

Site Ref: 267

Site Name: Wykebridge Depot, Killingbeck Bridge, LS14

Site Details

Northing:	434154	Area sq m:	6378.62	Ward	Killingbeck and Seacroft
Easting:	434233	Area Ha:	0.637862	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Transport tracks & ways
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State:

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2071.45	Distance to bus stop (metres)	105.87
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	2463
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 267

Site Name: Wykebridge Depot, Killingbeck Bridge, LS14

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
34/200/04/OT	Outline application to erect mental health resource building	07/07/2004	01/10/2004	A	99.99
H34/254/88/	Alterations and extension, to form offices to side of offic es. (this item	18/07/1988	22/08/1988	A	98.46

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Development unrelated to existing development		<input type="checkbox"/>			

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 267

Site Name: Wykebridge Depot, Killingbeck Bridge, LS14

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: Yes Achievability: Short term (0-5yrs)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment	Rank (1-5)
4 buses per hour. Good accessibility to primary and secondary education and health Services.	5
Access Comments	Rank (1-5)
access achievable	5
Local network comment	Rank (1-5)
Possible spare capacity at the moment, but some concerns over the cumulative impact.	4
Mitigation measure	Total score
	14

Support?	Need to combine with other sites:	Suitability for partial development:
yes	no	n/a

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Wyke Beck Culvert capacity and other asset protection issues

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

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

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 267

Site Name: Wykebridge Depot, Killingbeck Bridge, LS14

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Vacant brownfield site. Suitable in principle for residential development.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

23

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Employment Conclusion:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 282

Site Name: Manston Lane

Site Details

Northing:	434878	Area sq m:	62991.49	Ward	ss Gates and Whinmoor
Easting:	437201	Area Ha:	6.299149	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale
 Existing Use 2: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility
 Other uses:
 Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	No Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1013.36	Distance to bus stop (metres)	131.59
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	5367
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
H32/335/75/	54, 553 litres (12, 000 gall) re placement oil storage tank to coach works.	18/04/1975	07/07/1975	A	52.13
H32/650/75/	Pre-fabricated store to coach works.	16/07/1975	15/09/1975	A	52.13
H32/845/75/	Alterations to form new stores , offices and computer room, and extension to form new fire escape staircase, to fire-da	23/09/1975	08/12/1975	A	52.13
H32/87/78/	Alterations, including brickin g up of 4 windows, to wo rkshop.	31/01/1978	06/03/1978	A	52.13
H32/1008/79/	Alterations and extension, to form warehouse with loadi ng bay, with 10 car parking sp aces, to factory.	27/09/1979	29/10/1979	A	43.10
08/00298/OT	Outline application to layout access and erect residential development	18/01/2008	15/11/2012	A	100.00
H32/336/88/	Alterations and extension, to form offices, works, cante en and store, to light industr ial unit.	14/10/1988	04/11/1988	A	42.50
H32/201/90/	Laying out of car park, hardst anding, weighbridge and drain age to factory.	02/07/1990	08/11/1990	A	12.29
H32/79/87/	Part 1.8m high and part 2.4m high boundary fence to works .	30/04/1987	01/06/1987	A	54.03
H32/88/82/	Alterations and extension, to form timber store, to coach works.	05/03/1982	31/03/1982	A	52.90
32/144/96/FU	Two storey office extension to factory additional car parking spaces and landscaping	01/07/1996	01/11/1996	A	56.82
H32/32/76/	Alterations and extension, to form packing and despa tch area, to factory.	12/01/1976	08/03/1976	A	43.10
H32/486/76/	22730 litres (5000 gallons) fuel oil storage tank to fa ctory premises.	27/05/1976	02/08/1976	A	43.10
H32/1302/79/	Alterations and extension, to form replacement reel store, to fire damaged factory .	06/12/1979	21/01/1980	A	43.10
H32/275/80/	22, 730 litres underground petr ol storage tank, to works	12/03/1980	21/04/1980	A	44.09
H32/279/75/	Two pre-fabricated temporary s tores to coach works.	07/04/1975	17/06/1975	A	52.13
H32/48/82/	Alterations including 2 roller shutter doors, to side of co ach works.	08/02/1982	02/03/1982	A	52.59
H32/69/82/	Addition of 6 chimneys, to coa ch works.	22/02/1982	23/03/1982	A	53.00
H32/31/76/	Alterations and extension, to form additional cable manuf acturing area, to factory.	12/01/1976	08/03/1976	A	43.10
H32/62/76/	Resiting of one 9092.2 litre (2000 gall.) diesel tank with pump, and one 2 tonnes (2 tons) calor gas tank with pump,	16/01/1976	08/03/1976	A	43.10
32/77/99/FU	Extension to form spray booth to factory	09/04/1999	24/05/1999	A	43.13

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 282

Site Name: Manston Lane

H32/461/75/	34, 096 litre (7, 500 gal) replacement oil storage tank to co ach works.	22/05/1975	18/08/1975	A	52.13
H32/237/83/	Alterations and extension, to form timber store, to works .	05/07/1983	08/08/1983	A	50.82
H32/81/82/	Alterations, to existing timber store, to form workshop to co ach works.	01/03/1982	22/03/1982	A	52.82
06/06511/OT	Outline application to layout access and erect residential development	31/10/2006	05/04/2007	R	100.00
H32/43/82/	Alterations and extension, to form workshop with 2 store y offices and toilets, to work s.	03/02/1982	02/03/1982	A	44.04
H32/378/79/	Replacement detached prefabricated gate house unit to works .	02/05/1979	11/06/1979	A	52.04
H32/75/74/	Extension to enlarge packing, despatch and receiving departments to works.	22/04/1974	10/06/1974	A	43.10
H32/546/76/	Alterations and extension, to form enlarged factory area, to works premises.	16/06/1976	07/09/1976	A	43.10
13/00234/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 22 of Planning Application 08/00298/OT	15/01/2013		PCO	100.00
13/00288/RM	Reserved matters application for 177 houses, one block of 9 apartments and one block 6 apartments including associated landscaping	17/01/2013		PCO	100.00
H32/264/82/	Alterations and extension to form paint mix room to factory.	07/07/1982	09/08/1982	A	52.78
32/121/96/FU	Addition of chimney and 2 single storey and 1 two storey detached prefabricated office units to factory	07/06/1996	01/11/1996	A	56.82
H32/444/78/	Addition of primary gas meter kiosk to works.	05/05/1978	03/07/1978	A	54.73

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Development unrelated to existing development	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 282

Site Name: Manston Lane

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: Yes Physical Achievability: Short term (0-5yrs)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Has Planning Permission subject to S106

Rank (1-5)

5

Access Comments

Has Planning Permission subject to S106

Rank (1-5)

5

Local network comment

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

Rank (1-5)

5

Mitigation measure

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

Total score

15

Support?

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

Need to combine with other sites:

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

Suitability for partial development:

yes until Manston Lane Link Road is built

Highways Agency

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 :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 282

Site Name: Manston Lane

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Brownfield site. Planning permission granted for residential development 14/11/2012 (application no. 08/00298/OT).

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

189

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 807

Site Name: Strikes, Red Hall Lane, LS17

Site Details

Northing:	438358	Area sq m:	7816.77	Ward	ss Gates and Whinmoor
Easting:	434885	Area Ha:	0.781677	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Other
Existing Use 2:	Residential - Dwellings
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 2:	Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	Garden Centre
Site State:	Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	No Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	4154.42	Distance to bus stop (metres)	101.01
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	5154
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Garden Centre and carpark currently in use.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<input type="text"/>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
11/05078/FU	Demolition of buildings, laying out of access road and erect 20 houses, with landscaping	05/12/2011	17/08/2012	A	99.20
32/17/98/FU	Alterations to form restaurant kitchen and toilets and extension to form covered area to rear of garden centre	13/01/1998	15/05/1998	A	74.36
32/277/05/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	27/06/2005	26/07/2006	A	99.99
11/01701/FU	Use of land as overflow car park	26/04/2011	22/06/2011	A	10.38
32/429/03/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	10/10/2003	21/10/2005	R	99.98
32/19/97/FU	Addition of entrance lobby to front of garden centre	03/02/1997	07/03/1997	A	99.22
07/06329/RM	Reserved matters application for the erection of 17 flats and 23 houses	10/10/2007		APPRET	99.99
11/01233/DEM	Determination for demolition of detached house	24/03/2011	15/04/2011	A	10.38
32/220/94/FU	1.8m high boundary fence to garden centre	09/09/1994	22/12/1994	A	99.93
11/01777/OT	Outline application for residential development	03/05/2011	14/09/2011	W	99.99
07/06327/FU	Variation of condition 5 of approval 32/277/05/OT to permit 17 flats and 23 houses	10/10/2007		APPRET	99.99
H32/1007/79/	Detached production greenhouse , to garden centre.	26/09/1979	03/12/1979	A	97.58
07/07024/FU	Laying out of access road and erection of 17 flats and 23 houses, with landscaping	07/11/2007	15/05/2008	R	99.99
H32/25/86/	Alterations and extension, to form enlarged greenhouse, with office and boiler room, to garden centre.	31/01/1986	17/03/1986	A	97.56
32/178/03/OT	Outline application to erect 44 flats and 9 dwelling houses	26/11/2002	03/07/2003	W	99.99
12/03754/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 of Planning Application 11/05078/FU	29/08/2012	07/05/2013	A	99.20

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Development unrelated to existing development		<input type="checkbox"/>			

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 807

Site Name: Strikes, Red Hall Lane, LS17

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs)

Suitability: Yes

Achievability: Short term (0-5yrs)

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

20

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Employment Conclusion:

Site Ref: 1094A

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

Site Details

Northing:	438171	Area sq m:	300840.98	Ward	Harewood
Easting:	436765	Area Ha:	30.084098	HMCA:	Outer North East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2:	Office
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	3755.68	Distance to bus stop (metres)	225.88
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	4987
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Very large site set around Scholes (north, west, south). Western boundary links to East Leeds extension.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1094A

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
H32/194/83/	Change of use of agricultural sheds to boarding kennels and cattery.	07/06/1983	18/07/1983	A	33.36
12/02571/OT	Outline Application for means of access and erect residential development (circa 2000 dwellings), retail, health centre, community centre and primary school development, with associated drainage and landscaping	08/06/2012		PCO	34.12

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Coalescence/merging settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have marginal effect on the setting & special character of historic features, which c

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

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

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Development unrelated to existing development		<input type="checkbox"/>			

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1094A

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

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

Rank (1-5)

1

Access Comments

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

Rank (1-5)

2

Local network comment

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

Rank (1-5)

1

Mitigation measure

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

Total score

4

Support?

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - No

Need to combine with other sites:

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - no, however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to

Suitability for partial development:

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - possibly

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Boundary Amendment

[Empty box for West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer comments]

[Empty box for Boundary Amendment]

Natural England:

Education

[Empty box for Education]

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

[Empty box for Environment Agency Comments]

[Empty box for Environment Agency Constraints]

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

[Empty box for Yorkshire Water Comments]

[Empty box for Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme]

LCC Flood Risk Management:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1094A

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 12854 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1094B

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

Site Details

Northing:	436638	Area sq m:	758577.65	Ward:	Harewood
Easting:	437491	Area Ha:	75.857765	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 1: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 2: Community Services - Places of worship
 Neighbouring Use 3: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
 Other uses:
 Site State:

Site Detail

Topography:	Undulating	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2501.95	Distance to bus stop (metres)	275.79
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	11925
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	2.57	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.93	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1094B

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

Planning History

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1094B

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Partial
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Coalescence/merging settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have a significant effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

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

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Development unrelated to existing development	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1094B

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

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

Rank (1-5)

1

Access Comments

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

Rank (1-5)

2

Local network comment

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

Rank (1-5)

1

Mitigation measure

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

Total score

4

Support?

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - No

Need to combine with other sites:

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - no, however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to

Suitability for partial development:

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - possibly

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

[Empty text box]

Boundary Amendment

[Empty text box]

Natural England:

Education

[Empty text box]

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

[Empty text box]

Environment Agency Constraints:

[Empty text box]

Yorkshire Water Comments:

[Empty text box]

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

[Empty text box]

LCC Flood Risk Management:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1094B

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1094B

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

34

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

0

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Employment Conclusion:

Site Ref: 1094B

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

Site Details

Northing:	436638	Area sq m:	758577.65	Ward:	Harewood
Easting:	437491	Area Ha:	75.857765	HMCA:	Outer North East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 1: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 2: Community Services - Places of worship
 Neighbouring Use 3: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
 Other uses:
 Site State:

Site Detail

Topography:	Undulating	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2501.95	Distance to bus stop (metres)	275.79
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	11925
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	2.57	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.93	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1094B

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

Planning History

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Partial
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Coalescence/merging settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have a significant effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

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

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Development unrelated to existing development	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1094B

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

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

Rank (1-5)

1

Access Comments

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

Rank (1-5)

2

Local network comment

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

Rank (1-5)

1

Mitigation measure

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

Total score

4

Support?

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - No

Need to combine with other sites:

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - no, however there are lots of other sites around Scholes that could contribute to

Suitability for partial development:

Whole Site (1094A and 1094B) - possibly

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1094B

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1094B

Site Name: Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

34

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

0

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Employment Conclusion:

Site Ref: 1295B

Site Name: Land to the east of Skelton Lake

Site Details

Northing:	430461	Area sq m:	284739.69	Ward	Garforth and Swillington
Easting:	435472	Area Ha:	28.473969	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	Forestry - Managed Forest
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Other
Neighbouring Use 2:	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 3:	Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
Other uses:	Landfill (Operational)
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat (sloping in parts)	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	0.00	Distance to bus stop (metres)	0.00
Nearest Railway Station		Bus Stop ID	
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.04	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1295B

Site Name: Land to the east of Skelton Lake

Planning History

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Yes
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

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

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Development unrelated to existing development	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1295B

Site Name: Land to the east of Skelton Lake

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

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

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Good vehicular access can be achieved onto jct 45, but the opportunity for more than one access point is limited

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

Capacity exists on the East Leeds Link Road. Potential issues at Jct 45 when all Aire Valley built out

Rank (1-5)

4

Mitigation measure

Likely to require significant physical mitigation on Strategic Road Network & dependent on improved Public Transport and local services

Total score

10

Support?

yes with mitigation (all dwellings must be within 400m of bus stop meeting)

Need to combine with other sites:

requires development in East Leeds Link Road corridor to facilitate PT and other local services

Suitability for partial development:

the larger the development the greater scope for accessibility improvements

Highways Agency

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1295B

Site Name: Land to the east of Skelton Lake

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Development of the site would represent a rounding off the urban area (subject to existing development site 1295a being developed for residential). The canal to the south and neighbouring sites to the east and west would ensure that a low potential for future unrestricted sprawl exists. The site would need to share services, such as a primary school, health and local shopping with the adjacent site and wouldn't be sustainable as a stand alone site. The site adjoins sensitive natural habitats along the River Aire corridor and includes areas of mature woodland, which would require

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 0 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Employment Conclusion:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1297

Site Name: Former Vickers Tank Factory Site, Manston Lane, Cross Gates

Site Details

Northing:	434558	Area sq m:	214911.59	Ward	ss Gates and Whinmoor
Easting:	437469	Area Ha:	21.491159	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale
 Existing Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale
 Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	No Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1190.69	Distance to bus stop (metres)	167.10
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	11579
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	79.04
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
H32/384/77/	Single storey workshop block, with 2 storey offices, toilets, and vehicle preparation bay, to royal ordnance f	16/05/1977	01/08/1977	A	73.97
H32/5/82/	Detached 3 storey design offices, with toilets and plant room, to factory. (this item appears for informatio	05/01/1982	18/01/1982	A	97.26
H32/71/85/	Alterations to form oil store and oil store, to works hops.	10/04/1985	04/07/1985	W	96.96
H32/265/84/	Alterations including new roof , fascia and window, to facto ry canteen. (this item	02/11/1984	17/12/1984	A	97.03
H32/690/80/	25m high lighting mast to fact ory. (this item appears for i nformation only, being notific ation under the department	03/09/1980	29/09/1980	A	97.10
H32/802/76/	Alterations and extension, to form additional works hop, to works premises.	24/09/1976	01/11/1976	A	73.97
H32/699/78/	Alterations and extension, to form surgery to facto ry canteen.	19/07/1978	11/09/1978	A	73.97
H32/162/79/	Alterations and first floor ex tension, to form offices, store and armoury to factory police post. (this item	14/03/1979	14/05/1979	A	73.97
H32/731/77/	Alterations and extension to f orm store, with 2 store y offices, to ordnance factory . (this item appears fo	01/09/1977	24/10/1977	A	73.97
32/131/96/FU	2 detached storage buildings to factory	17/06/1996	27/09/1996	A	99.30
H32/256/83/	Alterations and top floor exte nsion to form offices to facto ry .(this item is for informat ion only being notificati	21/07/1983	29/07/1983	A	97.01
H32/204/78/	Demolition of existing buildin gs, alterations and exten sions and erection of new buil dings to factory. (this item	09/03/1978	03/04/1978	A	73.97
32/374/01/FU	Change of use of former tank factory to b8 (storage and distribution)	20/11/2001	26/07/2002	A	95.75
09/04999/OT	Outline application for residential (C3), employment (B1c), health centre (D1), foodstore (A1), ancillary uses (A1/A2/A3/A4), community building (A4/D2), associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure	17/11/2009		PCO	92.42
H32/161/79/	Alterations and extension, to form enlarged workshop and new instruction rooms, to facto ry apprentice training c	14/03/1979	14/05/1979	A	73.97
H32/218/86/	Laying out of accesses and ere ction of factory, inclu ding assembly area, test areas , stores, offices, dining roo	21/10/1986	26/11/1986	A	97.15

Site Ref: 1297

Site Name: Former Vickers Tank Factory Site, Manston Lane, Cross Gates

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------|
| Main Urban Area | <input type="checkbox"/> | Main Urban Area Extension | <input type="checkbox"/> | Brownfield | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major Settlement | <input type="checkbox"/> | Major Settlement Extension | <input type="checkbox"/> | Greenfield | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Smaller Settlement | <input type="checkbox"/> | Smaller Settlement Extension | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mixed | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Villages/Rural | <input type="checkbox"/> | Village/Rural Extension | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Development unrelated to existing development | | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | |

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1297

Site Name: Former Vickers Tank Factory Site, Manston Lane, Cross Gates

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Medium term (6-10 y) Suitability: Yes Physical Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

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

Rank (1-5)

3

Access Comments

Adequate frontage. Ghost Island required

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

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

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

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

Total score

10

Support?

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

Need to combine with other sites:

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

Suitability for partial development:

no

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail :

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

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

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

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1297

Site Name: Former Vickers Tank Factory Site, Manston Lane, Cross Gates

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

645

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1359

Site Name: Rothwell Garden Centre, Wood Lane, Rothwell, LS26

Site Details

Northing:	429190	Area sq m:	31555.92	Ward	Rothwell
Easting:	433091	Area Ha:	3.155592	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2:	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 3:	Industry and business - Wholesale distribution
Other uses:	Garden Centre on part of site
Site State:	Mixed

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	No Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	3731.73	Distance to bus stop (metres)	99.10
Nearest Railway Station	Woodlesford	Bus Stop ID	8739
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	14.87
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.88	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1359

Site Name: Rothwell Garden Centre, Wood Lane,
Rothwell, LS26

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
H22/10/86/	Use of agricultural site as garden centre.	22/01/1986	29/07/1987	A	23.15
21/246/92/FU	Use of agricultural site as garden centre	04/08/1992	10/11/1992	A	22.10
H21/261/89/	Outline application to erect detached house to nursery site. (site area 0.01ha)	09/08/1989	18/12/1989	A	49.39
21/361/92/FU	Use of agricultural site and retention of detached building to form garden centre	22/12/1992	28/02/1995	A	49.48

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1359

Site Name: Rothwell Garden Centre, Wood Lane, Rothwell, LS26

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Yes
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Mixed brown and greenfield site in Rothwell. The site relates well to the settlement being essentially an infill site between existing development and would not set a precedent for sprawl.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Development unrelated to existing development	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1359

Site Name: Rothwell Garden Centre, Wood Lane, Rothwell, LS26

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

4 buses per hour, Most of the site (70%) has access to primary education & employment

Rank (1-5)

4

Access Comments

Access ok from Wood Lane

Rank (1-5)

5

Local network comment

cumulative issues

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Total score

12

Support?

Yes

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Water mains along road frontage

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Lemonroyd

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 1359

Site Name: Rothwell Garden Centre, Wood Lane, Rothwell, LS26

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Mixed brown and greenfield site in Rothwell. The site relates well to the settlement being essentially an infill site between existing development and would not set a precedent for sprawl. Only part of the site is in Outer South area, the rest is in East Leeds - capacity and area given are for the proportion within Outer South. (1.49ha, 47 capacity in adjacent hmca)

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

83

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2039

Site Name: Thorpe Park, undeveloped non-submitted land

Site Details

Northing:	434078	Area sq m:	346670.67	Ward	Temple Newsam
Easting:	437977	Area Ha:	34.667067	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Office
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1733.11	Distance to bus stop (metres)	435.01
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	9907
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	100.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	Yes	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	1.64	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	1.94		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
PREAPP/06/00221	Revised master plan for Thorpe Park	01/11/2006		PCO	84.97
32/199/94/OT	Outline application to layout business park green park and access roads	08/09/1994	04/10/1995	A	99.64
32/355/01/RM	Laying out of new access and roundabout diverting footpaths and bridleway and construction of cycleway/footpath -option 1	01/11/2001	22/01/2002	A	12.50
32/356/01/RM	Laying out of new access and roundabout diverting footpaths and bridleway and construction of cycleway/footpath-option 2	02/11/2001	22/01/2002	A	16.39
32/140/96/FU	Variation of condition no 21 of application no 32/199/94/0t (total floor area increased from 111500 sqm to 167220 sqm)	01/07/1996	31/03/2004	A	98.38
32/269/94/FU	Extraction of coal by opencast mining	09/12/1994	26/05/1995	R	58.69
32/124/94/FU	Extraction of coal by opencast mining m	07/05/1994	26/05/1995	R	59.58
32/148/05/FU	Variation of condition no.9 of permission ref 32/140/96/fu (completion of access roads related to gross floor area)	22/03/2005	13/05/2005	A	98.38
32/44/05/FU	Variation of condition no 17 of permission 32/140/96/fu (foul & surface water drainage)	27/01/2005	15/04/2005	A	99.64
32/130/97/FU	Variation of conditions nos 17 and 19 of application number 32/199/94/o t (access arrangement and floor area)	23/06/1997	04/01/1999	A	98.38
32/156/05/RM	Phase 6 infrastructure planting to access road and roundabout and landscaping adjacent plots 5100 to 5500	07/04/2005	15/02/2007	W	31.55
12/03887/FU	Detailed Application for the Manston Lane Link Road (North - South Route)	10/09/2012		PCO	22.40
12/03886/OT	Outline Planning Application for mixed use development comprising offices (business park) (B1A), (B) and (C), retail and bar/restaurant (A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5), hotel (C1), leisure facilities (D1, D2), multi-storey car park, together with internal roads, car parking, landscaping and drainage.	10/09/2012		PCO	98.96

Site Ref: 2039

Site Name: Thorpe Park, undeveloped non-submitted land

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------|
| Main Urban Area | <input type="checkbox"/> | Main Urban Area Extension | <input type="checkbox"/> | Brownfield | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major Settlement | <input type="checkbox"/> | Major Settlement Extension | <input type="checkbox"/> | Greenfield | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Smaller Settlement | <input type="checkbox"/> | Smaller Settlement Extension | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mixed | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Villages/Rural | <input type="checkbox"/> | Village/Rural Extension | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Development unrelated to existing development | | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | |

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2039

Site Name: Thorpe Park, undeveloped non-submitted land

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Unknown

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

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

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Reliant on the construction of the Manston Lane Link Road

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

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

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

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

Total score

8

Support?

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

Need to combine with other sites:

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

Suitability for partial development:

no

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail :

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

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). No site designations but parts of the site are likely to meet Local Wildlife Site criteria based on wetland, amphibians and mosaic of habitats criteria. Great Crested News to consider. Needs to be assessed against Local Wildlife Site

Boundary Amendment

Site assessment needed against Local Wildlife Sites criteria.

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2039

Site Name: Thorpe Park, undeveloped non-submitted land

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

200

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2040

Site Name: Temple Point, Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton

Site Details

Northing:	432725	Area sq m:	25629.34	Ward	Garforth and Swillington
Easting:	437704	Area Ha:	2.562934	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Storage
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Transport - Transport tracks & ways
 Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings
 Other uses:
 Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	No Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2231.90	Distance to bus stop (metres)	323.63
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	7932
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
32/195/99/OT	Outline application to form access and erect a business park	20/08/1999	20/12/2001	A	99.99
32/188/02/RM	Laying out of access road site levelling and landscaping to proposed business park	25/04/2002	15/11/2002	A	99.99
07/9/00621/MOD	Laying out of access road site levelling and landscaping to proposed business park Non Material Amendment: Revised layout and grace landscaping layout.	29/11/2007	10/12/2007	M01	99.99
12/03712/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16 and 17 of Planning Application 12/01422/FU	23/08/2012		PCO	95.24
32/194/99/FU	Four two storey business units	20/08/1999	05/02/2002	W	28.16
12/01422/FU	Erection of 86 houses and associated greenspace	29/03/2012	02/08/2012	A	95.24
12/9/00203/MOD	Erection of 86 houses and associated greenspace NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 12/01422/FU: House type substitutions to Plots 39, 40, 44, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 56, 57, 74, 75, 78, 79, 15, 16, 17, 66 and 67	04/10/2012	13/11/2012	M01	95.24
12/04236/FU	Variation of condition 3 of Planning Application 12/01422/FU (Erection of 86 houses and associated greenspace) to allow use of alternative materials	04/10/2012	03/01/2013	A	95.24
32/449/04/OT	Variation of condition 2 of permission 32/195/99/ot (time limit)	30/11/2004	26/01/2005	A	96.75
08/03752/FU	Laying out of access and erection of 3 storey office block with 28 car parking spaces and landscaping	20/06/2008	18/09/2008	R	11.35
11/02402/FU	Erection of 86 houses and associated greenspace	02/06/2011	02/03/2012	R	98.17

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Development unrelated to existing development		<input type="checkbox"/>			

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2040

Site Name: Temple Point, Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Has Planning Permission

Rank (1-5)

5

Access Comments

Has Planning Permission

Rank (1-5)

5

Local network comment

Has Planning Permission

Rank (1-5)

5

Mitigation measure

Has Planning Permission

Total score

15

Support?

Yes - has planning permission

Need to combine with other sites:

No

Suitability for partial development:

n/a

Highways Agency

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 :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2040

Site Name: Temple Point, Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

86

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2062

Site Name: Redhall (East Leeds Extension)

Site Details

Northing:	438589	Area sq m:	143334.74	Ward	ss Gates and Whinmoor
Easting:	434853	Area Ha:	14.333474	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Office
 Existing Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
 Existing Use 3: Other
 Neighbouring Use 1
 Neighbouring Use 2:
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses: LCC depot
 Site State: Greenfield/brownfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	4382.31	Distance to bus stop (metres)	225.95
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	9531
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	15.20	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes
-------------------------------------	-----	---------------------------------------------	-----

<i>Site</i>	<i>Site Type</i>
Redhall Composting Whinmoor Lane	General Waste Management Sites

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
32/261/94/LI	Listed building application to lay out car park two storey rear extension and 2m high boundary fence to offices	28/11/1994	09/03/1995	W	13.93
32/171/04/LI	Listed building application to carry out alterations and demolish part of outbuildings and reroof outbuildings	26/04/2004	21/06/2004	A	13.93
09/04381/FU	3 additional detached prefabricated office units to offices	09/10/2009		APPRET	14.18
32/262/94/FU	Laying out of car park two storey rear extension and 2 metre high boundary fence to offices	28/11/1994	09/03/1995	W	13.93
32/170/04/FU	Alterations and new roof to outbuilding and laying out of car parking to offices	26/04/2004	21/06/2004	A	13.93
32/437/05/RE	Renewal of application ref 32/80/03/fu (retention of two prefabricated office units)	01/11/2005	14/12/2005	A	14.18
09/00610/LI	Listed Building Application for 2 linked detached prefabricated office units to offices	12/02/2009	09/04/2009	A	14.18
32/95/04/CLU	Certificate of lawfulness for use as storage of timber shredding and mulch and compost storage	02/02/2003	05/05/2005	A	10.56
32/228/94/FU	Change of use of existing premises to offices with museum area and car park, boundary fence and rugby pitch	14/10/1994	25/11/1994	A	13.93
32/438/05/LI	Listed building application to retain 2 prefabricated office units to rugby football league offices	28/10/2005	13/12/2005	A	14.18
08/06337/FU	Retention of 2 detached linked prefabricated office units to offices	30/10/2008	09/02/2009	A	14.18
09/04382/LI	Listed Building Application for 3 additional detached prefabricated office units to offices	09/10/2009		APPRET	14.18

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Partial
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Part Green Belt site (northern section, majority of site is an employment allocation on the existing UDP. The site is within the current planning brief for the East Leeds extension alongside the wider Redhall site and would be suitable for residential de

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Partial
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Part Green Belt site (northern section, majority of site is an employment allocation on the existing UDP. The site is within the current planning brief for the East Leeds extension alongside the wider Redhall site and would be suitable for residential de

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Development unrelated to existing development	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2062

Site Name: Redhall (East Leeds Extension)

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Medium term (6-10 y) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

3/2 buses per hour, limited access to other services, full East Leeds Extension allocation should improve offer

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

access options available

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

provision of East Leeds Orbital Road should mitigate local impacts

Rank (1-5)

4

Mitigation measure

provision of East Leeds Orbital Road and improved Public Transport

Total score

10

Support?

yes with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

Awaiting Comments

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2062

Site Name: Redhall (East Leeds Extension)

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

100

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2062

Site Name: Redhall (East Leeds Extension)

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Employment Conclusion:

Site Ref: 2062

Site Name: Redhall (East Leeds Extension)

Site Details

Northing:	438589	Area sq m:	143334.74	Ward	ss Gates and Whinmoor
Easting:	434853	Area Ha:	14.333474	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Office
 Existing Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
 Existing Use 3: Other
 Neighbouring Use 1
 Neighbouring Use 2:
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses: LCC depot
 Site State: Greenfield/brownfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	4382.31	Distance to bus stop (metres)	225.95
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	9531
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	15.20	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes
-------------------------------------	-----	---------------------------------------------	-----

<i>Site</i>	<i>Site Type</i>
Redhall Composting Whinmoor Lane	General Waste Management Sites

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
32/261/94/LI	Listed building application to lay out car park two storey rear extension and 2m high boundary fence to offices	28/11/1994	09/03/1995	W	13.93
32/171/04/LI	Listed building application to carry out alterations and demolish part of outbuildings and reroof outbuildings	26/04/2004	21/06/2004	A	13.93
09/04381/FU	3 additional detached prefabricated office units to offices	09/10/2009		APPRET	14.18
32/262/94/FU	Laying out of car park two storey rear extension and 2 metre high boundary fence to offices	28/11/1994	09/03/1995	W	13.93
32/170/04/FU	Alterations and new roof to outbuilding and laying out of car parking to offices	26/04/2004	21/06/2004	A	13.93
32/437/05/RE	Renewal of application ref 32/80/03/fu (retention of two prefabricated office units)	01/11/2005	14/12/2005	A	14.18
09/00610/LI	Listed Building Application for 2 linked detached prefabricated office units to offices	12/02/2009	09/04/2009	A	14.18
32/95/04/CLU	Certificate of lawfulness for use as storage of timber shredding and mulch and compost storage	02/02/2003	05/05/2005	A	10.56
32/228/94/FU	Change of use of existing premises to offices with museum area and car park, boundary fence and rugby pitch	14/10/1994	25/11/1994	A	13.93
32/438/05/LI	Listed building application to retain 2 prefabricated office units to rugby football league offices	28/10/2005	13/12/2005	A	14.18
08/06337/FU	Retention of 2 detached linked prefabricated office units to offices	30/10/2008	09/02/2009	A	14.18
09/04382/LI	Listed Building Application for 3 additional detached prefabricated office units to offices	09/10/2009		APPRET	14.18

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Partial
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Part Green Belt site (northern section, majority of site is an employment allocation on the existing UDP. The site is within the current planning brief for the East Leeds extension alongside the wider Redhall site and would be suitable for residential de

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Partial
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Part Green Belt site (northern section, majority of site is an employment allocation on the existing UDP. The site is within the current planning brief for the East Leeds extension alongside the wider Redhall site and would be suitable for residential de

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Development unrelated to existing development	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2062

Site Name: Redhall (East Leeds Extension)

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Medium term (6-10 y) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

3/2 buses per hour, limited access to other services, full East Leeds Extension allocation should improve offer

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

access options available

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

provision of East Leeds Orbital Road should mitigate local impacts

Rank (1-5)

4

Mitigation measure

provision of East Leeds Orbital Road and improved Public Transport

Total score

10

Support?

yes with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

Awaiting Comments

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Boundary Amendment

[Empty text box for West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer comments]

[Empty text box for Boundary Amendment comments]

Natural England:

Education

[Empty text box for Education comments]

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

[Empty text box for Environment Agency Comments]

[Empty text box for Environment Agency Constraints]

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

[Empty text box for Yorkshire Water Comments]

[Empty text box for Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme]

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2062

Site Name: Redhall (East Leeds Extension)

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

100

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2062

Site Name: Redhall (East Leeds Extension)

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Employment Conclusion:

Site Ref: 2086

Site Name: Barrowby Lane, Manston, LS15

Site Details

Northing:	434040	Area sq m:	211732.61	Ward	Temple Newsam
Easting:	438586	Area Ha:	21.173261	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2:
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	No Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2110.07	Distance to bus stop (metres)	763.79
Nearest Railway Station	Garforth	Bus Stop ID	9907
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	29.12
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.06	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	92.54		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2086

Site Name: Barrowby Lane, Manston, LS15

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
32/269/94/FU	Extraction of coal by opencast mining	09/12/1994	26/05/1995	R	91.19
32/124/94/FU	Extraction of coal by opencast mining m	07/05/1994	26/05/1995	R	98.80

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

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

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Development unrelated to existing development	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2086

Site Name: Barrowby Lane, Manston, LS15

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

No Public Transport or other local services

Rank (1-5)

1

Access Comments

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

Rank (1-5)

1

Local network comment

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

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

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

Total score

4

Support?

no

Need to combine with other sites:

yes

Suitability for partial development:

no

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail :

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

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

[Empty text box for Environment Agency Comments]

Environment Agency Constraints:

[Empty text box for Environment Agency Constraints]

Yorkshire Water Comments:

[Empty text box for Yorkshire Water Comments]

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

[Empty text box for Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works]

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2086

Site Name: Barrowby Lane, Manston, LS15

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

553

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2087

Site Name: Crawshaw Wood, north of Barrowby Lane, Garforth, LS25

Site Details

Northing:	433867	Area sq m:	112624.46	Ward	Temple Newsam
Easting:	439091	Area Ha:	11.262446	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2:
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Undulating	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1582.56	Distance to bus stop (metres)	972.96
Nearest Railway Station	Garforth	Bus Stop ID	5745
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2087

Site Name: Crawshaw Wood, north of Barrowby Lane,
Garforth, LS25

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
32/124/94/FU	Extraction of coal by opencast mining m	07/05/1994	26/05/1995	R	41.88

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2087

Site Name: Crawshaw Wood, north of Barrowby Lane, Garforth, LS25

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

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

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Development unrelated to existing development		<input type="checkbox"/>			

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2087

Site Name: Crawshaw Wood, north of Barrowby Lane, Garforth, LS25

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Poor accessibility

Rank (1-5)

1

Access Comments

Barrowby Lane is only access route and is not suitable

Rank (1-5)

1

Local network comment

cumulative issues

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Total score

5

Support?

No

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

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 :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

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

Boundary Amendment

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

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2087

Site Name: Crawshaw Wood, north of Barrowby Lane, Garforth, LS25

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 266 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2090A

Site Name: Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton, LS15

Site Details

Northing:	432784	Area sq m:	62732.13	Ward	Temple Newsam
Easting:	437173	Area Ha:	6.273213	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	0.00	Distance to bus stop (metres)	0.00
Nearest Railway Station		Bus Stop ID	
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	86.20	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2090A

Site Name: Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton, LS15

Planning History

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Yes
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Site A is within the Green Belt, but has a road frontage and is well related to the existing settlement form.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Development unrelated to existing development		<input type="checkbox"/>			

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2090A

Site Name: Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton, LS15

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) is a Large site. Northern part of site meets standards but the greater part of the site does not.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

The whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) has long frontages with adopted highway on its eastern boundary and northeast boundary. Numerous access points would be required for a site so large. Access elsewhere is questionable.

Rank (1-5)

2

Local network comment

The whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) would require a detailed Transport Assessment. Likely that the network would be unsuitable. No realistic opportunity to provide mitigation.

Rank (1-5)

1

Mitigation measure

For the whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) Mitigation would be required but not achievable

Total score

5

Support?

The whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) no

Need to combine with other sites:

The whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) no

Suitability for partial development:

The whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) - yes, much smaller site required.

Highways Agency

Major Impact - Likely to require significant physical mitigation

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2090A

Site Name: Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton, LS15

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 165 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2090B

Site Name: Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton, LS15

Site Details

Northing:	432371	Area sq m:	873198.90	Ward	Temple Newsam
Easting:	436982	Area Ha:	87.31989	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Undulating	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	0.00	Distance to bus stop (metres)	0.00
Nearest Railway Station		Bus Stop ID	
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	96.07	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2090B

Site Name: Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton, LS15

Planning History

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have a significant effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

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

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Development unrelated to existing development		<input type="checkbox"/>			

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2090B

Site Name: Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton, LS15

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) is a Large site. Northern part of site meets standards but the greater part of the site does not.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

The whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) Site has long frontages with adopted highway on its eastern boundary and northeast boundary. Numerous access points would be required for a site so large. Access elsewhere is questionable.

Rank (1-5)

2

Local network comment

The whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) would require a detailed Transport Assessment. Likely that the network would be unsuitable. No realistic opportunity to provide mitigation.

Rank (1-5)

1

Mitigation measure

For the whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) Mitigation would be required but not achievable

Total score

5

Support?

The whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) no

Need to combine with other sites:

The whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) no

Suitability for partial development:

The whole site (Sites 2090A and 2090B) - yes, much smaller site required.

Highways Agency

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2090B

Site Name: Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton, LS15

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 0 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2144

Site Name: Cartmell Drive, Halton Moor

Site Details

Northing:	432776	Area sq m:	68710.21	Ward	Temple Newsam
Easting:	433909	Area Ha:	6.871021	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
 Neighbouring Use 3: Agriculture
 Other uses:
 Site State:

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2903.43	Distance to bus stop (metres)	206.33
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	7827
SFRA Flood Zone:	1.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	1.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	89.59
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	89.32	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2144

Site Name: Cartmell Drive, Halton Moor

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
21/192/97/FU	Laying out of footpaths childrens play area and landscaping to public open space	25/07/1997	12/09/1997	A	82.90
11/01258/LA	Outline application for residential development	25/03/2011	24/06/2011	A	17.52

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Development unrelated to existing development		<input type="checkbox"/>			

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2144

Site Name: Cartmell Drive, Halton Moor

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

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

Rank (1-5)

5

Access Comments

access achievable

Rank (1-5)

5

Local network comment

local congestion issues especially with the cumulative impact

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Total score

13

Support?

yes with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

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 :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but lies within the Wyke Beck Valley wildlife corridor and sub-regional GI corridor. A mixture of grassland and scrub of local conservation value that should be retained to avoid a further pinchpoint in this corridor in relation to loss of land adjacent to Wyke Beck further south in the Enterprise Zone.

Boundary Amendment

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary substantially amended as per drawing RM/2144. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent wildlife corridor are addressed.

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 2144

Site Name: Cartmell Drive, Halton Moor

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

The site is designated as greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace will need to be assessed in the greenspace review. See also greenspace section, page 22, question G11. However, the site is part of a wider area of greenspace to the west. Development would not encroach too much into this larger area as the valley is wider at this point. The site was formerly identified as a possible housing site on the now withdrawn EASEL Area Action Plan.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

310

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Employment Conclusion:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3079

Site Name: Land to the north east of Bell Hill Industrial Estate, Rothwell

Site Details

Northing:	429425	Area sq m:	30231.14	Ward	Rothwell
Easting:	433006	Area Ha:	3.023114	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Storage
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Poorly defined
Natural Landscape:	No Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	3830.88	Distance to bus stop (metres)	282.17
Nearest Railway Station	Woodlesford	Bus Stop ID	782
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.64	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3079

Site Name: Land to the north east of Bell Hill Industrial Estate, Rothwell

Planning History

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3079

Site Name: Land to the north east of Bell Hill Industrial Estate, Rothwell

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

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

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Development unrelated to existing development	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3079

Site Name: Land to the north east of Bell Hill Industrial Estate, Rothwell

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: No

Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

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

Rank (1-5)

4

Access Comments

requires adjacent site for access

Rank (1-5)

3

Local network comment

cumulative issues

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Total score

10

Support?

yes with adjacent site

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

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

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3079

Site Name: Land to the north east of Bell Hill Industrial Estate, Rothwell

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 79 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3111

Site Name: Moorhouse Farm, Wakefield Road, Garforth, LS25 1AS

Site Details

Northing:	433346	Area sq m:	50186.87	Ward	Garforth and Swillington
Easting:	439452	Area Ha:	5.018687	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2:
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1233.35	Distance to bus stop (metres)	343.78
Nearest Railway Station	Garforth	Bus Stop ID	12909
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3111

Site Name: Moorhouse Farm, Wakefield Road, Garforth,
LS25 1AS

Planning History

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3111

Site Name: Moorhouse Farm, Wakefield Road, Garforth, LS25 1AS

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

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

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Development unrelated to existing development		<input type="checkbox"/>			

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3111

Site Name: Moorhouse Farm, Wakefield Road, Garforth, LS25 1AS

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

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

Rank (1-5)

4

Access Comments

no frontage to highway, combine with adj site

Rank (1-5)

3

Local network comment

local congestion/capacity issues and unclear whether mitigation is possible

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

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

Total score

9

Support?

no

Need to combine with other sites:

yes

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

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

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

[Empty text box for Environment Agency Comments]

Environment Agency Constraints:

[Empty text box for Environment Agency Constraints]

Yorkshire Water Comments:

[Empty text box for Yorkshire Water Comments]

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

[Empty text box for Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments]

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3111

Site Name: Moorhouse Farm, Wakefield Road, Garforth, LS25 1AS

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

153

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Red

Employment Conclusion:

Red

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3118

Site Name: Land east of York Road, Seacroft, Leeds, LS14 2AD

Site Details

Northing:	436960	Area sq m:	33105.72	Ward	ss Gates and Whinmoor
Easting:	436397	Area Ha:	3.310572	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Retail - Restaurants and Cafes
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Undulating	Boundaries:	Poorly defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2515.94	Distance to bus stop (metres)	261.14
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	13484
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0.02	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3118

Site Name: Land east of York Road, Seacroft, Leeds,
LS14 2AD

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
20/43/05/FU	Variation of condition no 1 of deemed planning consent for north and east supertram (extension of time limit)	31/01/2005	25/07/2005	A	93.60
H32/137/78/	Cricket pavilion, comprising t ea room, 2 changing roomsstore , and toilets to sports field.	16/02/1978	02/10/1978	W	13.23

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3118

Site Name: Land east of York Road, Seacroft, Leeds, LS14 2AD

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Development unrelated to existing development		<input type="checkbox"/>			

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3118

Site Name: Land east of York Road, Seacroft, Leeds, LS14 2AD

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: No

Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

[Empty text box for accessibility comment]

Rank (1-5)

1

Access Comments

[Empty text box for access comments]

Rank (1-5)

1

Local network comment

[Empty text box for local network comment]

Rank (1-5)

1

Mitigation measure

[Empty text box for mitigation measure]

Total score

3

Support?

No, park and ride site that must be maintained.

Need to combine with other sites:

[Empty text box]

Suitability for partial development:

[Empty text box]

Highways Agency

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 :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). No site-based designations but parts of the site are Lowland mixed deciduous woodland a UK BAP priority habitat and the Cock Beck flows near the northern boundary.

Boundary Amendment

[Empty text box]

Natural England:

Education

[Empty text box]

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

[Empty text box]

Environment Agency Constraints:

[Empty text box]

Yorkshire Water Comments:

[Empty text box]

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

[Empty text box]

LCC Flood Risk Management:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3118

Site Name: Land east of York Road, Seacroft, Leeds, LS14 2AD

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 87 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3119

Site Name: Hobberley Cottage/The Wellington(PH), Whin Moor Lane, Shadwell, Leeds, LS17 8LU

Site Details

Northing:	438748	Area sq m:	24216.12	Ward	ss Gates and Whinmoor
Easting:	435062	Area Ha:	2.421612	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Retail - Restaurants and Cafes
 Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Mixed

Site Detail

Topography:	Undulating	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	4471.28	Distance to bus stop (metres)	97.08
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	5720
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.43	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	-----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
32/372/02/FU	Alterations to front and side elevations access ramp to front and detached pergola to side of public house	01/10/2002	02/12/2002	A	16.69
32/279/03/FU	Single storey front extension dormer window to front and two dormer windows to rear	26/06/2003	18/08/2003	A	25.17
H32/46/88/	Laying out of access, alterations, including new stair case and hoist, and to form wash-up/kitchen, servery, e	16/02/1988	03/10/1988	A	39.71
H32/41/89/	Change of use of garage to part of restaurant and alterations, to form living room, kitchen, bedroom and office, to	09/02/1989	10/04/1989	R	41.28
32/85/02/RE	Extension of permission for extension to form play area to public house	05/03/2002	30/04/2002	R	16.69
H32/93/91/	Alterations and extension to form swimming pool, plant room, sauna and changing room with bedroom over part, to side of	10/04/1991	11/07/1991	A	21.45
H32/235/89/	Two, externally illuminated wall signs, to public house .	13/07/1989	22/09/1989	A	14.80
32/199/98/FU	Single storey rear extension to public house	17/08/1998	29/12/1998	A	11.01
32/222/92/FU	Proposed entrance canopy	28/07/1992	02/09/1992	A	17.64
H32/600/80/	Laying out of 24 car parking spaces, beer garden and childrens' play area to existing public house car park.	10/07/1980	08/09/1980	A	40.97
32/46/93/FU	5 floodlight posts to car park	01/04/1993	16/08/1993	A	11.01
32/298/97/FU	Extension to form play barn and enlarged dining area to rear of public house	19/11/1997	22/07/1998	R	17.64
32/270/94/FU	Paved external drinking area and single storey side extension to public house	08/12/1994	12/01/1995	A	11.01
H32/86/87/	Change of use involving alterations of detached bottle store , to public house soft drinks servery.	08/05/1987	22/06/1987	A	40.29
32/168/92/FU	Detached two storey accommodation block with 30 bedrooms	27/05/1992	11/08/1992	R	58.10
H32/42/89/	Change of use of garage to part of restaurant and alterations, to form living room, kitchen, bedroom and office, to	09/02/1989	10/04/1989	R	14.53
32/296/97/OT	Outline application to erect detached two storey 39 bedroom travel lodge to side of public house	19/11/1997	22/07/1998	R	17.64
H32/699/76/	Outline application to erect extension, to form preparation room with courtyard, siting of railway carriage f	16/08/1976	22/11/1976	A	39.61

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3119

Site Name: Hobberley Cottage/The Wellington(PH), Whin Moor Lane, Shadwell, Leeds, LS17 8LU

H32/274/90/	Alterations and extension to form entrance lobby to rear of public house.	05/10/1990	08/11/1990	A	40.85
32/177/96/FU	Single storey extension to form indoor play area to public house	13/08/1996	19/05/1997	A	16.69

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3119

Site Name: Hobberley Cottage/The Wellington(PH), Whin Moor Lane, Shadwell, Leeds, LS17 8LU

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

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

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Development unrelated to existing development	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3119

Site Name: Hobberley Cottage/The Wellington(PH), Whin Moor Lane, Shadwell, Leeds, LS17 8LU

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

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

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

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

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

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

Rank (1-5)

5

Mitigation measure

Widening and footway provision to Whin Moor Lane.

Total score

11

Support?

yes with miigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Existing Phase 3 East Leeds Eextension

Suitability for partial development:

n/a

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the scrub and pond for amphibians on the east area of the site.

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

[Empty box for Environment Agency Comments]

Environment Agency Constraints:

[Empty box for Environment Agency Constraints]

Yorkshire Water Comments:

[Empty box for Yorkshire Water Comments]

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

[Empty box for Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme]

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: 3119

Site Name: Hobberley Cottage/The Wellington(PH), Whin Moor Lane, Shadwell, Leeds, LS17 8LU

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

64

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

Site Details

Northing:	434058	Area sq m:	395479.72	Ward	Temple Newsam
Easting:	437974	Area Ha:	39.547972	HMCA:	East Leeds

Site Characteristics

Land Use

- Existing Use 1:
- Existing Use 2:
- Existing Use 3:
- Neighbouring Use 1
- Neighbouring Use 2:
- Neighbouring Use 3:
- Other uses:
- Site State:

Site Detail

Topography:		Boundaries:	
Natural Landscape:		Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1734.33	Distance to bus stop (metres)	415.01
Nearest Railway Station	Cross Gates	Bus Stop ID	9907
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	Yes	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	3.92	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 260px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	3.92		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	No
-------------------------------------	----	---------------------------------------------	----

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
32/29/03/RM	Laying out of access road and landscaping with associated levelling and drainage	29/01/2003	08/09/2003	A	18.28
PREAPP/06/00221	Revised master plan for Thorpe Park	01/11/2006		PCO	73.35
12/03887/FU	Detailed Application for the Manston Lane Link Road (North - South Route)	10/09/2012		PCO	22.05
32/355/01/RM	Laying out of new access and roundabout diverting footpaths and bridleway and construction of cycleway/footpath -option 1	01/11/2001	22/01/2002	A	11.92
32/246/04/RM	Variation of condition numbers 5 & 10 of application ref no 32/29/03/rm (drainage and balancing pond treatment)	15/06/2004	29/09/2004	A	18.28
07/9/00357/MOD	Laying out of access road and landscaping with associated levelling and drainage NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Erection of closed boarded timber fence	17/07/2007	20/09/2007	M01	18.28
32/199/94/OT	Outline application to layout business park green park and access roads	08/09/1994	04/10/1995	A	96.24
32/356/01/RM	Laying out of new access and roundabout diverting footpaths and bridleway and construction of cycleway/footpath-option 2	02/11/2001	22/01/2002	A	24.25
32/140/96/FU	Variation of condition no 21 of application no 32/199/94/0t (total floor area increased from 111500 sqm to 167220 sqm)	01/07/1996	31/03/2004	A	94.74
32/269/94/FU	Extraction of coal by opencast mining	09/12/1994	26/05/1995	R	56.42
32/124/94/FU	Extraction of coal by opencast mining	07/05/1994	26/05/1995	R	57.21
12/03886/OT	Outline Planning Application for mixed use development comprising offices (business park) (B1A), (B) and (C), retail and bar/restaurant (A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5), hotel (C1), leisure facilities (D1, D2), multi-storey car park, together with internal roads, car parking, landscaping and drainage.	10/09/2012		PCO	97.07
32/148/05/FU	Variation of condition no.9 of permission ref 32/140/96/fu (completion of access roads related to gross floor area)	22/03/2005	13/05/2005	A	94.74
32/156/05/RM	Phase 6 infrastructure planting to access road and roundabout and landscaping adjacent plots 5100 to 5500	07/04/2005	15/02/2007	W	27.40
32/44/05/FU	Variation of condition no 17 of permission 32/140/96/fu (foul & surface water drainage)	27/01/2005	15/04/2005	A	96.24
32/130/97/FU	Variation of conditions nos 17 and 19 of application number 32/199/94/o t (access arrangement and floor area)	23/06/1997	04/01/1999	A	94.74

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Main Urban Area Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Brownfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Major Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenfield	<input type="checkbox"/>
Smaller Settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Smaller Settlement Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mixed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Villages/Rural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Village/Rural Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Development unrelated to existing development		<input type="checkbox"/>			

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Suitability: Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

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

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Reliant on the construction of the Manston Lane Link Road

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

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

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

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

Total score

8

Support?

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

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

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 :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). This proposed allocation site supports a population of Great Crested Newts a European protected species. The habitat used by the newts includes wet woodland, fen, coarse grassland and standing water. This site also has records of Grasshopper Warbler, a UK BAP Priority Habitat and Red list bird of conservation concern associated with the fen habitat. There are also significant areas of semi-improved grassland and young woodland along the eastern parts of the allocation. Retain areas of wet woodland, fen, scrub and semi-improved grassland and provide additional breeding ponds for great crested newts on land adjacent to the railway. These measures should also help the Grasshopper Warblers provided some areas have restricted public access.

Boundary Amendment

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/CFSM032. Mitigation will be required to protect and enhance the boundaries with the excluded land and railway through providing a minimum 20 metre buffer planted with native shrubs and small trees. Great Crested Newts to consider.

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Site Ref: CFSM032 Site Name: Thorpe Park Business Park, Leeds

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Mixed use submission for residential (dwelling no's not specified), industrial (B1b/c or B8, offices B1a). Any development would be subject to the provision of the Manston Lane Link Road and East Leeds Orbital Route. (See also site 2039 above).

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

0

Residential Conclusion:

Retail Conclusion:

Employment Conclusion:

Amber

NB. Site assessments will be added to over time and some sections may be incomplete at present. Where we have not yet received comments from infrastructure providers and on other planning requirements, these will be included and taken into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.