps HSE Ma					
Overlaps HSE 0	Sas Pipeline				
Overlaps Pot. Cor	ntamination	✓			
Overlaps Mineral	s Safeguarded				
Overlaps Minerals Safe					

4235 Leslie Terrace, Woodhouse

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	

5007 Former Moorend training Centre, Tulip Street, Hunslet

Site Details							
Easting	430666	Northing	431107	Site area ha	0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area		Ward	City and Hu	ınslet			

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant building

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Shops

Other land uses - None

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

Description

An adult training centre built around 1976. Presumed derelict as still on Council website for sale and 2014 Google pictures suggest as much. Next to large retail park (City South).

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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	
Do features provide bound	
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?	
Francisch was at Osmalius's a	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

Character Conclusion

Overall Conclusion from assessment a characteristics of openness and perma	inence	oses or green beit	and essential	
SHLAA conclusions				
Availability: Short (=<5 yrs)	Suitability:	Suitable	Achievability: Short (=<5yrs)	
Summary of infrastructure provid	er comments			
LCC Highways Comments				
Public transport accessibility comments				Rank (1-
Part PT meets rest				
				4
Access comments				
Existing access on to Tulip St OK	<u> </u>			
				5
_ocal network comments				
Capacity / operation of Tulip St/Beza St poo	or			
				3
Mitigation measures				Total sco
mprovement to Tulip St / Beza St				
				12
Highways site support				
Yes with mitigation				
Contingent on other sites				
Contingent on other sites				
Sommingent on other stees				
Highways Agency				
· ·	etwork Status	No objection, no mit	tigation required	
n/a				
Network Rail				
Yorkshire Water				
Treatment Works				
Environment Agency				
Constraints South east of site within FZ2. See comment	ts in our previous D	&O consultation		
COULT COST OF SILE WITHIN 1 ZZ. SEE COMMENT	S III Our provious IC	20 consultation.		
LCC				
Ecology support Supported				

5007 Former Moorend training Centre, Tulip Street, Hunslet 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

Spatial relationships

App Number

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

Proposal

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

Decision

% of site

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	97.17
-----------------	-------

Former Moorend training Centre, Tulip Street, Hunslet

Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (n	n) 2300.31
Nearest bus sto	p 4010
Nearest bus stop distance (n	n) 69.28
Agricultural classification	on Urban
Overlaps SS	SI
Overlaps SE	GI
Overlaps LN	IA
Overlaps LN	IR
Overlaps Conservation Are	ea
Overlaps Listed Buildin	ng
Overlaps Strat. Employment buff	er
Overlaps Public Right of Wa	ay
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zor	ne 🗸
Overlaps EA Flood Zor	
Overlaps HSE Major Haza	rd
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipelii	ne
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	on 🗸
Overlaps Minerals Safegua	arded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 1	100m

5007 Former Moorend training Centre, Tulip Street, Hunslet

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

The site lies to the south west of a large retail park. There are mixed uses around the site such as retail and light industrial To the west of the site across the M621 is a residential area. Another residential area exists adjacent and to the south of the site. One potential restriction to development to the south west of the site is an area of Greenspace (N1). Whilst this is not part of the site it is possible that the potential for larger developments incorporating the site may be precluded. In general this site is suitable for development.

larger developments incorporating t	he site may be precluded. In general this site is suitable for development.
Site affects others?	
No	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Preferred housing allocation	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
Brownfield site in Main Urban Area,	suitable in principle for residential development.

5014 Gleadhow Road/Gledhow Terrace

Site Details							
Easting	431412	Northing	434946	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area		Ward	Gipton and	Harehills		

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Car Parks

Neighbouring land uses

Education

Dwellings

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Office

Education

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Slightly complicated enforcement case attached to this - 13/01215/UCU3.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 bound			
Coalescence Conclusion			

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?		
Can development pres		
Chanastan Canalusian		

Character Conclusion

5014 Gleadhow Road/Gle	edhow Terrace			
Overall Conclusion from assessmen characteristics of openness and per	t against all 4 pur rmanence	poses of green belt and es	ssential	
SHLAA conclusions				
Availability:	Suitability	<i>r</i> :	Achievability:	
Summary of infrastructure pro	vider comments			
LCC Highways Comments				
Public transport accessibility comments				Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Standards				
				5
Access comments				
Access on to Gledhow Road OK				5
Local network comments				
OK				4
Mitigation measures				Total score
Displaced hospital parking is an issue to	address			
				14
Highways site support Yes with mitigation				
res with mitigation				
Contingent on other sites				
Contingent on other sites				
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				
West of site FZ2 & FZ3. See comments	in our previous I&O c	consultation.		
1.00				
LCC Supported				
Ecology support Supported Supported (Green)				
Supported (Green)				

Inner Area

5014 **Gleadhow Road/Gledhow Terrace** Ecology boundary **Education comments** Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Potential flood risk from Gipton Beck Trunk sewer. This should be addressed within the FRA. Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England **Planning History** Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site **App Number Proposal** Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy	

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

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 %	99.94
-----------------	-------

5014 Gleadhow Road/Gledhow Terrace

Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	2456.75
Nearest bus stop	1886
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	120.58
Agricultural classification l	Jrban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	ed 🗆
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100r	m

5014 Gleadhow Road/Gledhow Terrace

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site is currently being used as a Car Park. Residential exists to the North East and to the South of the site. A small area of the risk Zone 2. Site is suitable for residential.	site is in Flood
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Preferred housing allocation	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
Brownfield site in the Main Urban Area, suitable in principle for residential development.	

5017 Amberton HOP, Thorn Mount, Gipton

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	433133	Northing	435576	Site area ha		0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Gipton and	Harehills			

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant building

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

HOP that has been recently closed. Vacant building. Currently with Asset Management as a site (19/06/2014)

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		

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

5017 Amberton HOP, Thorn Mount, Gipton

SHLAA conclusions				
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of infrastructure provide	r comments			
LCC Highways Comments				
Public transport accessibility comments				Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Standards				5
Access comments				
Use existing access on to Thorn Mount				5
Local network comments				
OK				4
Mitigation measures]			Total score
minigation measures	1			14
	1			
Highways site support Yes				
res				
Continuent on all or all or	1			
Contingent on other sites				
]			
Contingent on other sites				
Highways Agency				
	work Status No obj	ection, no mitigation requi	red	
n/a	,	, <u> </u>		
Network Rail				
Yorkshire Water				
Treatment Works				
Treatment Works				
Environment Agency				
Constraints				
FZ1 under 1ha. See comments in our previous	I&O consultation			
LCC				
Ecology support Supported				
Supported (Green)				
Ecology boundary				
Education comments				
Lucation comments				

Flood Risk Flood Zone 1 Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage

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

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

Natural England

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

O Clusts	
Core Strategy	

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

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	100.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %		100.00
Nearest train station	(Cross Gates

Nearest train station		Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)		3347.30
Nearest bus stop		8857
Nearest bus stop distance (m)		243.96

Agricultural classification Urban

5017 Amberton HOP, Thorn Mount, Gipton

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	\Box
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	\Box
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	Ä
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	∋d
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	m

5017 Amberton HOP, Thorn Mount, Gipton

Conclusions

Issues and Options Summary

This site is a former home for older people recently released for development by the LCC (2014). A planning brief is being prepared for the site. Current (06/2014) proposed uses with regard to the sale of the site by LCC are C2 - Care Home, C3 Dwellings and D1. The site is adjacent to SHLAA site 841 which had permission for 198 dwellings. This site(841) is largely complete. The site is set in a large residential area with a primary school and supermarket nearby (<300m). No significant planning history in the last 15 years as the building has been operating as a Home for Older People. The site is a Neighbourbourhood Renewal Area (UDP Policy R1). The past uses, the area, the adjacent uses, the UDP designation and the local services would suggest that this site ideal for residential development.

Site affects others?

Adjacent to this site to the east is Site 841 which is currently being built as residential. To the south is site 842 which has permission from application 07/01012 which includes site 841. It should be noted that this site(842) hasn't started and still has the potential to be used for a different use than residential. Both of these are H3-1A.22 in the UDP.

Sustainability summary		
Summary of reps		
Comments on phasing		
DPP Allocation		
Preferred housing allocation		
DPP Allocation Conclusion		

Brownfield site in the Main Urban Area, suitable in principle for residential development.

Site Deta	Site Details						
Easting	428531	Northing	432249	Site area ha	1.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Beeston an	d Holbeck

Site Characteristics

Site type Greenfield

On-site land uses

Vacant land

Transport tracks and ways

Neighbouring land uses

Vacant building

Office

Manufacturing and Wholesale

Allotment and city farm

Car Showroom

Wholesale distribution

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Vacant land with no access to the public.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	
Do features provide bound	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

5018 Land at Brown Lan	e West, Holbeck		
4. Preserve the setting and special	I character of historic towns		
Site within/adjacent to conservation are	ea/listed building/historical features?		
Can development preserve this charact	er?		
Character Conclusion			
Overall Conclusion from assessme characteristics of openness and pe	nt against all 4 purposes of green belt a	and essential	
CIII AA camalusiana			
SHLAA conclusions	Costa de Mario	A shift south titles	
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of infrastructure pro	ovider comments		
LCC Highways Comments			
Public transport accessibility comments		Rank (1-5)
Industrial backland fails to meet CS Sta	ndards	1	
		<u>'</u>	
Access comments			
Acces onto Brown Lane West shared in	dusrial access, unsuitable for residential use	1	
		<u>'</u>	
Local network comments			
congested part of the network			
		3	
Mitigation measures		Total so	core
Witigation measures		_	
		5	
Highways site support			
No No			
Contingent on other sites			
Contingent on other sites			
orningent on ourer exec			
Highways Agency			
Impact No material impact	Network Status No objection, no mit	igation required	
n/a			
Network Rail			
Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works			
Environment Agency			

Site within FZ3. See comments in our previous I&O consultation. On a historic landfill.

LCC			
Ecology support	Supported		
Supported (Green)			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Flood Zone 3A(i). So	urce is Hol Beck		
Utilities Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			
Natural England			
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Spatial relationships

UDP De	esigr	natio	ns
--------	-------	-------	----

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	%	85.17	
Nearest train station		Leeds City	
Nearest train station distance ((m)	1495.16	
Nearest bus s	top	14145	
Nearest bus stop distance ((m)	203.00	
Agricultural classificat	ion	Urban	
Overlaps S	SSI		
Overlaps SE	EGI		
Overlaps L	.NA		
Overlaps L	.NR		
Overlaps Conservation A	rea		
Overlaps Listed Build	ing		
Overlaps Strat. Employment but	ffer		
Overlaps Public Right of V	Vay		
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zo	one	✓	
Overlaps EA Flood Zo	one	✓	
Overlaps HSE Major Haz	ard		
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipel	ine	$\overline{\Box}$	
Overlaps Pot. Contaminat	ion	✓	
Overlaps Minerals Safegu	ıard	ed	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	100)m	

	lus i	

201122	and	Ontions	Summary

This site is located in a predominantly light industrial area. To the north are car showrooms and to the south and south east are light industrial and offices. To the east are allotments. Beyond the allotments is a significant area of housing. This site had no designation undet the UDP. The last planing application for the site took place in 1988 for a light industrial use. Also the site does not seem open to the public. However, there are no reasons why this site could not be developed as housing.

re are no reasons why this site could not be developed as housing.
affects others?
tainability summary
nmary of reps
nments on phasing
Allocation
proposed as housing allocation
Allocation Conclusion
to be allocated for employment

5020 Burley Willows Care Home, Willow Garth, Burley

Easting	428169	Northing	434378	Site area ha	0.5	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area		Ward Hyde Park and Woodhouse					

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses

Vacant building

Neighbouring land uses

Dwellings

Outdoor amenity and open space

Other land uses - None

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

Description

Recently closed HOP.

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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 t		
Do features provide bound		
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 pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		

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

SHLAA conclusions				
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of infrastructure provider	comments			
LCC Highways Comments				
Public transport accessibility comments				Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Standards				5
Access comments				
Access from Willow Approach / Willow Garth				5
Local network comments				
ОК				5
Mitigation measures				Total score
J. C.				15
				15
Highways site support				
No				
Contingent on other sites]
Contingent on other sites				
ooningon on one				
Highways Agency				
	vork Status No objecti	on, no mitigation requi	red	
n/a				
Network Rail				
Yorkshire Water				
Treatment Works				
F				
Environment Agency Constraints				
Site with FZ2 and FZ3. See comments in our p	revious I&O consultation.			
LCC Supported				
Ecology support Supported Supported (Green)				
Ecology boundary				
Education comments				

Flood Risk

Approx. 50% of site in Flood Zone 2. Approx. 10% of site is in Flood Zone 3A(i). Remainder of site is in FZ1.

Utilities

Gas

Electric

Fire and Rescue

Telecoms

Other

English Heritage

Natural England

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

% overlap

App Number Proposal Decision % of site

Spatial relationships

HIDD	Docide	nations
UDF	Desiar	เลเเบเเร

N32 Greenbelt	0.00
N34 PAS	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.00
N1 Greenspace	4.08
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00
Proposed Local Centre	0.00
Overlaps N37 SLA	

Core Strategy

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

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

Sch. Ancient Mon.

0.00

Nearest train station		Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)		842.92
Nearest bus stop		9465
Nearest bus stop distance ((m)	104.15

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	V
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlane Minerale Sefectioned	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

Canal	luciono
Conc	lusions

Issues and Options Summary	

This site is a former home for older people (HOP) that is now vacant. It is understood a planning brief is being written (24/06/2014) for the site by LCC AMU. Very little planning history as site until recently was being used as a HOP. The site is surrounded by N1 Greenspace, however the site does not encroach on this space. There is considerable housing to the north of the site on the other side of Burley Road. The buildings adjacent to the site to the north and east are are also all residential. Given the last use of the site, and its immediate surroundings this small site would be ideal for housing.

nis small site would be ideal for housing.
ite affects others?
ustainability summary
ummary of reps
comments on phasing
PP Allocation
referred housing allocation
PP Allocation Conclusion
rownfield site in the Main Urban Area, suitable in principle for residential development

5109 Browning House, 126 Chapeltown Road, Chapeltown

Site Details							
Easting	430910	Northing	435475	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Chapel Alle	erton
011 01							
Site Cha	racteristi	CS					
Site type Brownfield							
On-site land uses - None							
Adjacent land uses - None							
Other land	Other land uses - None						

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	
Description]	

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/const		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	i
Do features provide bound	
Coalescence Conclusion	

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

5109 Brow	ning House, 126 Chapeltown Ro	ad, Chapeltown
SHLAA conclusions	3	
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:
Summary of infr	astructure provider comments	
Highways Agency		
Impact	Network Status	
Network Rail		
Yorkshire Water		
Treatment Works		
Environment Ager	псу	
Constraints		
LCC		
Ecology support		
Ecology boundary		
Education comments		
Flood Risk		
rioda Kisk		
Utilities Gas		
Gds		
Electric		
Lioune		
Fire and Rescue		
Telecoms		
Other		
English Heritage		
Natural England		
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more	e than 50% of the site

Plaining History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50 % of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
11/9/00063/MOD	2 storey and part single storey community assessment service building, with car parking NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 11/00090/FU - Reduction in roof height	M01	100	

5109 Brov	vning House, 126 Chapeltown Road, Chapeltown		
13/03324/FU	Change of use of family assessment centre (Browning House) to 9 flats and ancillary building (Jubilee House) to be used as Childrens Nursery (D1).	Α	100
12/01691/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 7 and 12 of Planning Application 11/00090/FU	Α	100
11/00090/FU	2 storey and part single storey community assessment service building, with car parking	Α	100
11/01552/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 3 of Planning Application 11/00090/FU	Α	100
11/9/00087/MOD	2 storey and part single storey community assessment service building, with car parkingNON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 11/00090/FU: Addition of air conditioning units to north and east elevations	M04	100
11/01892/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 8 and 13 of Planning Application 11/00090/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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy	

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overla
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	~	
	_	

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	0.00	
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance	2588.11	
Nearest bus s	top	6597
Nearest bus stop distance	31.30	
Agricultural classificat	ion	Urban

5109 Browning House, 126 Chapeltown Road, Chapeltown

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	\Box
Overlaps Public Right of Way	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	Ī
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	~
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	d _
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100r	n

5109 Browning House, 126 Chapeltown Road, Chapeltown

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
ouotamaziiti ouminary	
C	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

5124 Pepper Road LS10

Site Details							
Easting	431605	Northing	430604	Site area ha	0.3	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA East Leeds, Inner Area					City and Hu	ınslet

Site Characteristics

Cita tuna	Dunitungfiald
Site type	Browniieid

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

_	
Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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				
Does the site provide acces				
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs				
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?				
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?				
Does the site contain buildings				
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?				
Encroachment Conclusion				

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

5124	Pepper	Road LS10				
SHLAA co	SHLAA conclusions					
Availabili	ity:	Suitability:	Achievability:			
Summar	ry of infras	tructure provider comments				
	s Agency					
Impact		Network Status				
Network	Rail					
Yorkshire	e Water					
Treatment	Works					
Environm	nent Agency					
Constraints	S					
LCC						
Ecology su	upport					
Ecology bo	oundary					
Education	comments					
Flood Risk						
Utilities						
Gas						
Electric						
	•					
Fire and Re	escue					
Telecoms						
Other						
English He	eritage					
J	Ų.					
Natural En	ngland					
	J					
Diampina	History A	onlications since 1/1/2009, covering mor	a than E00/ of the aita			

Plaining History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50 /6 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				

5124 Pepper Road LS10

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area	100.00	% over
Major Settlement	0.00	

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

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
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 (3217.77	
Nearest bus s	11927	
Nearest bus stop distance (m)		95.07
Agricultural classificat	Urban	
Overlaps S		

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<u></u>
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded]

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

5124 Pepper Road LS10

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

5141 BOGGART HILL LS14

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	434518	Northing	436618	Site area ha	(0.7	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Killingbeck	and Seacroft		

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

_	
Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs		
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

5141 BOG0	GART HILL LS14		
SHLAA conclusions	3		
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:
Summary of infr	astructure provider comments		
Highways Agency			
Impact	Network Status		
Network Rail			
Network Rail			
Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works			
Environment Ager	псу		
Constraints	·		
LCC			
Ecology support			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities Gas			
Electric			
Licetife			
Fire and Rescue			
The and Rescue			
Telecoms			
relecoms			
Other			
English Heritage			
Natural England			
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering mor	e than 50% of the site	
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

5141 BOGGART HILL LS14

Spatial relationships

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

Core	Strategy

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

% overlap

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 %	0.08
Nearest train station (Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2798.80
Nearest bus stop	1831
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	261.50
Mediest bus stop distance (III)	201.30
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	H
Overland Minerale Sefections	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	itti 📗

5141 BOGGART HILL LS14

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. Princi	iple of residential development accepted

5148 Otter Island Wellington Road Leeds

Easting 428600 Northing 433590 Site area ha 2.1 SP7 Main Urban Area Infill HMCA Inner Area Ward City and Hunslet	Site Details							
HMCA Inner Area Ward City and Hunslet	Easting	428600	Northing	433590	Site area ha	2.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topogra	phy	Landscape	
Bounda	es	Road front	

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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			
Does the site provide acces			
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs			
Areas of protected/unprote			
Site includes Grade 1, Grad			
Does the site contain buildings			
Are these buildings used fo			
Encroachment Conclusion			

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

5148 Ott	er Island Wellington Road Leeds	
SHLAA conclusio	ns	
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:
Summary of in	frastructure provider comments	
Highways Agend Impact	Network Status	
ППраст	Network Status	
Network Rail		
Yorkshire Water		
Treatment Works		
Environment Ag	ency	
Constraints		
LCC		
Ecology support		
Ecology boundary		
Education commen	ıts	
Flood Risk		
Utilities Gas		
Electric		
Fire and Rescue		
Telecoms		
Othor		
Other English Heritage		
Natural England		

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
14/05332/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 17 of Planning Application 13/05566/FU		100

5148 Otte	r Island Wellington Road Leeds			
14/9/00211/MOD	Erection of 113 No dwellings and associated works NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 13/05566/FU amendemnt to second floor window from 1350mm deep to 1050mm deep		100	
14/9/00210/MOD	Erection of 113 No dwellings and associated works NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 13/05566/FU aMENDMENT TO INTERNAL LAYOUT, AMEDMENT TO SECOND FLOOR WINDOW FROM TAX WINDOW TO OBSCURE GLAZED WINDOW		100	
13/05566/FU	Erection of 113 No dwellings and associated works	Α	100	

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.85	

Other Spatial Relationship

Overlaps N37 SLA

Sch. Ancient Mon.

LCC ownership	0.00	
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance	1162.91	
Nearest bus s	8791	
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	219.98

Agricultural classification Urban

0.00

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	✓
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	~
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	V
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

5148 Otter Island Wellington Road Leeds

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
ouotamaziiti ouminary	
C	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

5150 Dog and Gun, 601 York Road Leeds

Site Details							
Easting	433563	Northing	434089	Site area ha	0.6	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Gipton and	Harehills		

Site Characteristics

Site type Mix 60:40

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons			
Would development result in an i			
Is the site well connected to the			
Would development round off the			
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?			
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion			

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?				
Do features provide bound				
Coalescence Conclusion				

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

App Number

14/06171/ADV

Proposal

Three illuminated and seven non illuminated signs

5150	Dog and	d Gun, 601 York Road Leeds	
SHLAA con	clusions		
Availability	<i>r</i> :	Suitability:	Achievability:
Summary	of infras	tructure provider comments	
Highways Impact	Agency	Network Status	
mpact		nomon orang	
Network R	ail		
Yorkshire \	Water		
Treatment W	/orks		
Environme	nt Agency		
Constraints			
LCC Ecology supp	port		
Lcology supp	JOIL		
Ecology bou	ndary		
Education co	omments		
Flood Risk			
Utilities Gas			
Electric			
Fire and Res	cue		
Telecoms			
Other			
English Herit	age		
Natural Engl	and		
Planning H	istory Ap	oplications since 1/1/2009, covering mor	e than 50% of the site

Decision

Α

% of site

100

5150 Dog	and Gun, 601 York Road Leeds			
14/05165/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4 and 5 of Planning Application 14/02846/FU	A	100	
14/02846/FU	Change of use and alterations to first floor to form seven flats; alterations to ground floor to form supermarket and associated highways works	A	100	

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations		
N32 Greenbelt	0.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.32	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

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

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 %	0.32
Nearest train station	Cross Gates
Nearest train station distance (m)	2743.87
Nearest bus stop	3947
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	48.23
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overland CCCI	
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

5150 Dog and Gun, 601 York Road Leeds

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Summary of Teps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Other land uses - None

5161 Grove Park Care Home Grove Lane Meanwood

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	428745	Northing	436484	Site area ha	0.4	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area Ward Chapel Allerton							
Site Characteristics Site type Brownfield							
On-site land uses - None							
Adjacent land uses - None							

Tanamanhii	Lamalanana	
Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

Description			

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

5161 **Grove Park Care Home Grove Lane Meanwood SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status Network Rail **Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England Planning History Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site

App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
13/00797/FU	Variation of condition 18 of approval 12/00687/FU to allow for off-site drainage pipework	Α	99

5161 Grov	ve Park Care Home Grove Lane Meanwood			
11/00915/FU	Three storey residential care home, with basement car parking, laundry, kitchen and stores.	Α	99	
12/00687/FU	Three storey residential care home, with basement car parking, laundry, kitchen and stores. (Minor material amendment to approved scheme 11/00915/FU to revise internal layout and create 3 additional bedrooms, revise window design and replace render to elevations with facing brick)	Α	99	
11/9/00268/MOD	Three storey residential care home, with basement car parking, laundry, kitchen and stores.NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 11/00915/FU: Extension of existing basement within approved footprint so both lifts can provide service to all floors; additional storage and rearrangement of rooms to accommodate alterations; addition of external escape staircase to lower ground floor levels	M01	99	
12/02494/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 10 of Planning Application 12/00687/FU	Α	99	
11/04998/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 7, 13, 15, 18 and 19 of Planning Application 11/00915/FU	Α	99	
13/01683/FU	Three storey residential care home, with basement car parking, laundry, kitchen and stores. (Minor material amendment to approved scheme 11/00915/FU to revise internal layout to create 1 additional bedroom, and to revise site layout to relocate surface car parking)	Α	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	0.26	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.30	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	100.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	0.00	
No areat train atation		Dendari Dank
Nearest train station		Burley Park
Nearest train station distance	(m)	1555.87
Nearest bus s	top	5268
Nearest bus stop distance	(m)	27.29

Agricultural classification Urban

5161 Grove Park Care Home Grove Lane Meanwood

Overlaps SS	SI
Overlaps SE	GI
Overlaps LN	IA
Overlaps LN	IR _
Overlaps Conservation Are	ea
Overlaps Listed Buildin	ıg
Overlaps Strat. Employment buff	er
Overlaps Public Right of W	ay
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zor	ne
Overlaps EA Flood Zo	ne
Overlaps HSE Major Haza	rd
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipelii	ne
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	on ,
Overlaps Minerals Safegua	irded
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 1	uum

5161 Grove Park Care Home Grove Lane Meanwood

Conclusions	
ssues and Options Summary	
ite affects others?	
ustainability summary	
ummary of reps	
omments on phasing	
PP Allocation	
dentified housing site	
PP Allocation Conclusion	
ite with current or recently expired planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted	

HLA20000 St Mary's Lane LS 9

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	431104	Northing	433810	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Burmantoft	s and Richmond Hill

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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 acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas (SSSIs		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

HLA20000 St Mary's	Lane LS 9	
SHLAA conclusions		
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:
Summary of infrastr	ructure 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		
Diamaina III-la	lications since 1/1/2009 covering mor	to then E00/ of the site

Flairing History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50 % of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
13/03886/EXT	Extension of time period for planning permission 10/03225/FU 2 storey extension to form 6 one bedroom flats to anattment block	Α	100	

HLA20000 St Mary's Lane LS 9

10/03225/FU	2 storey extension to form 6 one bedroom flats to apartment block	Α	100	
10/00630/FU	2 storey extension to form 6 one bedroom flats to apartment block	Α	100	
13/05304/FU	2 storey extension, to form 2 flats	Α	75	

Spatial relationships

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

Core	Strategy
------	----------

_		
0 % overlap	100.00	Main Urban Area
0	0.00	Major Settlement
0	0.00	Minor Settlement
_	✓	Overlaps Urban Extension

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 S	% 0.00
No speak tusin station	Landa Citu
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (n	n) 1541.42
Nearest bus sto	op 2569
Nearest bus stop distance (n	n) 135.16

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	i

Agricultural classification Ur	ban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	\Box
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	

HLA20000 St Mary's Lane LS 9

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	1
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion]
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

HLA21042 65 Brown Lane East LS11

Site Details							
Easting	428885	Northing	431977	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Beeston an	d Holbeck	

Site Characteristics

Site type Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topogra	phy	Landscape	
Bounda	es	Road front	

Description

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?			
Do features provide bound			
Coalescence Conclusion			

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary				
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside			
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs			
Areas of protected/unprote				
Site includes Grade 1, Grad				
Does the site contain buildings				
Are these buildings used fo				
Encroachment Conclusion				

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

HLA21042 65 Br	own Lane East LS11		
SHLAA conclusions	i		
Availability:	Suitability:	Achie	evability:
Summary of infr	astructure provider comments		
Highways Agency			
Impact	Network Status		
Network Rail			
Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works			
Environment Agen	псу		
Constraints			
LCC			
Ecology support			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities Gas			
Electric	1		
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms			
Other English Heritage			
Natural England			
Planning History App Number	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more Proposal	Decision	% of site

HLA21042 65 Brown Lane East LS11

Spatial relationships

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

Core	Strategy

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

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	100.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

0.00	LCC ownership %
Leeds City	Nearest train station
1458.31	Nearest train station distance (m)
2906	Nearest bus stop
266.21	Nearest bus stop distance (m)
Urban	Agricultural classification
	Overlaps SSSI
	Overlaps SEGI
	Overlaps LNA
	Overlaps LNR
	Overlaps Conservation Area
✓	Overlaps Listed Building
	Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer
	Overlaps Public Right of Way
	Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone
	Overlaps EA Flood Zone
	Overlaps HSE Major Hazard

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline

Overlaps Pot. Contamination

✓

HLA21042 65 Brown Lane East LS11

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
J .	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

HLA21046 Coupland Place LS11

Site Details							
Easting	429586	Northing	431630	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area			Ward	City and Hu	unslet		

Site Characteristics

C!t - t	Brownfield
NITA TVINA	RECMUTION
JILC LYPC	DIOWINCIA

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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		
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the 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

10/02958/EXT

HLA21046 Coupland Place LS11				
SHLAA conclusions				
Availability:	Suitability:		Achi	evability:
Summary of infra	astructure provider comments			
Highways Agency				
Impact	Network Status			
Network Rail]			
Yorkshire Water				
Treatment Works				
Environment Agen	су			
Constraints				
LCC	1			
Ecology support				
Ecology boundary				
Education comments				
Flood Risk				
	_			
Utilities Gas				
Ous				
Electric				
	7			
Fire and Rescue				
Telecoms				
Other				
English Heritage				
Natural England				
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more	re than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal		Decision	% of site

Extension of time application for application number 08/04067/LA , Outline application for residential development

Α

99

HLA21046 Coupland Place LS11				
13/05882/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 of Planning Application 10/02769/LA	Α	99	
10/05216/RM	Reserved matters application for residential development of 8 dwellings, car parking and landscaping	Α	99	
10/02769/LA	Removal of conditions 3 and 5 and variation of conditions 4 and 6 of application no. 08/04067/LA (3, affordable housing provision, 4, amended number of dwellings, 5, provision of additional educational facilities and 6, provision of green space and leisure facilities.	Α	99	
13/05751/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 2 and 4 of Planning Application 10/05216/RM	Α	99	
10/02768/LA	Removal of condition number 7 of application no. 08/04067/LA (provision of public transport improvements)	Α	99	

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	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00

|--|

% overlap

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

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	100.00
LB Corridor RA	0.00
EASEL RA	0.00
Aire Valley RA	0.00
West Leeds Gateway	0.00

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	99.99
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1565.06
Nearest bus stop	5660
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	67.89
Agricultural classification	Urban

HLA21046 Coupland Place LS11

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	~
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	∌d
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100	m

HLA21046 Coupland Place LS11

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamasmity ourminary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Topography

Boundaries

Description

HLA21049 Kings Arms, Stocks Hill, Holbeck, Leeds, LS11 9PB

Site Details								
Easting	429075	Northing	432381	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Beeston and Holbeck		
Site Cha	Site Characteristics							
Site type Brownfield								
On-site land uses - None								
Adjacent land uses - None								
Other land uses - None								

Landscape

Road front

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

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

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

11/03927/FU

Change of use of public house to eight flats, with two

dormer windows to rear, laying out of car park, and bin store

HLA21049 Kings Arms, Stocks Hill, Holbeck, Leeds, LS11 9PB **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

Α

100

HLA21049 King	s Arms, Stocks Hill, Holbeck, Leeds, LS11 9PB			
12/03758/FU	Variation of condition 1 of previous approval 12/02355/FU for minor material amendment for alterations to parking layout, access and bin store, part retrospective.	Α	87	
11/03928/LI	Listed Building application for insertion of dormer windows, replacement windows, cleaning of building and associated works, internal partition walls and new openings, replacement doors and new staircase in connection with the change of use of public house to eight flats together with laying out of car parking and external works.	A	100	
12/00624/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 6 of Planning Application 12/03758/FU	A	100	
12/02287/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2 and 3 of Planning Application 12/03803/LI	A	100	
12/02354/LI	Listed Building application for change of use of public house to nine flats, including external and internal alterations, laying out of car park and landscaping	Α	100	
12/03803/LI	Listed Building application for Variation of condition 1 of previous approval 12/02354/LI for minor material amendment for alterations to parking layout, access and bin store, part retrospective.	A	87	
12/02355/FU	Change of use of public house to nine flats, laying out of car park and landscaping	Α	100	

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	0.00
N34 PAS	0.00
RL1 Rural Land	0.00
N1 Greenspace	0.00
N1A Allotments	0.00
N5 Open Space	0.00
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00
UDP City Centre	0.00

S2S6 Town Centre

Overlaps N37 SLA
Sch. Ancient Mon.

Proposed Local Centre

0.00 % overlap

0.00

0.00

0.00

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

Regeneration Areas		
Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	
'		

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	%	0.00
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1018.64
Nearest bus st	ор	12273
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	74.05

Agricultural classification Urban

HLA21049 Kings Arms, Stocks Hill, Holbeck, Leeds, LS11 9PB

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	✓
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overland Minarala Cafarvan	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguard	ied
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 10)m

HLA21049 Kings Arms, Stocks Hill, Holbeck, Leeds, LS11 9PB

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary]
ouotamasmity ourminary	
C]
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

HLA21049 86 Elland Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS11 0AB

Site Details								
Easting	429016	Northing	431782	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Beeston an	d Holbeck	
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 unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

4. Preserve the 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 $\frac{1}{2}$

HLA21049 86 Elland Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS11 0AB SHLAA conclusions Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status **Network Rail Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
09/01080/FU	Use of land as hand car wash with new vehicular access and 2m high access gates to front and side	R	53

HLA21049 86 Elland Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS11 0AB				
10/05464/FU	Retrospective application for single storey rear extension to shop	Α	100	
09/01079/ADV	3 fascia signs to hand car wash		53	
09/03863/FU	Use of land as hand car wash with new vehicular access and 2m high access gates to front and side	R	53	
11/01967/FU	Change of use and 2 storey rear extension and first floor side extension of vacant first floor store to form 6 flats	w	100	
11/04016/FU	First and second floor extensions above shop units, and creation of 8 self contained flats at first and second floor	Α	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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy	

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

Regeneration Areas	
--------------------	--

Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m)	1562.86
Nearest bus stop	5748
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	97.82
Agricultural classification	Urban
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

HLA21049 86 Elland Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS11 0AB

HLA21049 86 Elland Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS11 0AB

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DDD All III	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
Site with current or recently expire	ed planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

Boundaries

Description

HLA21049 272A Dewsbury Road, Hunslet, Leeds, LS11 6JT

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	429980	Northing	430935	Site area ha	0	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and H	unslet	
					·			
Site Cha	racteristi	CS						
Site type	Site type Brownfield							
On-site land uses - None								
Adjacent land uses - None								
Other land uses - None								
Topograph	ny				Landscape			

Road front

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required	

1. Check the unresticted 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?	i
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 acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	e 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildi	ngs	
Are these buildings used fo	r agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion		

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the 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

App Number

12/00328/FU

Proposal

Change of use and alterations of vacant offices to 5 flats

HLA21049 272A Dewsbury Road, Hunslet, Leeds, LS11 6JT **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Summary of infrastructure provider comments **Highways Agency** Network Status Impact **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

Decision

Α

% of site

100

HLA21049 272A Dewsbury Road, Hunslet, Leeds, LS11 6JT 12/04290/COND Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3 A 100 and 4 of Planning Application 12/00328/FU

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00	% overla
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	✓	

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

Other Spatial Relationship

0.00
Leeds City
2274.10
9294
51.78

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

HLA21049 272A Dewsbury Road, Hunslet, Leeds, LS11 6JT

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 acce	pted

HLA24051 236 Tong Road LS12

Site Details								
Easting	426893	Northing	433126	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Armley		

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary	
Does the site provide acces	
Does the site include local/	
Areas of protected/unprote	
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	
Does the site contain buildi	
Are these buildings used fo	
Encroachment Conclusion	

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

HLA24051 236 Tong Road LS12 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

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% or the site				
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site		
14/00757/FU	Use of vacant site as car wash with storage cabin and office	Α	99		

HLA24051 236 Tong Road LS12

11/02684/EXT

Extension of time of previous approval 07/06223/FU for 3 storey block of 9 two bed apartments

Α

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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	100.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	100.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership	0.00	
Nearest train station		Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (2285.44	
Nearest bus s	503	
Nearest bus stop distance (26.15	

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	V
Occupana Minanala Cafancianda	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	d
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100n	n

HLA24051 236 Tong Road LS12

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

HLA24052 Theaker Lane LS12

Site Details								
Easting	427076	Northing	433533	Site area ha		0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area			Ward	Armley			

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITTEIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

_	
Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

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

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the 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

HLA24052 Theaker Lane LS12				
SHLAA conclusions				
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:		
Summary of infrastr	ructure 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				
10.0000				
Other English Heritage				
Natural England				
Diamaina History Ass	lications since 1/1/2009 covering mor	to then EOV of the site		

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
10/00009/FU	Removal of conditions 20 and 21 of application number 07/03712/OT (Provision of green space and affordable housing)	W	97	

HLA24052 Theaker Lane LS12

14/00362/FU

Change of use of former medical centre to form 14 flats

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	1.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Overlaps N37 SLA		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	100.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	100.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership % 0.07

Nearest train station	Burley Parl	
Nearest train station distance (m)		1839.09
Nearest bus stop		3688
Nearest bus stop distance (m)		38.81

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	d
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100r	n

HLA24052 Theaker Lane LS12

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	1
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion]
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

HLA26002 Ash Grove LS6

Site Details							
Easting	428599	Northing	435400	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	HMCA Inner Area			Ward	Hyde Park	and Woodhouse	

Site Characteristics

Site type	Brownfield
Site type	DIOWITICIU

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons		
Would development result in an i		
Is the site well connected to the I		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?			
Do features provide bound			
Coalescence Conclusion			

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary			
Does the site provide acces			
Does the site include local/			
Areas of protected/unprote			
Site includes Grade 1, Grad			
Does the site contain buildings			
Are these buildings used fo			
Encroachment Conclusion			

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

12/01131/FU

HLA26002 Ash 0	Grove LS6		
SHLAA conclusions			
Availability:	Suitability:	Ac	hievability:
Summary of infr	astructure provider comments		
Highways Agency			
Impact	Network Status		
Natural Dail	1		
Network Rail			
Yorkshire Water			
Treatment Works			
Environment Agen	су		
Constraints			
LCC	1		
Ecology support			
Ecology boundary			
Education comments			
Flood Risk			
Utilities	1		
Gas			
	_		
Electric			
	7		
Fire and Rescue			
Telecoms	1		
Other			
English Heritage			
Natural England			
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than	50% of the site	
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site

Α

98

Three storey rear extension to form six flats, associated parking and landscaping

HLA26002 Ash	n Grove LS6		
10/04134/FU	3 storey extension comprising 5 two bedroom flats with 14 car parking spaces for flats and club	R	98
13/05589/TR	Fell and remove 2 Ash trees	NBJ	98
12/04984/FU	Change of use of of social club to form four flats; alterations including new windows, associated parking and landscaping	R	98
09/02706/FU	4 storey block of 6 two bedroom flats with 18 car parking spaces attached to rear of club with flats above	W	98
13/01215/FU	Change of use of ground and first floor of social club to form 6 flats with car parking	Α	98
10/01462/FU	3 storey extension comprising 5 additional two bed flats to flatted accommodation	R	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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core	Strategy
COLC	Jualegy

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

Red	ener	ation	Areas
	00.		, ouo

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership ^o	% 0.00
Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (n	n) 733.41
Nearest bus sto	op 12239
Nearest bus stop distance (n	n) 171.14

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	

Inner Area					
HLA26002 Ash Grove LS6					
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded					

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

HLA26002 Ash Grove LS6

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
Site with current or recently expired	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

HLA26028 Moorland Avenue LS6

Site Details							
Easting	428699	Northing	434863	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Inner Area					Ward	Hyde Park	and Woodhouse

Site Characteristics

Cita tuna	Dunitungfiald
Site type	Browniieid

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 unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary				
Does the site provide acces				
Does the site include local/				
Areas of protected/unprote				
Site includes Grade 1, Grad				
Does the site contain buildings				
Are these buildings used fo				
Encroachment Conclusion				

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

14/01512/RM

HLA26028 Moorland Avenue LS6							
SHLAA conclusions							
Availability:	Suitability:		Achie	evability:			
Summary of infrastructure provider comments							
Highways Agency	1						
Impact	Network Status						
	=						
Network Rail							
Yorkshire Water	1						
Treatment Works							
Environment Ager Constraints	ncy						
LCC							
Ecology support							
Faalam, harmadam,							
Ecology boundary							
Education comments							
Flood Risk							
Utilities	1						
Gas							
Electric							
Fire and Rescue							
Telecoms							
Other							
English Heritage							
Natural England							
3							
Diam's tra	Applications size 4/4/0000	a than 500/ - f than "					
Planning History App Number	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more Proposal		Decision	% of site			

Α

99

Reserved matters application for part 3 and part 4 storey block of 15 student flats

HLA26028 Moorland Avenue LS6

10/05548/EXT

Extension of time period for planning permission 08/00397/OT Outline application for one part 3, part 4 storey block of 15 student flats

Α

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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core	Strategy	

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

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %			
Nearest train station		Burley	Park

Nearest train station	Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (n	n) 858.18
Nearest bus sto	op 12630
Nearest bus stop distance (n	n) 60.85

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

HLA26028 Moorland Avenue LS6

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
, ,	
Summary of reps	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
Site with current or recently expired	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

HLA26031 12-28 Westfield Road LS3

Site Detail	IIS						
Easting	428801	Northing	434089	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA Ir	nner Area				Ward	Hyde Park	and Woodhouse

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Prownfield
Site type	Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

_	
Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an i	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the	built up area?	
Would development round off the	e settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier b and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries 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 acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote	cted woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	e 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildi	ngs	
Are these buildings used fo	r agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

12/04875/COND

HLA26031 12-28 Westfield Road LS3 **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

Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 6

and 7 of Planning Application 12/02531/RM

SPL

99

HLA26031 12-2	8 Westfield Road LS3			
13/01352/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5 and 12 of Planning Application 10/00874/OT	SPL	99	
14/01619/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3 and 7 of Planning Application 12/02531/RM	Α	99	
12/9/00135/MOD	Outline application to erect part 6 storey and part 7 storey block of 21 student cluster flats with 119 bedrooms and 9 crash pads and 3 one bedroom flats, with 17 car parking spaces NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 10/00874/OT: Design changes from outline planning permission	M01	99	
12/03731/FU	Change of use of ground floor student accommodation (3 flats) to shop (Use Class A1)	Α	99	
12/03350/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 5, 6 and 7 of Planning Application 10/00874/OT	SPL	99	
14/9/00158/MOD	Reserved Matters Application for External Appearance and Landscaping to erect a part 6 storey and part 7 storey block of 21 student cluster flats with 119 bedrooms and 9 crash pads and 3 one bedroom flats, for key work accommodation, with 11 car parking spaces - NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 12/02531/RM - amendment to red line boundary adj of car parking spaces, no. of spaces remain as per Reserved Matters application	M01	99	
12/02531/RM	Reserved Matters Application for External Appearance and Landscaping to erect a part 6 storey and part 7 storey block of 21 student cluster flats with 119 bedrooms and 9 crash pads and 3 one bedroom flats, for key work accommodation, with 11 car parking spaces	Α	99	
11/00872/EXT	Extension of Time of 07/03425/FU for part 6 and 7 storey building of 68 Serviced Apartments, comprising 28 two bedroom flats and 40 one bedroom flats (24 of which are open plan studio units), with communal facilities, lounge, laundry and ground floor and basement car parking	A	99	
10/00874/OT	Outline application to erect part 6 storey and part 7 storey block of 21 student cluster flats with 119 bedrooms and 9 crash pads and 3 one bedroom flats, for key work accommodation, with 17 car parking spaces	R	99	
12/04513/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 4 of Planning Application 10/00874/OT	Α	99	
10/01779/EXT	Extension of Time Period for planning application 26/212/05/FU part 6 storey and part 7 storey block of 71 flats with 55 car parking spaces	Α	99	
14/03758/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 7 of Planning Application 12/02531/RM	Α	99	

Spatial	relationships	

UDP Designations

Core Strategy

HLA26031 12-28 Westfield Road LS3

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

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

•
LCC ownership % 0.00
Nearest train station Leeds City
earest train station distance (m) 1264.88
Nearest bus stop 7899
Nearest bus stop distance (m) 80.13
Agricultural classification Urban
Constant Const
Overlaps SSSI
Overlaps SEGI
Overlaps LNA
Overlaps LNR
Overlaps Conservation Area
Overlaps Listed Building
erlaps Strat. Employment buffer
Overlaps Public Right of Way
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone
Overlaps EA Flood Zone
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline
Overlaps Pot. Contamination
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
erlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

HLA26031 12-28 Westfield Road LS3

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DDD All III	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
Site with current or recently expire	ed planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

HLA26031 114 Burley Road LS4

Site Details							
Easting	428467	Northing	434370	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	MCA Inner Area		Ward	Hyde Park a	and Woodhouse		

Site Characteristics

Cita tuna	Dunitungfiald
Site type	Browniieid

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

Descri	ption
2 23011	J J

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/consti		
Would development result in an is		
Is the site well connected to the b		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?			
Do features provide bound			
Coalescence Conclusion			

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary		
Does the site provide acces		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildings		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

App Number

09/03718/FU

Proposal

Change of use of offices to form 9 flats

HLA26031 114 Burley Road LS4					
SHLAA conclusions					
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:			
Summary of infra	astructure provider comments				
Highways Agency					
Impact	Network Status				
Network Rail					
Yorkshire Water					
Treatment Works					
Environment Agen	су				
Constraints					
LCC	1				
Ecology support					
Ecology boundary					
Education comments					
Flood Risk					
	1				
Utilities Gas					
Electric					
Fire and Rescue					
The and Rescue					
Telecoms					
Other					
English Heritage					
Natural England]				
rvaturai Erigialiu					
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering mor	re than 50% of the site			

Decision

Α

% of site

100

HLA26031 114 Burley Road LS4

10/03602/FU

Change of use of first floor office to 1 one bedroom flat

% overlap

Α

75

% overlap

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	1.00			
Overlaps N37 SLA				
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00			

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership) %	0.00
Nearest train station		Burley Park
Nearest train station distance ((m)	985.82
Nearest bus s	top	7742
Nearest bus stop distance ((m)	19.80

Agricultural classification Urban

	Overlaps SSSI
	Overlaps SEGI
	Overlaps LNA
	Overlaps LNR
	Overlaps Conservation Area
	Overlaps Listed Building
	Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer
	Overlaps Public Right of Way
	Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone
$\overline{\Box}$	Overlaps EA Flood Zone
$\overline{\Box}$	Overlaps HSE Major Hazard
$\overline{\Box}$	Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline
V	Overlaps Pot. Contamination
	Overlans Minerals Safeguarded

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

HLA26031 114 Burley Road LS4

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	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

HLA26034 18A-20 Burley Lodge Road LS4

Easting 428379 Northing 434523 Site area ha 0.1 SP7 Main Urban Area Infill Word Lines Area Word Lines Area	Site Deta	ails						
LIMCA Inner Area Ward Huda Park and Woodhausa	Easting	428379	Northing	434523	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
nivica illilei area ward nyde Park and woodnouse	HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Hyde Park	and Woodhouse

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 unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an i	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the	built up area?	
Would development round off the	e settlement?	
Is there a good existing barrier b and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead	to physical connection of settlements?	
Do features provide bound	daries 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 acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/	national nature conservation areas (SSSIs	
Areas of protected/unprote	cted woodland/trees/hedgerows?	
Site includes Grade 1, Grad	e 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildi	ngs	
Are these buildings used fo	r agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion		

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

12/04782/FU

occupation

HLA26034 18A-20 Burley Lodge Road LS4 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Summary of infrastructure provider comments **Highways Agency** Network Status Impact **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

Change of use from family dwellings to dwellings of multiple

84

HLA26034 18A-20 Burley Lodge Road LS4

12/00127/FU	6 terrace (C3 use) dwellinghouses	Α	86
12/02172/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 7, 8, 10 and 13 of Planning Application 12/00127/FU	SPL	86
13/03005/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 8, 10 and 11 for Planning Application 12/01903/FU	SPL	79
12/05381/FU	Change of use of four houses (C3) to form four houses in multiple occupation (C4)	R	84

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	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

Overlaps N37 SLA
Sch. Ancient Mon.

LCC ownership %	5.57
-----------------	------

0.00

Nearest train station		Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)		810.42
Nearest bus s	4704	
Nearest bus stop distance (97.81	

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	$\overline{\Box}$
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	\Box
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

HLA26034 18A-20 Burley Lodge Road LS4

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
, i	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	ed planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

HLA26036 7 Grosvenor Road LS6

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	428830	Northing	435813	Site area ha	0.2	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Headingley	

Site Characteristics

Sito typo	Prownfield
Site type	Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

Descri	ption

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an i	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the I	built up area?	
Would development round off the settlement?		
Is there a good existing barrier be and the undeveloped land?	etween the existing urban area	
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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	3 1 1	L

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

HLA26036 7 Grosvenor Road LS6 **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Summary of infrastructure provider comments Highways Agency Impact Network Status Network Rail **Yorkshire Water** Treatment Works **Environment Agency** Constraints LCC Ecology support Ecology boundary Education comments Flood Risk Utilities Gas Electric Fire and Rescue Telecoms Other English Heritage Natural England

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site		
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site
11/03199/FU	Two blocks of flats total of 9 flats	W	100

HLA26036 7 Grosvenor Road LS6				
11/04251/EXT	Extension of time period for planning application 07/03854/FU for detached 3 storey block of 3 two bed and 2 one bed flats	A	100	
13/03019/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3 and 4 of Planning Application 11/04939/FU	Α	100	
11/04939/FU	One block of 7 flats	Α	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		
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner Sou	th RA 0.00	% overlap
LB Corrid	or RA 0.00	
EASI	EL RA 0.00	
Aire Valle	ey RA 0.00	
West Leeds Gat	eway 0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %		0.00
Nissusset tusin station		Dumlan Damle
Nearest train station		Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)		1126.32
Nearest bus stop		10821
Nearest bus stop distance (m)		226.33
Agricultural classificat	ion	Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

HLA26036 7 Grosvenor Road LS6

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps]
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

HLA26036 Royal Park Road LS6

Site Deta	ails							
Easting	428389	Northing	435037	Site area ha	0.2		SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area			·	Wa	ırd	Headingley	

Site Characteristics

Γ		B 61.1.1
П	Site type	Brownfield

On-site land uses - None

Adjacent land uses - None

Other land uses - None

Topography	Landscape	
Boundaries	Road front	

Descri	ntion
DESCHI	puon

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/cons	titue ribbon development?	
Would development result in an i	solated development?	
Is the site well connected to the I		
Would development round off the		
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?		
Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion		

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would 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		
Does the site provide access		
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildi		
Are these buildings used fo		
Encroachment Conclusion	3 1 1	L

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

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

14/00158/COND

HLA26036 Royal	Park Road LS6				
SHLAA conclusions					
Availability:	Suitability:		Achi	evability:	
Summary of infra	astructure provider comments				
Highways Agency					
Impact	Network Status				
Network Rail					
Yorkshire Water					
Treatment Works					
Environment Agen	су				
Constraints					
LCC	1				
Ecology support					
Ecology boundary					
Education comments					
Flood Risk					
Utilities					
Gas					
Electric					
Fire and Rescue]				
Telecoms					
	1				
Other English Heritage					
3 3	1				
Natural England					
Planning History App Number	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more Proposal	re than 50% of the site	Decision	% of site	

Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 5, 16, 21 and 29 of Planning Application 11/03335/FU

Α

100

HLA26036 Royal Park Road LS6

Reserved matters application for nine flats, one retail unit and one office unit (Use class B1) NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 14/00134/RM Replacement sliding door on the front (south elevation)of the building, replacement glazing to the window on the front (south elevations)of the building and replacement delivery door to the rear (north elevation) of the building.	M05	100	
Reserved Matters Application for Nine flats, one retail unit and one office unit (Use class B1)	Α	100	
Variation of condition 8 (development occupation) of approval 11/03335/FU to allow phased completion	W	100	
Extension of time of application 08/06821/OT for outline application to erect 3 storey block of 27 flats and one retail unit and one A2 unit.	Α	100	
Variation of conditions 26 and 27 of previous approval 11/01399/OT to allow opening hours to be 07.00 to 23.00 hours Monday to Sunday and hours of delivery, loading, unloading and refuse collection to be 07.00 to 18.30 Monday to Sunday including Bank Holidays	Α	100	
Variation of conditions 8 (developent occupation) and 15 (servicing and delivery vehicles) of planning application 11/01399/OT	Α	100	
Nine flats, one retail unit and one office unit (Use class B1)	Α	100	
Reserved matters application for nine flats, one retail unit and one office unit (Use class B1)	Α	100	
Outline application to erect single storey retail unit, with 3 storey attached block, comprising office and 10 two bedroom flats, with car parking	R	100	
	and one office unit (Use class B1) NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 14/00134/RM Replacement sliding door on the front (south elevation) of the building, replacement glazing to the window on the front (south elevations) of the building and replacement delivery door to the rear (north elevation) of the building. Reserved Matters Application for Nine flats, one retail unit and one office unit (Use class B1) Variation of condition 8 (development occupation) of approval 11/03335/FU to allow phased completion Extension of time of application 08/06821/OT for outline application to erect 3 storey block of 27 flats and one retail unit and one A2 unit. Variation of conditions 26 and 27 of previous approval 11/01399/OT to allow opening hours to be 07.00 to 23.00 hours Monday to Sunday and hours of delivery, loading, unloading and refuse collection to be 07.00 to 18.30 Monday to Sunday including Bank Holidays Variation of conditions 8 (developent occupation) and 15 (servicing and delivery vehicles) of planning application 11/01399/OT Nine flats, one retail unit and one office unit (Use class B1) Reserved matters application for nine flats, one retail unit and one office unit (Use class B1) Outline application to erect single storey retail unit, with 3 storey attached block, comprising office and 10 two	and one office unit (Use class B1) NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 14/00134/RM Replacement sliding door on the front (south elevation)of the building , replacement glazing to the window on the front (south elevations)of the building and replacement delivery door to the rear (north elevation) of the building. Reserved Matters Application for Nine flats, one retail unit and one office unit (Use class B1) Variation of condition 8 (development occupation) of approval 11/03335/FU to allow phased completion Extension of time of application 08/06821/OT for outline application to erect 3 storey block of 27 flats and one retail unit and one A2 unit. Variation of conditions 26 and 27 of previous approval 11/01399/OT to allow opening hours to be 07.00 to 23.00 hours Monday to Sunday and hours of delivery, loading, unloading and refuse collection to be 07.00 to 18.30 Monday to Sunday including Bank Holidays Variation of conditions 8 (developent occupation) and 15 (servicing and delivery vehicles) of planning application 11/01399/OT Nine flats, one retail unit and one office unit (Use class B1) Reserved matters application for nine flats, one retail unit and one office unit (Use class B1) Qutline application to erect single storey retail unit, with 3 storey attached block, comprising office and 10 two	and one office unit (Use class B1) NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 14/00134/RM Replacement sliding door on the front (south elevation) of the building , replacement glazing to the window on the front (south elevations) of the building and replacement delivery door to the rear (north elevation) of the building. Reserved Matters Application for Nine flats, one retail unit and one office unit (Use class B1) Variation of condition 8 (development occupation) of approval 11/03335/FU to allow phased completion Extension of time of application 08/06821/OT for outline application to erect 3 storey block of 27 flats and one retail unit and one A2 unit. Variation of conditions 26 and 27 of previous approval 11/01399/OT to allow opening hours to be 07.00 to 23.00 hours Monday to Sunday and hours of delivery, loading, unloading and refuse collection to be 07.00 to 18.30 Monday to Sunday including Bank Holidays Variation of conditions 8 (developent occupation) and 15 (servicing and delivery vehicles) of planning application 11/01399/OT Nine flats, one retail unit and one office unit (Use class B1) A 100 Reserved matters application for nine flats, one retail unit and one office unit (Use class B1) Outline application to erect single storey retail unit, with 3 storey attached block, comprising office and 10 two

Spatial relationships

UDP Designations

0.00	% overlap
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
0.00	
	0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00

Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	100.00
Major Settlement	0.00
Minor Settlement	0.00
Overlaps Urban Extension	V

% overlap

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %		0.00
Nearest train station		Burley Park
Nearest train station distance (m)		507.97
Nearest bus stop		9743
Nearest bus stop distance ((m)	46.13

HLA26036 Royal Park Road LS6

Agricultural classification U	Jrban
3	
Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	ed
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100n	m

HLA26036 Royal Park Road LS6

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
DPP Allocation	
Identified housing site	
DPP Allocation Conclusion	
Site with current or recently expired	d planning permission or existing UDP allocation. Principle of residential development accepted

HLA34023 Chapeltown Rd/Savile Road LS7

Site Deta	ails						
Easting	430812	Northing	435423	Site area ha	0.1	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Chapel Alle	erton
Site Cha	racteristic	cs					
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 unresticted 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 pres	erve this character?	
Character Conclusion		

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

HLA34023 Chapeltown Rd/Savile Road LS7				
SHLAA conclusion	s			
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:		
Summary of infi	rastructure provider comments			
Highways Agency	,			
Impact	Network Status			
Network Rail				
Yorkshire Water				
Treatment Works				
Environment Agei Constraints	ncy			
LCC				
Ecology support				
Ecology boundary				
Education comments	3			
Flood Risk				
Utilities Gas				
Electric				
Fire and Rescue				
Telecoms				
	'			
Other				
English Heritage				
Nichtural Furthern				
Natural England				
L				
Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering mor	re than 50% of the site		

Platining Pristory Applications since 1/1/2003, covering more than 50 % of the site				
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
09/02703/FU	Use of vacant land to hand car wash and valeting facility including new gantry, 2 new buildings and 2 new steel lock	R	99	

HLA34023 Chapeltown Rd/Savile Road LS7

	•					
	of 3 years					
09/00696/FU	Use of vacant land to hand car wash and valeting facility including new canopy, two new temporary buildings and 2 new steel lock up units	R	99			
09/00767/ADV	3 internally illuminated canopy signs and 3 non illuminated wall signs to car wash	W	99			

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy

100.00 % overlap	100.0	Main Urban Area
0.00	0.0	Major Settlement
0.00	0.0	Minor Settlement
<u> </u>	V	Overlaps Urban Extension

Regeneration Areas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

_eeds City
2496.96
6597
95.87
_6

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	✓
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	1

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

HLA34023 Chapeltown Rd/Savile Road LS7

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 acce	pted

Topography

HLA34026 2 Grange View, Chapeltown, Leeds, LS7 4EP

Site Deta	Site Details							
Easting	430973	Northing	435719	Site area ha	0	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	IMCA Inner Area				Ward	Chapel Allerton		
Site Characteristics Site type Brownfield On-site land uses - None Adjacent land uses - None Other land uses - None								

Boundaries	Road front	
Description		

Landscape

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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	
	Do features provide bound	
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	

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to		
Can development pres		
Character Conclusion		

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

App Number

12/00817/COND

Proposal

Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4,

6 and 7 of Planning Application 10/04824/FU

HLA34026 2 Grange View, Chapeltown, Leeds, LS7 4EP **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

Decision

Α

% of site

100

HLA34026 2 Grange View, Chapeltown, Leeds, LS7 4EP					
10/04824/FU	Retrospective alterations to second floor including dormer window to rear and use of building as 6 flats	Α	100		
12/04415/FU	Change of use of basement to form managers office and studio flat	R	100		

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy	

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

_			_
Rea	eners	ation	Areas
IXCG		111011	AI Cas

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

Other Spatial Relationship

LCC ownership %	6 0.00
Nearest train station	Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (m	2834.04
Nearest bus stop	169
Nearest bus stop distance (m	32.66

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	✓
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	
Overlana Minarala Cafaguarda	
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarde	eu _
Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100r	m 🗆

HLA34026 2 Grange View, Chapeltown, Leeds, LS7 4EP

Conclusions	
Issues and Options Summary	
Site affects others?	
Sustainability summary	
Summary of reps	
Summary of reps	
Comments on phasing	
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	

Topography

HLA21047 137 DEWSBURY ROAD, HUNSLET, LEEDS, LS11 5NN

Site Details							
Easting	430136	Northing	431744	Site area ha	0	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	City and H	unslet
Site Characteristics							
Site type Brownfield On-site land uses - None							
Adjacent land uses - None							
Other land uses - None							

Boundaries	Road front	
Description		
Description		

Landscape

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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		
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

Strong defensible boundary	between site and urban area	
Does the site provide acces	s to the countryside	
Does the site include local/		
Areas of protected/unprote		
Site includes Grade 1, Grad		
Does the site contain buildi	ngs	
Are these buildings used fo	r agricultural purposes?	
Encroachment Conclusion		

Encroachment Conclusion

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

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

characteristics of openness and permanence

Natural England

Inner Area HLA21047 137 DEWSBURY ROAD, HUNSLET, LEEDS, LS11 5NN 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

Planning History	Applications since 1/1/2009, covering more than 50% of the site			
App Number	Proposal	Decision	% of site	
10/04288/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 5, 7, 11, 13 and 14 of Planning Application 10/03440/FU	Α	100	

HLA21047 137 DEWSBURY ROAD, HUNSLET, LEEDS, LS11 5NN					
10/01139/FU	Change of use and alterations including first and second floor rear extension of former public house to form 5 one bedroom flats and 4 studio flats with addition of bin store and cycle shed to rear	R	100		
10/03440/FU	Change of use and alterations including first and second floor rear extension of former public house to form 2 two bedroom flats, 4 one bedroom flats, and 2 studio flats with boundary wall/gate, bin store and car parking to rear	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	

Core Strategy

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

Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	100.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

Other Spatial Relationship

Overlaps N37 SLA
Sch. Ancient Mon.

LCC ownership	0.06	
Nearest train station		Leeds City
Nearest train station distance (r	1514.14	
Nearest bus st	12315	
Nearest bus stop distance (m)		63.18

0.00

Agricultural classification Urban

Overlaps SSSI	
Overlaps SEGI	
Overlaps LNA	
Overlaps LNR	
Overlaps Conservation Area	
Overlaps Listed Building	
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	
Overlaps Public Right of Way	
Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	
Overlaps EA Flood Zone	
Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	
Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	
Overlaps Pot. Contamination	_

Overlaps Minerals	Safeguarded
Overlans Minerals Safegu	arded 100m

HLA21047 137 DEWSBURY ROAD, HUNSLET, LEEDS, LS11 5NN

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 de	velopment accepted

HLA26038 25 MOORLAND AVENUE, WOODHOUSE, LEEDS, LS6 1AP

Site Details								
Easting	428746	Northing	434793	Site area ha	0	SP7	Main Urban Area Infill	
HMCA	Inner Area				Ward	Hyde Park	and Woodhouse	
Site Chai	racteristic	es						
Site type	Brownfield							
On-site land uses - None								
Adjacent land uses - None Other land uses - None								
Topograph	У				Landscape			
Boundarie	s				Road front			
Description								

Greenbelt Assessment - Not Required

1. Check the unresticted 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	i	
Do features provide bound		
Coalescence Conclusion		

3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroahment

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

4. Preserve the 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 $\frac{1}{2}$

App Number

10/04519/FU

Proposal

Change of use of house to 6 self contained flats

HLA26038 25 MOORLAND AVENUE, WOODHOUSE, LEEDS, LS6 1AP **SHLAA** conclusions Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Summary of infrastructure provider comments **Highways Agency** Network Status Impact **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

% of site

100

Decision

Α

HLA26038 25 MOORLAND AVENUE, WOODHOUSE, LEEDS, LS6 1AP

Spatial relationships

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

Core Strategy

100.00	% overlap
0.00	
0.00	
✓	
	0.00

% overlap

Reg	ene	erati	on	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

0.00	p %	LCC ownership
urley Park	F	Nearest train station
928.24		Nearest train station distance
8419		Nearest bus s
121.01	(m)	Nearest bus stop distance
rban	ition l	Agricultural classifica
	SSSI	Overlaps S
	EGI	Overlaps S
	LNA	Overlaps I
	LNR	Overlaps
✓	Area	Overlaps Conservation A
	ding	Overlaps Listed Build
	uffer	Overlaps Strat. Employment bu
	Way	Overlaps Public Right of \
	one '	Overlaps SFRA Flood Z
	'one	Overlaps EA Flood Z
	zard	Overlaps HSE Major Haz
	eline	Overlaps HSE Gas Pipe
	tion	Overlaps Pot. Contamina
	uarde	Overlaps Minerals Safeg

Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m

HLA26038 25 MOORLAND AVENUE, WOODHOUSE, LEEDS, LS6 1AP

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	