Site Details

Northing: 428627 Area sq m: 21147.35 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440138 Area Ha: 2.114735 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Storage

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Industry and business - Wholesale distribution

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Mineral workings and quarries

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3347.38Distance to bus stop (metres)136.17Nearest Railway StationWoodlesfordBus Stop ID7848

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 4 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Brownfield site, part of larger employment site but the main building is not included in this submission. The site is flat and mainly being used for storage. Boundaries are well defined with a fence and public footpath running around the site with steep banks to the east hiding a mineshaft. Road frontage is to the north and the north eastern boundary adjoins a new housing site.

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?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/105/92/	Detached prefabricated office units to works.	03/04/1992	03/06/1992	Α	24.62
09/04606/OT	Outline application to layout access road and erect 85 houses and 30 flats, with car parking	26/10/2009	01/02/2010	W	100.00
10/01412/OT	Outline Application to layout access and erect 79 dwelling houses	25/03/2010		PCO	99.89
H33/42/84/	Detached stone and sand wareho use and asphalt mixing plant, with storage hoppers, 18.28m high chimney and weighbridg	20/02/1984	04/06/1984	R	44.68
33/146/96/FU	Detached pre-fabricated office unit to works	20/05/1996	24/06/1996	Α	49.00
H33/21/80/	Outline application to erect p lant, haulage and storageunit to agricultural site. (site ar ea 2.6 ha).	11/01/1980	21/07/1980	А	71.37
H33/305/85/	Alterations and extension, to form lobby and reception to of fices, to works.	31/10/1985	16/12/1985	А	26.79
H33/125/84/	Change of use of plant haulage and storage depot to solid fuel storage and dry blending unit.	19/04/1984	16/07/1984	R	20.95
H33/204/82/	Laying out of access road, to form plant haulage and stora ge unit, with detached single storey office with toilet, oi	10/08/1982	13/10/1982	Α	73.00
H33/357/85/1	Extension of temporary permiss ion for the use of plant haula ge and storage depot to coal s creening and plant haulage an	02/02/1987	16/03/1987	Α	21.33
H33/143/82/	Alterations and extension, to form pre-fabricated offic e unit, to works.	18/05/1982	28/06/1982	Α	27.12
33/353/05/FU	New detached storage shed	25/07/2005	09/11/2005	Α	57.61
H33/357/85/	Use of plant haulage and stora ge depot to coal scree ning and plant haulage and sto rage depot.	16/12/1985	14/04/1986	А	20.27

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of la	rge built up areas		
Would development lead to/constitute	ribbon development?		
Would development result in isolated	development?		
Is the site well connected to built up a	rea (2+ boundaries with e	existing built up area)?	
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the settle	ment pattern?:	
Do natural/physical features provide a area and undeveloped land?	good existing barrier be	tween existing urban	
Overall sprawl conclusion:			
Prevent neighbouring towns from n	nerging		
Would development of the site lead to	physical connection of s	settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing barrier/bo	undary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
Assist in safeguarding countryside	from encroachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary	between the site and the	e existing urban area?	
Does the site provide access to the co	ountryside?		
Does the site include local or national	conservation designated	d areas?	
Does the site include areas of woodla significant unprotected tree/hedge cov		at are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildings?	Are	these in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Co	nclusion_		
Preserve the setting and special ch	aracter of historic towr	ns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conshistorical feature?	ervation area, listed build	ding or other	
If yes, could development preserve th	is character?:		
Overall Character Preservation Concl	usion:		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Conformity with Core S	trategy		
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
	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

HLAA C	onclusions						
Availability:	Medium term (6-1	0 y Suitability:	Yes Physic	al	Achievability:	Medium term	(6-10 years)
ummary	of Infrastruc	cture provide	er comme	nts and o	ther planni	ing require	ements
Leeds City	Council Highw	ays inc Metro					
Accessibility							Rank (1-5)
		Transport or prima which has been a				the	3
Access Cor	nments						Rank (1-5)
Suitable acc	ess can be achiev	red from Queen St	treet				5
Local netwo	ork comment						Rank (1-5)
The scale of	development sho	uld not cause an is	ssue on the lo	cal network			5
Mitigation n	neasure						Total score
							13
Support?		Need to comb	oine with other	er sites:	Suitability	for partial de	velopment:
Yes							
Highways A n/a Network Ra Biodiversit West Yorksh	<u>ail :</u> У	LCC Ecology Off	icer:	Boundar	y Amendment		
Supported wi	th mitigation to pro with river plain an	otect and enhance d woodland habita	wildife				
Natural Engl	land:						
Education							
_	<u>Vater/Flooding</u> t Agency Comme	ents:	E	nvironment A	gency Constra	ints:	
	ater Comments:				er Waste Water		orks Comme
LCC Flood R	Risk Management	<u>.</u>					
<u>Utilities</u>	.						
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.

Electric:

Site Ref: 298	Site Name:	Hollinshurst Depot, Queen Bywater	Street, Allerton
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments Conclusion of Asses	(Text)		
	Silletti		
Conclusion summary:			
		g employment use but adjoins recently de mined) planning application for residentia	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 55	Floorspace sq m (Non residen	tial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Red		Green

Site Details

Northing: 427808 Area sq m: 18139.25 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 442459 Area Ha: 1.813925 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Office

Neighbouring Use 3: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

✓

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 5307.11 Distance to bus stop (metres) 171.52

Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 7720

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 1.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 4 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

The site has a current employment use and is set between two housing estates to the north and south (the latter being a new development) and an office development to the south east. Allotments border the site to the north west. Site is flat, long and thin with the only access / road frontage coming from the east. Trees align the boundaries of the site on all sides.

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?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/304/82/	One non illuminated logo sign, size 1.8m x 1.5m height above ground 2.8m (underside), one non illuminated individual	17/12/1982	17/01/1983	А	92.68
PREAPP/08/00234		25/06/2008	14/07/2008	PRECAG	100.00
H33/198/81/	Alterations and extension, to form single storey showr oom and offices, to builders m erchants.	30/03/1981	08/06/1981	Α	92.84

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 0.00 Major Urban Area: Major Settlement 0.00 Urban Extenstion Area: 0.00 Smaller settlement 1.00 Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: 0.00 Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: East Leeds

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.

HLAA Conclusions	5						
Availability: Short term (0-5y	rs) Suitability:	Yes		ı	Achievability:	Short terr	m (0-5yrs)
Summary of Infrastru	cture provide	er com	ments	and ot	her plann	ing requ	uirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro						
Accessibility comment							Rank (1-5
4 buses per hour, 100% prima	ary & secondary edu	ucation, 80	0% empl	oyment			4
Access Comments							Rank (1-5
Visibility probably achievable	from Barnsdale Ro	ad					5
Local network comment							Rank (1-5
Local congestion issues							3
Mitigation measure							Total sco
Junction improvements onto	Barnsdale Road						
							12
Support?	Need to comb	oine with	other si	es:	Suitabilit	y for partia	I development:
Yes with mitigation						<u> </u>	·
Highways Agency							
n∕a <mark>Network Rail :</mark>							
<u>Biodiversity</u>							
West Yorkshire Ecology and	I LCC Ecology Off	icer:		Boundary	Amendment		
Supported with mitigation to p corridor of the disused railway		the wildlif	fe				
Natural England:							
<u>Education</u>							
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u> Environment Agency Comm	='		Enviro	nment Aa	ency Constra	aints:	
					.,		
Yorkshire Water Comments:	<u> </u>		Yorks	hire Water	Waste Wate	r Treatmen	t Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemer	 nt:						
<u>Utilities</u>							
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.

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	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	<u> </u>	
		1	
Would gypsies and	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site i			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	110	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	emont		
Conclusion of Asses	Silient		
Conclusion summary:			
		yment use. Situated between	two residential estates. Suitable for
residential development in princip	ле.		
21. 2 1. (1 11. 11.			
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 90	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Red		Green

Site Name: Barnsdale Road, Allerton Bywater

Site Ref: 310

Site Ref: 352 Site Name: Land On West Side Of Swillington Lane, Swillington

Site Details

Northing: 430576 Area sq m: 8961.52 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 437857 Area Ha: 0.896152 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: Being used as paddock

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1822.36Distance to bus stop (metres)233.90Nearest Railway StationWoodlesfordBus Stop ID1777

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Greenfield site to the west of Swillington.

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)

Site Ref: 352 Site Name: Land On West Side Of Swillington Lane, Swillington

Site Name: Land On West Side Of Swillington Lane, Site Ref: 352 **Swillington**

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 ribb	on developmer	nt?			
Would development result in isolated deve	elopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries	with existing	ng built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively	"round off" the	settlement	pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a goo area and undeveloped land?	od existing barri	ier betweer	n existing urban	✓	
Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted spraw	wl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from merg	jing				
Would development of the site lead to phy	sical connection	n of settler	nents?		
Do natural/physical features provide a goodevelopment?	od existing barr	ier/bounda	ry to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but there is no defensible bou	ndary				
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	m encroachme	ent			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	veen the site ar	nd the exis	ting urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the country					
Does the site include local or national con	servation desig	nated area	is?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	trees, hedgero	ows that are	e protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agr	ricultural land?			✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are these	in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclu	<u>usion</u>				
The site performs an important role safegu	uarding country	side from e	encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special characteristics	cter of historic	towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservatistorical feature?	ation area, listed	d building o	or other		
If yes, could development preserve this ch	naracter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	<u>n:</u>				
Development of the site would have no eff	ect on the setti	ng and spe	ecial character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Green Belt site. The site juts out to the we Development could set a precedent for fur			nrelated to the existing	ng settlement form.	
Conformity with Core Stra	itegy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ment	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller sett	lement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:	C	0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gatew	ay:	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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

Site Ref: 352 Site Name: Land On West Side Of Swillington Lane, Swillington

HLAA Conclusions	
vailability: Long term (11+ year Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term	(11+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requ	irements
eeds City Council Highways inc Metro	
Accessibility comment	Rank (1-5)
0% Primary, 90% Health, No Secondary or Employment. Within 700m of 3 buses per hour.	2
Access Comments	Rank (1-5)
Suitable access can be achieved from Swillington Lane	5
Local network comment	Rank (1-5)
The scale of the development should not cause an issue on the local network	5
Mitigation measure	Total scor
Accessibility not ideal but on balance ok due to small scale of development	12
Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial Yes	development:
lighways Agency /a letwork Rail :	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment	
supported	
latural England:	
ducation	
Prainage/Water/Flooding	
nvironment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	
Forkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
CC Flood Risk Management:	
d <u>tilities</u> Bas:	

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.

Electric:

Site Ref: 352	Site Name: Land On West Side Of Swillington Lane, Swillington			
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	/ Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy ₋Traveller Sit	e Assessmen	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe	
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe	
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown	
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	ssment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. The site juts out could set a precedent for further		gton, and is unrelated to the existing se	ttlement form. Development	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	24	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):	
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:	
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed	

Site Details

Northing: 428713 Area sq m: 8882.55 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 440933 Area Ha: 0.888255 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Other

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: Open greenspace, appears to be some garden encroachment

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 4128.72
Distance to bus stop (metres) 168.70

Nearest Railway Station Woodlesford Bus Stop ID 6427

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Greenfield site in Allerton Bywater. The site is well contained with an access point to the west. There are a few TPO's related to the site.

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?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
ENQ/09/00412	Detached stables in garden to rear	19/03/2009	31/03/2009	PD	11.54
10/03750/FU	Detached garage to front	13/08/2010	08/10/2010	Α	11.54
H33/137/86/	Outline application to lay out access and erect 4 dwell ings, to vacant site. (site a rea 0.16ha)	21/05/1986	22/09/1986	А	10.12
33/211/03/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	14/04/2003	07/07/2003	Α	99.40
33/338/02/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	25/07/2002	23/10/2002	W	99.52
06/02709/OT	Renewal of outline permission for residential development	03/05/2006	18/07/2006	Α	99.40

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 0.00 Major Urban Area: Major Settlement 0.00 Urban Extenstion Area: 1.00 Smaller settlement 1.00 Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: 0.00 Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: East Leeds

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.

HLAA Conclusio	ons			
Availability: Medium term	n (6-10 y Suitability: Y	'es	Achievability: Mediur	n term (6-10 years)
ummary of Infras	tructure provider (comments and ot	her planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council Hi	ghways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Mostly meets accessibility	standards			4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Access achiveable from (strip) - limit development	Carlton View, although no c to 30 units max	direct link to adopted high	way (likely ransom	3
Local network commen	t			Rank (1-5
Small site with negligible	local imapct			5
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				12
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for par	tial development:
yes				
n∕a Network Rail : Biodiversity		B	.	
	and LCC Ecology Officer sted Newts recorded on ac		Amendment	
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
	·····			
<u> Drainage/Water/Flood</u> Environment Agency Co		Environment Ac	jency Constraints:	
orkshire Water Comme	nts:	Yorkshire Water	r Waste Water Treatme	ent Works Comme
_CC Flood Risk Manage	ment:			
<u>Jtilities</u>				
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.

Electric:

Site Ref: 827	Site Name:	Cariton view, Allerto	n Bywater
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessmer	nt	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	•	
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	1.19	
Experience of previous	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
	,		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
			proved 2006, not built. Suitable in
principle for residential use, subje	ect to detailed design	n, as Tree Preservation Order (TF	PO) on site.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 25	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not a	assessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 432744 Area sq m: 31849.68 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 441372 Area Ha: 3.184968 HMCA: Outer South East

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 sport facility

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):359.91Distance to bus stop (metres)199.06Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID11002SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Urban Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Greenfield site in Garforth. Well contained by development and well connected to residential area. Boundary to the north is less well defined.

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:	41.16	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)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
33/119/97/FU	78 dwelling houses	14/05/1997	14/10/2003	W	95.89
H33/695/80/	Outline application to erect s tables and hay shed, to grazi ng land.	24/11/1980	02/03/1981	А	94.85
33/359/94/OT	Outline application to erect residential development lay out football pitch and provision of open space	22/12/1994	21/12/1995	W	95.89
33/297/99/FU	109 dwelling houses	19/11/1999	14/10/2003	W	55.56

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of lar	ge built up areas		
Would development lead to/constitute	ribbon development?		
Would development result in isolated	development?		
Is the site well connected to built up an	rea (2+ boundaries with	existing built up area)?	
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the settle	ement pattern?:	
Do natural/physical features provide a area and undeveloped land?	good existing barrier be	etween existing urban	
Overall sprawl conclusion:			
Prevent neighbouring towns from n	nerging		
Would development of the site lead to	physical connection of	settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing barrier/bo	oundary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
Assist in safeguarding countryside	from encroachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary	between the site and th	e existing urban area?	
Does the site provide access to the co	ountryside?		
Does the site include local or national	conservation designate	d areas?	
Does the site include areas of woodlar significant unprotected tree/hedge cov		hat are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildings?	Are	these in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Co	nclusion		
Preserve the setting and special ch	aracter of historic tow	ns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a cons historical feature?	ervation area, listed bui	lding or other	
If yes, could development preserve the	is character?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	usion:		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Conformity with Core S	tratogy		
Comorning with Core 3	lialegy		
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
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

HLAA Conclusion	IS				
Availability: Unknown	Suitability: LD	F to detern	nine A	chievability: Unl	known
Summary of Infrastr	ucture provider co	ommen	ts and oth	er planning	requirements
Leeds City Council High	nways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment					Rank (1-5)
Good accessibility					5
Access Comments					Rank (1-5
site accessed by Kennet La	ne				5
Local network comment					Rank (1-5
cumulative issues					
					4
Mitigation measure					Total scor
					14
Support?	Need to combine v	with other	sites:	Suitability for	partial development:
yes					
Highways Agency n/a Network Rail : Biodiversity	al I CC Faclory Officer		Payadam (
West Yorkshire Ecology an		ha	· —	Amendment	and botched areas are
Not supported (RED). Kenne southern half of this site, bas Also forms part of a valuable disused railway.	ed on the open grassland	l habitat.	excluded an drawing RM, ensure impa	d boundary subst /1004. Mitigation v	Red hatched areas are antially amended as per will still be required to ridor are addressed, i.e. ag the disused
Natural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
<u>Drainage/Water/Floodin</u> Environment Agency Comr		Env	ironment Age	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments	s:	Yori	kshire Water \	Waste Water Trea	atment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	ent:				

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: 1004	Site Name:	Name: Land to north of Kennet Lane/ West of Welland Drive, Garforth				
Electric:						
Telecom:						
Fire and Rescue Services:						
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:						
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:					
English Heritage:						
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t				
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe			
managed	(Text)		1 2			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe			
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	,				
Proximity to housed	Yes	No				
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	<u>'</u>				
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown			
encampments	(Text)		·			
O-maluaian of Acces						
Conclusion of Asses	sment					
Conclusion summary:						
	I need to be consider	ed through the greenspace	space on existing UDP and Local Nature review. See greenspace section, page			
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 65	Floorspace sq m (Non residential):			
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:			
Amber	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed			

Site Ref: 1007 Site Name: Land South of Selby Road, Garforth, LS25 1

Site Details

Northing: 431999 Area sq m: 58986.02 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440016 Area Ha: 5.898602 HMCA: Outer South East

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: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1742.89 Distance to bus stop (metres) 382.26

Nearest Railway Station Garforth Bus Stop ID 3356

SFRA Flood Zone: 1.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 1.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Currently used for agriculture the site has no road frontage being surrounded by further fields and a beck to the north. Trees border the site on three sides, apart from the south east boundary where a further field leads to a disused railway track. Sloping site and part of a wider collection of SHLAA sites in this area..

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)

Site Ref: 1007 Site Name: Land South of Selby Road, Garforth, LS25 1

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/411/80/	Outline application to erect d etached house to vacant site.	19/06/1980	08/09/1980	R	25.06
08/05894/CLE	Certificate of Lawful use of land as a nursery	16/10/2008		APPRET	25.05
H33/429/81/	3 bedroom detached house with office, covered yard and g reenhouse to smallholding.	27/10/1981	08/02/1982	Α	25.05

Site Name: Land South of Selby Road, Garforth, LS25 1 **Site Ref: 1007**

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? $\hfill\Box$ 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 history	oric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Isolated site. Not connected to settlement and has no road frontage. Performs an importa safeguarding countryside.	ant role in
Conformity with Core Strategy	

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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: 1007 Site Name: Land South of Selby Road, Garforth, LS25 1

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability	: LDF to determine	Achievability: Lo	ong term (11+ years)
summary of Infrastructure provide	der comments an	d other planning	g requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	<u>)</u>		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
60% 4 buses per hour			3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Landlocked site, requires adjacent site for acc	ess		3
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Existing local congestion and significant cumm	nulative issues		3
Mitigation measure			Total scor
			9
Support? Need to cor	mbine with other sites:	Suitability fo	r partial development:
No Yes		No	<u> </u>
Highways Agency			
Potential for cumulative impact in combination	with other sites. If site stil	Il included at next sift as	ssess as part of East
Leeds cluster. Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology C	Officer: Bour	ndary Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance corridor of the beck to the south-west and fish protect. Retain a minimum 20 metres corridor to	ce the wildlife bonds to the	······································	
(fish ponds), bats, White-clawed Crayfish and V consider			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environme	nt Agency Constraint	s:
Vorkshira Water Comments	Vorkohira	Water Waste Water Tr	eatment Works Comme
Yorkshire Water Comments:	t orksnire \	vvater vvaste vvater ir	eaunent works comme

Utilities

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref: 1007	Site Name:	Land South of	Selby Road,	Garforth, LS25 1
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
o	_			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
oite i				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
	<u> </u>			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. The site is in an	isolated position with	nin the Green Belt and	development would	result in an island of
development unrelated to the ex				
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 133	Floorspace so	q m (Non residenti	al):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	E	mployment Conclusion:
Red		ssessed		ot assessed

Site Ref: 1013 Site Name: Land to the South of Goody Cross Lane, Little Preston.

Site Details

Northing: 430396 Area sq m: 11677.99 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 438694 Area Ha: 1.167799 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2290.81 Distance to bus stop (metres) 220.11

Nearest Railway Station Woodlesford Bus Stop ID 8816

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: Yes Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Greenfield site between Swillington and Little Preston. Borders residential area to the west.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.76	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)

Site Ref: 1013 Site Name: Land to the South of Goody Cross Lane, Little Preston.

Site Ref: 1013 Site Name: Land to the South of Goody Cross Lane, Little Preston.

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large	built up area	S			
Would development lead to/constitute ribb	on developm	ent?			
Would development result in isolated deve	elopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up area	2+ boundarie	es with exist	ing built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effectively	"round off" the	e settlemen	t pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a goo area and undeveloped land?	d existing ba	rrier betwee	en existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion: Low potential to lead to unrestricted spraw	/I				
Prevent neighbouring towns from merg	jing				
Would development of the site lead to phy	sical connec	tion of settle	ements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?	od existing ba	rrier/bound	ary to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but would significantly reduce	the green be	elt gap			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	n encroachn	nent			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	ween the site	and the exi	sting urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the count	ryside?				
Does the site include local or national con	servation des	signated are	eas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	trees, hedge	rows that a	re protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a ago	ricultural land	?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are thes	e in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclu	<u>ısion</u>				
The site does not perform an important ro	le in safeguar	ding the co	untryside from encroa	chment	
Preserve the setting and special characteristics	ter of histor	ic towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation historical feature?	ation area, list	ed building	or other		
If yes, could development preserve this ch	naracter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	<u>n:</u>				
Development of the site would have no eff	ect on the se	tting and sp	pecial character of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Green Belt site between Swillington and L	ittle Preston,	would signi	ficantly reduce the gre	een belt gap.	
Conformity with Core Stra	itegy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller sett	lement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:		0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gatew	ay:	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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

Site Ref: 1013 Site Name: Land to the South of Goody Cross Lane, Little Preston.

HLAA (Conclusions					
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	e Achieval	bility: Long te	erm (11+ years)
Summary	y of Infrastruc	ture provide	er comments	and other pl	anning red	quirements
Leeds City	y Council Highwa	ays inc Metro				
	ty comment					Rank (1-5)
2 buses per Employmen	hour within 600m of t.	3 buses per hour	r. 100% Primary, 10	00% Health. No Se	econdary or	3
Access Co	mments					Rank (1-5)
The site ha	s no frontage to ado	pted highway				1
Local netw	ork comment					Rank (1-5)
The scale of	of the development s	hould not cause a	an issue on the loca	al network		5
Mitigation	measure					Total scor
None that o	can overcome the lac	ck of access				9
Support?		Need to comb	ine with other site	es: Suit	ability for part	ial development:
No						
Highways	Agency					
n/a Network F	Rail :					
<u>Biodiversi</u>	<u>ty</u>					
West Yorks	hire Ecology and L	.CC Ecology Offi	cer: E	Boundary Amend	ment	
corridor of the Retain a mir	vith mitigation to pro ne beck and associa nimum 20 metres co rfish and Water Vole	ted woodland to the rridor to the beck.	he east.			
Natural Eng	gland:					
Education	<u>.</u>					
Drainage/	Water/Flooding					
Environme	nt Agency Commer	nts:	Enviro	nment Agency Co	onstraints:	
Yorkshire V	Vater Comments:		Yorksh	ire Water Waste	Water Treatme	ent Works Comme
LCC Flood	Risk Management:					
<u>Utilities</u>						

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.

Gas:

Site Ref: 1013	Site Name:	Land to the South of Goo Little Preston.	ody Cross Lane,
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site :			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	-	•
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary: Green Belt site between Swilling	ton and Little Preston	. As submitted the site has no access	to the adopted highway - the
inclusion of the commercial unit			to the datapeter nightary the
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 100	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 1044 Site Name: Wakefield Road and Barrowby Lane, Garforth

Site Details

Northing: 433519 Area sq m: 218862.58 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 439916 Area Ha: 21.886258 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):744.54Distance to bus stop (metres)225.04Nearest Railway StationGarforthBus Stop ID5789SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Flat triangular site currently used for agriculture. It is set to the east of Garforth but bordered by housing to the east and north. Farms are located to the south west and further fields beyond. A small pylon runs along part of the northern boundary.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.61	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 Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Site Ref: 1044 Site Name: Wakefield Road and Barrowby Lane, Garforth

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/213/84/	Outline application to erect s upermarket, offices and p etrol filling station, with pl aying fields, changing f	28/06/1984	22/08/1984	R	35.97
H33/186/81/	Outline application to lay out accesses and erect super market including warehouse and offices, commercial	31/03/1981	17/06/1981	R	19.63
H33/126/84/	Outline application to erect s upermarket, shop units, offic es and petrol filling station, with playing field, changing f	19/04/1984	06/08/1984	R	35.94
H33/185/81/	Laying out of access and erect ion of supermarket inclu ding warehouse and offices, co mmercial garage and showroom,	31/03/1981	17/06/1981	R	19.63

Site Ref: 1044 Site Name: Wakefield Road and Barrowby Lane, Garforth

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	ge built up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute r	ibbon development?			
Would development result in isolated d	evelopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up are	ea (2+ boundaries wi	th existing built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the set	tlement pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a garea and undeveloped land?	good existing barrier	between existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sp	rawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from m	erging			
Would development of the site lead to	physical connection	of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing barrier	/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible b	ooundary			
Assist in safeguarding countryside f	rom encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	etween the site and	the existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the co	untryside?		\checkmark	
Does the site include local or national of	conservation designa	ted areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlan significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		s that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land?		\checkmark	
Does the site contain buildings?	A	re these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Cor	nclusion			
The site performs an important role saf	eguarding countrysic	le from encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special cha	racter of historic to	owns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a consensation historical feature?	ervation area, listed b	uilding or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	s character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	sion:			
Development of the site would have no	effect on the setting	and special character of his	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Relates well to settlement. Fairly well of	ontained reducing po	otential for further sprawl.		
Conformity with Core St	rategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settl	ement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller se	ttlement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.0	Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

Site Ref: 1044 Site Name: Wakefield Road and Barrowby Lane, Garforth

HLAA Conclusion	ıs			
Availability: Short term (0-5	Syrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastr	ucture provide	r comments a	nd other plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Not all of the site meets required crossing A642 to reach locations.		education and health	, difficult for pedestria	4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Size of site would require m	nultiple accesses to be	provided		5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Local congestion issues an	d potential for significa	nt cumulative impac	t with other nearby sit	es 3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Unclear whether sufficient r	nitigation and capacity	improvements can b	oe achieved	12
Support?	Need to combi	ne with other sites:	Suitability	y for partial development:
Yes with mitigation				<u> </u>
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative importance cluster Network Rail:	act in combination with	other sites. If site s	till included at next si	it assess as part of East
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Offic	er: Bo	undary Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floodin	 I <u>g</u>			
Environment Agency Com	ments:	Environm	ent Agency Constra	iints:
Yorkshire Water Comment	s:	Yorkshire	e Water Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	ent:			
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.

Gas:

Site Ref:	1044	Site Name:	Wakefield Road and	Barrowby Lane, Garforth
Electric				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herit	age			
Leeds City	Council:			
West Yorks	hire Archaeology	Service:		
English He	ritage:			
Gypsy _T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed		(Text)		
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers I		(Text)	1.10	11100,200
site?				
Dravinsitu	to housed	Yes	No	
Proximity to	nd travellers	(Text)	No	
0,1				
	e of previous	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
encampme	ents	(Text)		
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment		
Conclusion s	ummarv:			
	-	ential for both housing	g and a retail function. It is set	close to Garforth town centre and is
			vicinity. There are strong links to	the settlement with existing ined by existing farms to the south
west, reducing			ne site is flat with no physical co	
development.				
Site Capacity	(dwellings units)	: 575	Floorspace sq m (Nor	residential):
Residential C	onclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green		Green	า	Red

Site Details

Northing: 433304 Area sq m: 35798.58 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 439724 Area Ha: 3.579858 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Natural Landscape:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 982.89 Distance to bus stop (metres) 157.75

Nearest Railway Station Garforth Bus Stop ID 9935

Limited Tree Cover

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.69	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)

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 ribb	oon development	>		
Would development result in isolated dev	elopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up area	(2+ boundaries w	ith existing built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effectively	"round off" the se	ttlement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a godarea and undeveloped land?	od existing barrie	between existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
Low potential to lead to unrestricted spray	νl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from mer	ging			
Would development of the site lead to phy	ysical connection	of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a go development?	od existing barrie	r/boundary to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging of settlements				
Assist in safeguarding countryside fro	m encroachmen	t		
Is there a strong defensible boundary bet	ween the site and	the existing urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the count	ryside?		✓	
Does the site include local or national cor	nservation designa	ated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?		s that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a ag	ricultural land?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	✓	are these in agricultural use?	✓	
Overall countryside Encroachment Concl	<u>usion</u>			
The site does not perform an important ro	le in safeguarding	g the countryside from encroa	chment	
Preserve the setting and special chara	cter of historic to	owns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservatistorical feature?	ation area, listed l	ouilding or other		
If yes, could development preserve this c	haracter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	on:			
Development of the site would have no ef	fect on the setting	g and special character of hist	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Well connected to settlement. Tree line to	north west boun	dary contain site reducing pot	ential for further sprawl.	
Conformity with Core Stra	ategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller sett	element	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.0	0 Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

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** Rank (1-5) Railway station just outside 800m buffer, difficult for pedestrians crossing A642 to reach local centre 4 Rank (1-5) **Access Comments** Highway frontage likely to be insufficient for required sightlines Rank (1-5) Local network comment Local congestion/capacity issues and potential for significant cumulative impact with other nearby Mitigation measure **Total score** Unclear whether sufficient mitigation and capacity improvements can be achieved 10 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: Yes 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: **Biodiversity** West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: **Boundary Amendment** Not supported (RED). No site-based designations but Water Suppported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are Vole records in drain to north of the site. excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/1100. Mitigation will be required to maintain flows of water in the ditch, and provide habitat enhancement through ditch enhancements and flood water attenuation pond designed to retain water for Water Vole habitat at north of site - most of these enhancement works will be rquired in the excluded area **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.

LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:			
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy Traveller Site	Assessment	ł .		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Site:				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)	,		
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. Whilst the site is				
1044. The site needs to be comb west.	ined with 1044 to ach	ieve suitable access	. The proposed HS2 ra	ail line runs to the north
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 47	Floorspace	sq m (Non residentia	1):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Em	ployment Conclusion:
Green	Not as	ssessed		t assessed

Site Name: Clear View Farm, Wakefield Road, Garforth

Site Ref: 1100

Site Details

Northing: 428443 Area sq m: 529152.22 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 441729 Area Ha: 52.915222 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Utilities & Infrastructure - Water Storage and Treatment

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

✓

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 4601.18 Distance to bus stop (metres) 451.48

Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 11451

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 1.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large site that adjoins the northern border of Allerton Bywater, this used to be a railway line and is set on an embankment preventing access to the majority of the site. Site has an agriculture use with two sections of woodland in the central part, the south east section has a road frontage and is well linked to residential development.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	23.30	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	76.66	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)

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	e built up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute ri	bbon development?			
Would development result in isolated de	evelopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up are	a (2+ boundaries with e	existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effective	y "round off" the settle	ment pattern?:		
Do natural/physical features provide a g area and undeveloped land?	ood existing barrier be	tween existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
Prevent neighbouring towns from me	erging			
Would development of the site lead to p	hysical connection of s	ettlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a g development?	ood existing barrier/bo	undary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
Assist in safeguarding countryside fr	om encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary be	etween the site and the	existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the cou	ntryside?			
Does the site include local or national co	onservation designated	l areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		at are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a a	agricultural land?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	☐ Are t	these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Cone	clusion			
Preserve the setting and special char	acter of historic towr	ns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conser historical feature?	vation area, listed build	ding or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclus	ion:			
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Majority of site not in green belt.				
Conformity with Core St	rategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller set		1.00
		Omanor Sen	a.o.mont	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area: Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gatew	vav.	0.00
Locus Diadioid Collidol.	0.00	WOOL LOUG CALEW		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: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to	determine Achievability: Medium term ((6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider com	ments and other planning require	ments
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
3/4 buses per hour, 40% employment, 40% primary and so	econdary education, 40% primary health	2
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Limited site frontage with highway		2
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Congestion issues		2
Mitigation measure		Total score
Major works required possibly new signaled junction		6
Support? Need to combine with	other sites: Suitability for partial dev	elopment:
Yes with mitigation		
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other s Leeds cluster. Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	ites. If site still included at next sift assess as part Boundary Amendment	of East
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildli corridor function of the woodland, through connecting new woodland planting and wet woodland/fens as part of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems. Consider Harvest N		
Natural England:		
Education		
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Wo	rks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		

<u>Utilities</u>

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: 1149	Site Name:	Land off Park Land Allerton Bywater	e and Doctor's Lane,
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	10	
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
within Green Belt. As most of the	e site is not within Gre	een Belt and the part that is	the south eastern part of the site is could constitute rounding off of the the the scale of development in relation to
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 1000	Floorspace sq m (N	Non residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

 Northing:
 434293
 Area sq m:
 96554.15
 Ward
 Harewood

 Easting:
 440606
 Area Ha:
 9.655415
 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 673.37 Distance to bus stop (metres) 430.07 Nearest Railway Station Garforth Bus Stop ID 4418 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3b Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No Yes 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Green Belt site set just north of Garforth. The site is part of a wider collection of sites between Garforth and the motorway to the north, which this section borders. Currently in agricultural use the site is flat, consisting of open fields and a small group of trees in the centre. A road abuts the western boundary but the site stops just short of this, though there is an access point available if the boundary was amended.

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)

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	e built up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute ril	bon development?	?		
Would development result in isolated de	velopment?		✓	
Is the site well connected to built up area	a (2+ boundaries w	ith existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectivel	y "round off" the se	ttlement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a g area and undeveloped land?	✓			
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
Low potential to lead to unrestricted spra	awl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from me	rging			
Would development of the site lead to p	hysical connection	of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a g development?	ood existing barrie	r/boundary to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging of settlements				
Assist in safeguarding countryside fr	om encroachmen	t		
Is there a strong defensible boundary be	etween the site and	the existing urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the cou	ntryside?		✓	
Does the site include local or national co	onservation designa	ated areas?	✓	
Does the site include areas of woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		s that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a a	gricultural land?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Cond	<u>clusion</u>			
The site performs an important role safe	guarding countrysi	de from encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special char	acter of historic to	owns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conser historical feature?	vation area, listed l	ouilding or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclus	ion:			
Development of the site would have no	effect on the setting	and special character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Relates poorly to settlement. Well conta	ined by the motorw	ray to the north reducing pote	ntial for further sprawl.	
Conformity with Core St	rategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ment	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller sett	lement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.0	0 Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF	to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11	+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider co	mments and	other planni	ng require	ments
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Fails Public Transport requirements and has a poor foo	tway connection in	to Garforth Town C	entre	3
Access Comments				Rank (1-
No frontage onto highway, requires other site for access	SS			2
Local network comment				Rank (1-
Route into Garforth constrained by narrow railway bridenetwork	ge, capacity/conge	stion issues on wid	er	3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
The cumulative impact on capacity of local network wit considered, local physcial constraints would also need		by sites needs to be	•	8
Support? Need to combine w	ith athan aitea.			
	ith other sites:	Suitability	for partial dev	elopment:
No Highways Agency	ith other sites:	Suitability	for partial dev	/elopment:
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other cluster Network Rail:				
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other eeds cluster Network Rail: Biodiversity	er sites. If site still			
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other cluster Network Rail:	Bound Suppo Wildliff per dra to ens addres	included at next sift	if Red hatched d and boundary tigation will still at Crested New ave been desig	t of East areas (Local amended a be required vts are
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other eeds cluster Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). Parts of the site recently assessed against Local Wildlife Site (Site of Ecological and Geological modern and Sufficient to be designated.	Bound Suppo Wildliff per dra to ens addres	dary Amendment rted with mitigation e Site) are excluded awing RM/1165. Miture impacts on Gre ssed. Parts of site h	if Red hatched d and boundary tigation will still at Crested New ave been desig	t of East areas (Local amended as be required vts are
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other leeds cluster Network Rail: Biodiversity Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). Parts of the site recently assessed against Local Wildlife Site (Site of Ecological and Geological modern of the site recently assessed against Local Wildlife Site (Site of Ecological and Geological modern of SEGI) criteria and sufficient to be designated assed on importance for Great Crested Newts.	Bound Suppo Wildliff per dra to ens addres	dary Amendment rted with mitigation e Site) are excluded awing RM/1165. Miture impacts on Gre ssed. Parts of site h	if Red hatched d and boundary tigation will still at Crested New ave been desig	areas (Loca amended a be required vts are
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other leeds cluster Network Rail: Biodiversity Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). Parts of the site recently assessed against Local Wildlife Site (Site of Ecological and Geological myortance, SEGI) criteria and sufficient to be designated based on importance for Great Crested Newts. Natural England:	Bound Suppo Wildliff per dra to ens addres	dary Amendment rted with mitigation e Site) are excluded awing RM/1165. Miture impacts on Gre ssed. Parts of site h	if Red hatched d and boundary tigation will still at Crested New ave been desig	t of East areas (Local amended a be required vts are
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other leeds cluster Network Rail: Biodiversity Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). Parts of the site recently assessed against Local Wildlife Site (Site of Ecological and Geological myortance, SEGI) criteria and sufficient to be designated based on importance for Great Crested Newts. Natural England:	Bound Suppo Wildliff per dra to ens addres	dary Amendment rted with mitigation e Site) are excluded awing RM/1165. Miture impacts on Gre ssed. Parts of site h	if Red hatched d and boundary tigation will still at Crested New ave been desig	areas (Loca amended a be required vts are
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other leeds cluster Network Rail: Biodiversity Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). Parts of the site recently assessed against Local Wildlife Site (Site of Ecological and Geological modern of the site of Ecological and Geological an	Bound Suppo Wildlift per dra to ens addres Local V	dary Amendment rted with mitigation e Site) are excluded awing RM/1165. Miture impacts on Gre ssed. Parts of site h	if Red hatched d and boundary tigation will still at Crested New ave been desig	t of East areas (Local amended a be required vts are
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other leeds cluster Network Rail: Biodiversity Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). Parts of the site recently assessed against Local Wildlife Site (Site of Ecological and Geological modern on importance, SEGI) criteria and sufficient to be designated assed on importance for Great Crested Newts. Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding	Bound Suppo Wildlift per dra to ens addres Local V	dary Amendment rted with mitigation e Site) are excluded awing RM/1165. Mi ure impacts on Gre ssed. Parts of site h Wildlife Site in 2012	if Red hatched d and boundary tigation will still at Crested New ave been desig	t of East areas (Local amended a be required vts are
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other leeds cluster Network Rail: Biodiversity Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). Parts of the site recently assessed against Local Wildlife Site (Site of Ecological and Geological modern on importance, SEGI) criteria and sufficient to be designated assed on importance for Great Crested Newts. Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding	Bound Support Wildliff to ensuaddres Local V	dary Amendment rted with mitigation e Site) are excluded awing RM/1165. Mi ure impacts on Gre ssed. Parts of site h Wildlife Site in 2012	if Red hatched and boundary tigation will still at Crested New ave been design.	l areas (Loca amended a be required vts are gnated as

Hilitiaa

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: 1	165	Site Name:	Land North of Garforth, B Garforth	arwick Road,
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescu	a Sarvicas:			
The and Rescu	ic oci vices.			
Built Heritage	-			
Leeds City Cou		0		
West Yorkshire		Service:		
English Heritaç	je:			
Gypsy_Tra	veller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be managed	effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managou		,		
Would gypsie		Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live site?	on the	(Text)		
Site :				
Proximity to h	noused	Yes	No	
gypsies and t		(Text)	'	
Evperience of	i provious	Yes	No	Unknown
Experience of encampments		(Text)	INO	UNKNOWN
Conclusion	of Asses	sment		
Conclusion sumr	nary:			
			ugh the middle of the site, which would	
potential for furthe	r sprawl into the	e Green Belt. Highwa	stained by the motorway to the north co ays concerns re access - no site frontage	ge and route to Garforth
			ations will need to be taken into account ore details of the proposed rail line are	
Site Capacity (dw				
	,		Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ntiai):
Residential Conc	lusion:		l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber		Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 433684 Area sq m: 10089.79 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 443931 Area Ha: 1.008979 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

SFRA Flood Zone:

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2442.36Distance to bus stop (metres)168.99Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID10894

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 2

Health and Safety Executive Hazard: No Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00

Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: No Conservation Areas No

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

No

Listed Buildings:

0.00

0.00

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Small field bordered by residential properties on three sides, to the north are further fields. Gently sloping site that due to the topography is raised slightly above the surrounding houses. Trees line the boundaries and there are two access points, one to the south and the other to the east.

UDP Designation

Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	98.56	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)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
33/150/96/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	22/05/1996	25/10/1996	R	99.22

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? $\hfill\Box$ Are these in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroa	chment
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 hist	oric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Well related to settlement. Development would round off this part of Micklefield. Well corpotential for further sprawl.	ntained reducing
Conformity with Core Strategy	
Maior Cattle	

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs	s) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provide	er comments a	ind other plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Poor bus services, rail available	but outside 800m	n buffer		2
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Access achievable onto St Hel	ens Drive			5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Small site with no significant in	npact, but cumulat	ive issues with much	larger adjacent sites	4
Mitigation measure				Total scor
				11
Support?	Need to comb	ine with other sites	: Suitabilit	y for partial development:
Yes				
n/a Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and	I CC Ecology Offi	cer· B	oundary Amendment	
Supported	200 Ecology Cili		andary Americanient	
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u> Environment Agency Comme	nte:	Environ	ment Agency Constra	ainte:
Environment Agency Comme			nent Agency Consuc	anto.
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshi	e Water Waste Water	r Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management	<u> </u>			
<u>Utilities</u> 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.

Electric:

Site Ref: 1169	Site Name:	Micklefield LS25	ot Hall Farm Road,
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	/ Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy Traveller Sit	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	•	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	ssment		
Conclusion summary:			
possible to secure the provision	out as a tree belt in a of the tree belt through	association with an adjacent pla gh voluntary means or court act	subject to a planning obligation inning permission. As it has not been ion a compulsory purchase order has in of the order is scheduled to take
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	27	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
	Reta	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Residential Conclusion:			

Site Details

Northing: 432048 Area sq m: 82967.99 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 444609 Area Ha: 8.296799 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 3: Forestry - Managed Forest

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3191.93Distance to bus stop (metres)417.42Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID911SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3a Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Flat site set just to the south of the main settlement. Currently in agricultural use as a single field. This is bordered on two sides by woodland, to the east the main road provides a frontage whilst to the north the site abuts grazing land that was part of an old quarry.

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:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/506/74/	Additional lorry parking area with security fence and f loodlights (1.7ha (4 acres).	14/11/1974	17/02/1975	R	20.93

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	je built up area	as			
Would development lead to/constitute ri	ibbon developn	nent?			
Would development result in isolated de	evelopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up are	a (2+ boundari	es with ex	isting built up area)?		
Would development of the site effective	ly "round off" th	ne settleme	ent pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a garea and undeveloped land?	good existing ba	arrier betw	een existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Low potential to lead to unrestricted spr	awl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from me	erging				
Would development of the site lead to p	ohysical connec	ction of set	tlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a gdevelopment?	good existing b	arrier/bour	ndary to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging of settlements					
Assist in safeguarding countryside for	rom encroach	ment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	etween the site	and the e	xisting urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the cou	ıntryside?			✓	
Does the site include local or national of	onservation de	signated a	reas?		
Does the site include areas of woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		erows that	are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land	d?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are the	ese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Con	clusion				
The site does not perform an important	role in safegua	rding the o	countryside from encro	achment	
Preserve the setting and special cha	racter of histo	ric towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conse historical feature?	rvation area, lis	sted buildir	ng or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclus	sion:				
Development of the site would have no	effect on the se	etting and	special character of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Set to the south of Micklefield the site of eliminating any potential for further spra		by one bo	undary. However, it is o	ontained on all sides	
					_
Conformity with Core St	rategy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller set	tlement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:		0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gatev	vay:	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

HLAA C	conclusions						
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)) Suitability:	LDF to determi	ne	Achievability:	Long term (1	11+ years)
ummary	of Infrastruc	ture provide	er comment	s and ot	her plann	ing requir	ements
	Council Highwa	ays inc Metro					
	y comment						Rank (1-5)
100% rail							3
Access Co	mments						Rank (1-5
Frontage to	Great North Road s	should provide vsi	ibility				5
Local netw	ork comment						Rank (1-5)
Cumulative	issues						4
Mitigation i	measure						Total scor
							12
Support?		Need to comb	ine with other s	ites:	Suitabilit	y for partial d	evelopment:
Yes							
Highways Potential for Leeds cluste Network R	cumulative impact i	n combination wit	h other sites. If s	site still inclu	ided at next si	ift assess as pa	art of East
Biodiversit	<u>ty</u>						
West Yorks	hire Ecology and L	.CC Ecology Offi	icer:	Boundary	Amendment		
the east and	ith mitigation to enh south west by plant ards the southern c	ting up an area of					
Natural Eng	land:						
Education							
	Vater/Flooding at Agency Commer	nts:	Envir	onment Aa	ency Constra	aints:	
	g				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
Yorkshire W	later Comments:		Yorks	shire Water	Waste Wate	r Treatment W	orks Comme
LCC Flood I	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.

Gas:

Site Ref: 1173	Site Name:	Land south of Micklefield Honeysuckle Close) LS2	` -			
Electric:						
Telecom:						
Fire and Rescue Services:						
Built Heritage						
Leeds City Council:						
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:					
English Heritage:						
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t				
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe			
managed	(Text)					
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe			
travellers live on the	(Text)	140	Iviaybe			
site?						
Proximity to housed	Yes	No				
gypsies and travellers	(Text)					
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown			
encampments	(Text)					
Conclusion of Acces						
Conclusion of Asses	sment					
Conclusion summary:						
Green Belt site. The site is set on the southern edge of Micklefield. Whilst development would extend the settlement to the south it is surrounded by woodland which provides natural screening from the countryside and eliminates the possibility of further sprawl.						
Site Capacity (dwellings units): 186 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):						
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:			
Amber	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed			

Site Details

Northing: 432746 Area sq m: 6645.37 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 444632 Area Ha: 0.664537 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Terminals and Interchanges

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3070.67Distance to bus stop (metres)208.59Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID3207

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 2 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Triangular shaped flat site set between Micklefield station and existing housing. Currently an agricultural use, the field borders the station car park to the south, the houses to the north are separated by a small access road that runs along the boundary. There is a small gap in the north east corner where the field links to further fields that are designated as a future housing site through the UDP. Trees line the eastern boundary.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	85.19	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)

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of lar	ge built up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute	ribbon development?			
Would development result in isolated of	development?			
Is the site well connected to built up ar	ea (2+ boundaries with e	existing built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the settler	ment pattern?:	Yes	
Do natural/physical features provide a area and undeveloped land?	good existing barrier bet	ween existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sp	orawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from n	nerging			
Would development of the site lead to	physical connection of s	ettlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing barrier/bo	undary to contain		
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 co	ountryside?			
Does the site include local or national	conservation designated	areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlar significant unprotected tree/hedge cov		at are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	☐ Are t	hese in agricultural use?	· 🗌	
Overall countryside Encroachment Co	nclusion			
The site does not perform an important	t role in safeguarding the	e countryside from encro	achment	
Preserve the setting and special cha	aracter of historic town	s		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conschistorical feature?	ervation area, listed build	ling or other		
If yes, could development preserve thi	s character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	usion:			
Development of the site would have no	o effect on the setting an	d special character of hi	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Development would slightly extend the for further sprawl.	e settlement. Adjacent to	railway station. Well cor	ntained with low potential	
Conformity with Core S	trategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Sett	lement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller se	ettlement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

Access Comments Access via Garden Village is not suitable Local network comment Cumulative issues Rank (1-5) Rank (1-5) Cumulative issues	HLAA Conclusio	ns			
Access biblity comment Access Via Garden Village is not suitable Local network comment Cumulative issues Mitigation measure Total sco Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No No Network Rail: Impact on existing station, opportunity for increased car parking Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England: Education Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments LCC Flood Risk Management:	Availability: Short term (0-	5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: Long	g term (11+ years)
Access Comments Access via Garden Village is not suitable Local network comment Cumulative issues Ambitigation measure Total sco Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No Network Rail: Impact on existing station, opportunity for increased car parking Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Access via Garden Village is not suitable Rank (1-5 3 3 Access via Garden Village is not suitable 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ummary of Infrast	ructure provider	comments and	other planning r	requirements
Access Comments Access via Garden Village is not suitable Local network comment Cumulative issues Mitigation measure Total sco 8 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No Network Rail: Impact on existing station, opportunity for increased car parking Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England: Education Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			
Access Comments Access via Garden Village is not suitable Local network comment Cumulative issues Amount of the combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No No Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No No Network Rail: Impact on existing station, opportunity for increased car parking Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Access via Garden Village is not suitable Local network comment Cumulative issues A Mitigation measure Total sco 8 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No Highways Agency Network Rail: Impact on existing station, opportunity for increased car parking Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	100% rail				3
Local network comment Cumulative issues A Mitigation measure Total sco 8 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No Highways Agency Network Rail: Impact on existing station, opportunity for increased car parking Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Education Prokshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Mittigation measure Total sco 8 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No Highways Agency //a Network Rail: Impact on existing station, opportunity for increased car parking Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported 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:	Access via Garden Village	is not suitable			1
Mitigation measure Total sco 8 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No Network Rail: Impact on existing station, opportunity for increased car parking Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No Highways Agency n/a Network Rail: Impact on existing station, opportunity for increased car parking Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported 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:	Cumulative issues				4
Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No Highways Agency n/a Network Rail: Impact on existing station, opportunity for increased car parking Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Mitigation measure				Total score
Highways Agency h/a Network Rail: Impact on existing station, opportunity for increased car parking Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported 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:					8
Highways Agency n/a Network Rail: Impact on existing station, opportunity for increased car parking Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported 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:	Support?	Need to combir	ne with other sites:	Suitability for p	artial development:
Network Rail: Impact on existing station, opportunity for increased car parking Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Forkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	No				
Supported 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:	n/a Network Rail : Impact on existing station, c	opportunity for increased	d car parking		
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:		and LCC Ecology Office	er: Bound	dary Amendment	
Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Porkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	Бирропеа				
Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	Natural England:				
Environment Agency Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	<u>Education</u>				
Environment Agency Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	D				
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:			Environmen	t Agency Constraints:	
LCC Flood Risk Management:				. J,	
	Yorkshire Water Commen	its:	Yorkshire W	ater Waste Water Treat	tment Works Comme
<u>Utilities</u>	LCC Flood Risk Managem	nent:			
Gas:	<u>.</u>				

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.

Electric:

Site Ref: 1174	Site Name:	Land to north of Mic Car Park, Micklefiel	cklefield Railway Station d, LS25
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	y Service:		
Gypsy ₋ Traveller Sit	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Conclusion of Asses	ssment		
Conclusion summary:			
o the south and the A1/M to the	east. Development w would only be possible	vould effectively constitute rou	nd the railway station and railway line nding off of the settlement north of the Housing site that adjoins the site in the
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	n residential):		
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 1175A Site Name: Land to the east of Brigshaw Lane, Kippax

Site Details

Northing: 429718 Area sq m: 29539.07 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 441291 Area Ha: 2.953907 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Other
Other uses: SEGI
Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3335.45Distance to bus stop (metres)277.06Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID1249

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way:

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Currently an agricultural use the site consists of a square shaped field bordered by trees. It has a road frontage along the western boundary and abuts a Site of Ecological and Geological Importance (SEGI) to the east (the SHLAA site has been separated so this section is no longer included within this site).

UDP Designation

	<u>"</u>		
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)

Site Ref: 1175A Site Name: Land to the east of Brigshaw Lane, Kippax

Site Ref: 1175A Site Name: Land to the east of Brigshaw Lane, Kippax

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large bu	ilt up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon	development?			
Would development result in isolated develop	pment?			
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+	boundaries with exist	ing built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effectively "ro	und off" the settlemen	t pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	existing barrier betwee	en existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from mergin	q			
Would development of the site lead to physic	cal connection of settle	ements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?				
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible bound	ary			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from e	encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	en the site and the exi	sting urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countrys	ide?		✓	
Does the site include local or national conse	rvation designated are	eas?	✓	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tresignificant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	ees, hedgerows that a	re protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricu	ıltural land?			
Does the site contain buildings?	Are thes	e in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>on</u>			
The site performs an important role safeguar	ding countryside from	encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special characte	r of historic towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation historical feature?	n area, listed building	or other		
If yes, could development preserve this char-	acter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:				
Development of the site would have margina	l effect on the setting	& special character of	historic features, which	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Set to the south of settlement but is linked to further sprawl.	the north and west. N	lo defensible boundary	y to south could lead to	
Conformity with Core Strate	egy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ment	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller sett	lement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

Site Ref: 1175A Site Name: Land to the east of Brigshaw Lane, Kippax **SHLAA Conclusions** Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Gypsy_Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively No Maybe Yes managed (Text) Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? Proximity to housed Yes No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Unknown Yes No encampments (Text) **Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary:** Green Belt site. The site is designated N5 proposed greenspace on the existing UDP, however, the site is still in agricultural use. See also greenspace section, page 27, question G9. The original SHLAA site has been split as the eastern side is a protected Site of Ecological and Geological Importance (SEGI), site B, so is not considered suitable for development. In Green Belt terms there is existing residential development to the west and north of the site so the site relates well to the existing settlement. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 76 0 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): **Employment Conclusion: Residential Conclusion:** Retail Conclusion: Amber Not assessed Not assessed

Site Ref: 1175B Site Name: Land to the east of Brigshaw Lane, Kippax

Site Details

Northing: 429772 Area sq m: 10087.91 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 441425 Area Ha: 1.008791 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Other - SEGI

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3272.84 Distance to bus stop (metres) 241.39

Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 1249

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

The site is designated as a Site of Ecological & Geological Importance (SEGI). Site is roughly square, flat and overgrown. A pylon is situated in the south east corner.

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 Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Site Ref: 1175B Site Name: Land to the east of Brigshaw Lane, Kippax

Site Ref: 1175B Site Name: Land to the east of Brigshaw Lane, Kippax

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	je built up areas				
Would development lead to/constitute ri	ibbon development?				
Would development result in isolated de	evelopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up are	a (2+ boundaries wit	h existing built up area)?	✓		
Would development of the site effective	ly "round off" the set	tlement pattern?:	No		
Do natural/physical features provide a garea and undeveloped land?	good existing barrier	between existing urban			
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
High potential to lead to unrestricted sp	rawl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from me	erging				
Would development of the site lead to p	ohysical connection of	of settlements?			
Do natural/physical features provide a gdevelopment?	good existing barrier/	boundary to contain			
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but there is no defensible b	oundary				
Assist in safeguarding countryside for	rom encroachment				
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	etween 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 woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		that are protected, or	✓		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land?				
Does the site contain buildings?	☐ A	e these in agricultural use?			
Overall countryside Encroachment Con	clusion				
The site performs an important role safe	eguarding countrysid	e from encroachment			
Preserve the setting and special char	racter of historic to	wns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conse historical feature?	rvation area, listed b	uilding or other			
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclus	sion:				
Development of the site would have a s	significant effect on th	ne setting and special chara	cter of historic features		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Protected SEGI. Performs important fur	nction in protecting c	ountryside.]	
Conformity with Core St	rategy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ement	0.00	
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller set	tlement	0.00	
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:	0.00) Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

Site Ref: 1175B Site Name: Land to the east of Brigshaw Lane, Kippax **SHLAA Conclusions** Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Gypsy_Traveller Site Assessment Maybe Could site be effectively No Yes managed (Text) Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? Proximity to housed Yes No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown encampments (Text) **Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary:** Green Belt site. This section of SHLAA site 1175 is a protected Site of Ecological and Geological Importance (SEGI) on the existing UDP and West Yorkshire Ecology have objected to its potential development. 0 Site Capacity (dwellings units): 32 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): **Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:** Not assessed Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 432596 Area sq m: 42955.18 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 444295 Area Ha: 4.295518 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2756.31 Distance to bus stop (metres) 161.12 Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 3207 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Gently sloping, triangular shaped site which abuts housing to the east. Currently used for agriculture the site is a single field but has allotments currently in use in the southern corner. A road frontage runs along the northern boundary, to the west is offices and to the south of this is a steep bank that was part of an old quarry.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	1.17	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	97.39	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?: Yes

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/313/74/	Concrete block double garage.	07/08/1974	25/11/1974	W	31.73

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large buil	t up areas				
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?					
Would development result in isolated develop	ment?				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+	boundaries	with existin	g built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "rou	nd off" the s	settlement p	oattern?:		
Do natural/physical features provide a good earea and undeveloped land?	xisting barri	ier between	existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging					
Would development of the site lead to physical	al connectio	n of settlem	nents?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good e development?	xisting barri	ier/boundar	y to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	ncroachme	ent			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area? \qed					
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, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	es, hedgero	ows that are	protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricul	tural land?			✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are these	in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>1</u>				
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic	towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation historical feature?	area, listed	d building o	rother		
If yes, could development preserve this chara	cter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:					
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Greensen Assessment Contraction.					
Conformity with Core Strate	gy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ment	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller sett	lement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:	0	0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0	0.00	West Leeds Gatew	ay:	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

HLAA Conclusion Availability: Short te		ity: LDF to determi	ine A	chievability: Mediu	um term (6-10 years)
	,				
Summary of ini	rastructure prov	ider comment	s and oth	er planning re	equirements
-	il Highways inc Met	<u>ro</u>			Dank (4 E
Accessibility comm	ent				Rank (1-5
100701011					4
Access Comments					Rank (1-5
	on Pit Lane, however na vith Great North Road	rrow road with footwa	ay on on side	and nas limited	5
Local network com	ment				Rank (1-5
Cumulative issues					4
Mitigation measure					Total sco
Junction improveme	nt of Pit Lane and Great	North Road			13
Support?	Need to c	ombine with other s	ites:	Suitability for pa	urtial development:
Yes with mitigation					·
Highways Agency Potential for cumulati Leeds cluster	! ve impact in combination	n with other sites. If s	site still includ	ed at next sift asses	s as part of East
Network Rail:	liabalfiald Davings				
Possible impact on M Biodiversity	пскетей Рагкway				
	logy and LCC Ecology	Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Supported	3,				
Natural England:					
Education					
Drainage/Water/F	looding				
Environment Agenc	y Comments:	Envir	ronment Age	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Co	mments:	York	shire Water \	Waste Water Treatn	nent Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Mai	nagement:				
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.

Gas:

Site Ref:	1176	Site Name:	Land to the south of Pit L LS25	ane, Micklefield,
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herita	<u>age</u>			
Leeds City (Council:			
West Yorks	hire Archaeology	Service:		
English Her	itage:			
Gypsy _T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	•	(Text)		
Would gyp		Yes	No	Maybe
travellers li site?	ive on the	(Text)		
Proximity t		Yes	No	
gypsies an	d travellers	(Text)		
	of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme	ents	(Text)		
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment		
Conclusion su	ımmary:			
frontage. The s		e site is currently bein	xisting UDP, not within the Green Belt. Ig used for allotments. Retention or rep	
Site Capacity	(dwellings units)	98	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Co	onclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green		Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

 Northing:
 434005
 Area sq m:
 174141.89
 Ward
 Harewood

 Easting:
 440024
 Area Ha:
 17.414189
 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: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):737.41Distance to bus stop (metres)326.07Nearest Railway StationGarforthBus Stop ID4418SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3b Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No Yes 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Roughly triangular in shape the site has a current agricultural use consisting of open fields. The site is flat and bordered to the north and west by roads, though the motorway to the north is inaccessible. To the south are sporadic dwellings and beyond this the railway line.

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 Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
33/6/93/FU	Extraction of coal and fireclay by opencast mining m	12/01/1993	14/01/1994	R	72.78
33/308/94/FU	Variation of condition no 9 of application no 33/6/93/fu (transportation of abnormal heavy loads)	01/11/1994	22/12/1994	Α	72.78

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? $\hfill\Box$ Are these in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroad	chment
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 history	oric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Isolated site that relates poorly to settlement. It is well contained by roads and a railway I for furtrher sprawl.	ine reducing potential
Conformity with Core Strategy	

Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00		Smaller settlement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	(0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	(0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
Fast Leeds				

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.

HLAA Conclusions		
vailability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: LDF	to determine Achievability: Long term	(11+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider co	mments and other planning requ	irements
eeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
ccessibility comment		Rank (1-5
oor footway connection into Garforth Town Centre with nder nearby railway bridge	n little scope for mitigation due to restriction	3
Access Comments		Rank (1-5
The level of development would require multiple access would need to be considered in conjunction with access Barwick Road		4
ocal network comment		Rank (1-5
Route into Garforth constrained by narrow railway bridg capacity/congestion issues on wider network	ge, significant cummulative	2
Mitigation measure		Total sco
Unclear whether the physical constraints on Barwick Ro cummulative impact on capacity of local network with ot		9
Support? Need to combine with	ith other sites: Suitability for partial	development:
No	No	
lighways Agency otential for cumulative impact in combination with other eeds cluster. letwork Rail: evel crossing; asset protection issues. Contribution to Co		
liodiversity		
/est Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
upported with mitigation to protect and enhance the will orridor function alongside the south side of the motorwal arough native shrub planting and a network of wildlife poenefit the locally important population of Great Crested	ay onds to	
atural England:		
ducation		
rainage/Water/Flooding		
nvironment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
orkshire 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: 1226	Site Name:	adjacent to M1 Garforth	North of) and
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
motorway to the north so little po concerns re access - route to Ga	tential for further spra rforth constrained by	he northern part of the site. The site is awl into the Green Belt. Flat site with narrow railway bridge. These considneed to be reduced accordingly once	road frontage. Highways erations will need to be taken
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 457	Floorspace sq m (Non resid	ential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	Il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 432935 Area sq m: 2583339.38 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 442450 Area Ha: 258.333938 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):881.05Distance to bus stop (metres)779.81Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID6754SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 2 29.23 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No Yes 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large site currently having an agricultural use consisting of several fields, a large farm in the centre and some plant growing tunnels to the north. The site adjoins the whole of the east side of Garforth and is roughly the same size as Garforth, it slopes upwards towards the east. A road runs along the western boundary and a railway line splits the site through the centre.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.99	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:	0.27		
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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
08/00988/FU	Use of land for siting of seasonal workers caravans and an additional 24ha of polytunnels to farm	20/02/2008	18/03/2009	Α	11.39
11/05424/FU	Variation of conditions 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 19 of previous approval 08/00988/FU to permit the retention of agricultural workers caravans and polytunnels	23/12/2011	23/07/2012	А	10.86
09/03961/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 6, 12 and 14 of Planning Application 08/00988/FU	07/09/2009	27/01/2012	А	11.39

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large k	ouilt up areas				
Would development lead to/constitute ribbo	on developmen	it?			
Would development result in isolated deve	lopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries	with existir	ng built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effectively "	round off" the s	settlement	pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a goo area and undeveloped land?	d existing barri	er betweer	existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Low potential to lead to unrestricted spraw	I				
Prevent neighbouring towns from merg	ing				
Would development of the site lead to phy-	sical connection	n of settler	nents?		
Do natural/physical features provide a goo development?	d existing barri	er/bounda	ry to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but would significantly reduce	the green belt	gap			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	n encroachme	nt			
Is there a strong defensible boundary betw	een the site an	nd the exist	ing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the country	yside?			✓	
Does the site include local or national cons	servation desig	nated area	s?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	trees, hedgero	ws that are	e protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agr	icultural land?			✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are these	in agricultural use?	✓	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclu	sion_				
The site performs an important role safegu	arding countrys	side from e	encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special charac	ter of historic	towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conserva historical feature?	tion area, listed	d building c	r other		
If yes, could development preserve this ch	aracter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	<u>):</u>				
Development of the site would have margin	nal effect on the	e setting &	special character of	historic features, which	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Large site that would result in significant en the site but would reduce separation between				by roads that surround	
Comformality with Comp Cive	4				
Conformity with Core Stra	tegy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ment	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00		Smaller sett	lement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:	0	.00	Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

HLAA Conclusion	S			
Availability: Short term (0-5)	yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastru	ucture provide	er comments and	d other planni	na requirements
-	-			3 14 1 1
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			David /4 5
Accessibility comment 10% 4 buses per hour, 20% r	rail 10% primary			Rank (1-5
10 % 4 buses per flour, 20 % i	all, 10% pilinary			2
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Large scale development, wito be considered in conjunct				ad need 5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Significant cumulative issues	;			
				4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				11
Support?	Need to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
Yes, but likely significant external network capacity issues				
Highways Agency				
Potential for cumulative impar Leeds cluster.	ct in combination wit	h other sites. If site still	l included at next sif	t assess as part of East
Network Rail :				
Improvements to Garforth sta	tion and/or Micklefie	eld Parkway. Asset prote	ction. Very long tern	n 4 tracking
Biodiversity		_		
West Yorkshire Ecology and	d LCC Ecology Offi	cer: Bour	ndary Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding	1			
Environment Agency Comn	nents:	Environme	nt Agency Constra	ints:
Yorkshire Water Comments	:: ::	Yorkshire V	Nater Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	nt:			
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.

Gas:

Site Ref: 1232	Site Name:	Land at Stourton (Ridge Road, Garfo	Grange Farm, Selby Road - orth LS25
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeolog	y Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Si	te Assessmen	t	
		No	Mayba
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	INO	Maybe
3			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	1	' '
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	1.13	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	,	
Conclusion of Asse	ssment		
Conclusion comments			
Conclusion summary:	e in scale and would r	esult in a significant extension	on to the east of Garforth. Whilst
development would represent a	significant incursion in	nto Green Belt, reducing the	gap between Garforth and Micklefield,
			efensible boundary. The proposed HS2 tion measures are likely to be required.
Site Capacity (dwellings units	s): 6300	Floorspace sq m (N	lon residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 429628 Area sq m: 61728.95 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 438896 Area Ha: 6.172895 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

☑

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2147.61 Distance to bus stop (metres) 467.26

Nearest Railway Station Woodlesford Bus Stop ID 7695

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Greenfield site to the south of Swillington. Seperated from residential area by industrial estate to the north.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	94.58	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/223/87/	Operation of two hydraulic sho vels and attendant dump truck s, on extended hours, to openc ast mine. m	11/08/1987	21/09/1987	Α	90.34
H33/281/86/1	Extension of temporary permiss ion regarding the hours of op eration of a second hydraulic shovel and 3 dump trucks to	06/01/1987	02/02/1987	Α	89.94
H33/696/80/	Tipping of colliery spoil, to opencast coal site.	26/11/1980	24/02/1981	Α	89.73
H33/281/86/	Amendment to previous authoris ation involving the hoursof op eration of a second hydraulic shovel and 3 dump trucks to	29/09/1986	13/10/1986	Α	90.22

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built	t up areas				
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon of	development	t?			
Would development result in isolated developed	ment?				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	boundaries v	with existir	ng built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "rou	nd off" the s	ettlement	pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good exarea and undeveloped land?	xisting barrie	er betweer	existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl					
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging					
Would development of the site lead to physica	al connection	of settler	nents?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good e development?	xisting barrie	er/bounda	ry to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging of settlements					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from er	ncroachmer	nt			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	n the site an	d the exis	ing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countrysic	de?				
Does the site include local or national conserv	ation desigr	nated area	s?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	es, hedgerov	ws that are	e protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricul-	tural land?			✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are these	in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>1</u>				
The site does not perform an important role in	safeguardin	ng the cou	ntryside from encroa	chment	
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic	towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation historical feature?	area, listed	building o	r other		
If yes, could development preserve this chara-	cter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:					
Development of the site would have no effect	on the settin	g and spe	cial character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Green Belt site to the south of Swillington. De a precedent for further sprawl to the north and			nd the settlement to t	he south and could set	
Conformity with Core Strate	gy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ment	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00		Smaller settl	ement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:	0.	00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.	00	West Leeds Gatewa	ay:	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: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF	F to determine Achievability: Long ten	m (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider co	omments and other planning req	uirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
5% Health, 40% Primary, No Secondary, No Employme	ent, No Transport	1
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Frontage on Astley Lane with scope for required visibil	lity	4
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
The scale of the development should not cause an iss	ue on the local network	5
Mitigation measure		Total score
Speed limit reduction from National to 30mph along ar require traffic calming features to support reduction	nd in advance of site frontage may also	10
Support? Need to combine w	vith other sites: Suitability for partia	al development:
No		
Highways Agency n/a Network Rail :		
<u>Biodiversity</u>		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the b flows down the east of the site (which flows to St Aidan Provide a 20 metre buffer from the beck.		
Natural England:		
Education		
Draine as Mater/Electina		
Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatmer	nt Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		
<u>Utilities</u>		
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.

Electric:

Site Ref: 1237	Site Name:	Land to the north a Swillington,	and east of Astley Lane,
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeolog	y Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy ₋Traveller Si	te Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	1 -	1, 2, 2, 2
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments .	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asse	ssment		
Conclusion summary:			
	rea of Swillington. De	velopment would extend the s	rading estate, the site is poorly settlement to the south and could set a e poor accessibility.
Site Capacity (dwellings units	s): 137	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 1244 Site Name: Land to the North of Garforth Cliffe Park,

S	iŧ	e	ח	Δi	ta	П	6

Northing: 432169 Area sq m: 34814.38 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 441634 Area Ha: 3.481438 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Recreation & Leisure - Holiday Park

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 874.68 Distance to bus stop (metres) 340.30 Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 12496 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 2 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Flat rectangular site currently with an agricultural use. It is bordered to the south by a caravan park, reservior and a small area of woodland. To the east is existing housing and to the west and north are further fields. There is an access road in the south west corner but this would not be wide enough or suitable to support a new housing development.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.89	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

Site Ref: 1244 Site Name: Land to the North of Garforth Cliffe Park, LS25

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/245/76/1	Renewal of outline permission to erect service reser voir, with access road and pip e corridors, to agricul	06/06/1979	10/09/1979	А	29.95
H33/245/76/	Outline application to erect s ervice reservoir, with acces s road and pipe corridors, to agricultural land, quar	30/03/1976	02/08/1976	А	30.54
33/118/97/FU	Use of agricultural land as cricket pitch and two football pitches	14/05/1997	13/02/1998	Α	97.44
33/151/02/FU	Change of use of agricultural land to golf practice area	05/04/2002	06/06/2002	R	96.47

Site Ref: 1244 Site Name: Land to the North of Garforth Cliffe Park,

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?	
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 history	oric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Well contained site with good links to settlement. Development would round off this secti	on of Garforth.
Conformity with Core Strategy	

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

Site Ref: 1244 Site Name: Land to the North of Garforth Cliffe Park,

HLAA Conclusio	ons						
Availability: Short term (0	0-5yrs) Suitabil	ity: LDF t	to determine	A	chievability:	Long term	(11+ years)
Summary of Infras	tructure prov	ider cor	nments a	and oth	er plann	ing requi	irements
Leeds City Council Hi	ghways inc Met	<u>ro</u>					
Accessibility comment							Rank (1-5)
Poor buses, 20% primary,	50% secondary, 50)% health					2
Access Comments							Rank (1-5)
No frontage onto adopted	highway, abuts lar	ger potentia	al developme	nt sites			3
Local network comment	t						Rank (1-5)
Significant cummulative is	ssues						4
Mitigation measure							Total score
							9
Support?	Need to co	ombine wit	h other sites	s:	Suitabilit	y for partial	development:
No							
L							
Potential for cumulative im Leeds cluster.	pact in combination	n with other	sites. If site	still includ	led at next si	ft assess as	part of East
Network Rail :							
<u>Biodiversity</u>							
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology	Officer:	В	oundary A	Amendment		
Supported							
Natural England:							
<u>Education</u>							
Drainage/Water/Flood	ina						
Environment Agency Co			Environ	ment Age	ncy Constra	ints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	nts:		Yorkshi	re Water \	Waste Wate	Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manager	ment:						
<u>Utilities</u>							

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.

Gas:

Site Ref:	1244	Site Name:	Land to the North of Ga LS25	rforth Cliffe Park,
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herit	age			
Leeds City	Council:			
	hire Archaeology	Service:		
English Her	ritage:			
Gypsy ₋ T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	•	(Text)	-	
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers li	ive on the	(Text)		
Site?				
Proximity t	to housed	Yes	No	
	d travellers	(Text)	1	
Experience	e of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme		(Text)	110	OTIKHOWH
•				
Conolinati	f A			
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment		
Conclusion su	ummary:			
	straints apart from		d, with site 3110 would round off the concerns re no direct access. Would	
Site Capacity	(dwellings units)	: 84	Floorspace sq m (Non resi	dential):
Residential Co			Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber			ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 1269 Site Name: Land between Pit Lane and Roman Road, Micklefield

Site Details

432286 276620.60 Northing: Area sq m: Ward Kippax and Methley 443412 Easting: Area Ha: 27.66206 HMCA: **Outer South East**

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Mineral workings and quarries

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1986.10 Distance to bus stop (metres) 836.46 Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 12951 SFRA Flood Zone:

0.00

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 2 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No Yes 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large flat site currently with an agricultural use. Fields surround a farm in the centre, the site is bordered to the south and west by roads. There is a quarry to the east and some sporadic housing that runs along the north east boundary. Trees line the northern border containing the site.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.74	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?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes	
Site		Site Type		
Peckfield Quarry Micklefield		Quarries		
Peckfield Quarry Micklefield		Landfill Sites		

Site Ref: 1269 Site Name: Land between Pit Lane and Roman Road , Micklefield

Site Ref: 1269 Site Name: Land between Pit Lane and Roman Road , Micklefield

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?	□ No ✔
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?	✓
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 history	oric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Isolated site that does not relate to settlement. Development would reduce the separation and Micklefield and set a precedent for further sprawl.	between Garforth

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
Fast Leeds			

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: 1269 Site Name: Land between Pit Lane and Roman Road , Micklefield

HLAA Conclusi	ions			
Availability: Short term	(0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF t	o determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infra	structure provider con	nments and of	ther plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council I	lighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1
The site fails all the acce	ssibility criteria			1
Access Comments				Rank (1
Has frontage access to	the highway			4
Local network comme	nt			Rank (1
Local congestion issues	;			3
Mitigation measure				Total so
				8
Support?	Need to combine wit	h other sites:	Suitability	y for partial development:
No	Would require the deve and 2157 to meet CS s		N/A	
Lighways Agency				
	impact in combination with other	sites. If site still inclu	uded at next sit	ft assess as part of East
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecolog	y and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	y Amendment	
corridor function of the la roadside to the west i.e.	n to protect and enhance the wild and to the north, and tree belt alo minimum 20 metre buffer along etention of vegetation along road	ng the		
Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Floo	<u>ding</u>			
Environment Agency C	omments:	Environment Ag	gency Constra	ints:
Yorkshire Water Comm	nents:	Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water	Treatment Works Comm

Utilities

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:	1269	Site Name:	Land between Pit Lane ar Micklefield	nd Roman Road ,
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Duilt Haritana				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:				
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site Assessment				
	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed		(Text)		
Would gyp		Yes	No	Maybe
travellers li	ve on the	(Text)		
Site:				
Proximity to housed		Yes No		
gypsies an	d travellers	(Text)		
Experience	of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme		(Text)		
Conclusion of Assessment				
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. Isolated site, unrelated to the existing settlement of Micklefield. Development would set a precedent for unrestricted sprawl and contribute to the coalescence of Garforth and Micklefield. Highways concerns re poor accessibility.				
Site Capacity (dwellings units): 621 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):				ntial):
Residential Conclusion:		Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red		Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 1270 Land between Pit Lane and the Cresent Site Name: Micklefield

Site Details

432359 147848.79 Northing: Area sq m: Ward Kippax and Methley 444319 Easting: Area Ha: 14.784879 HMCA: **Outer South East**

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings Neighbouring Use 3: Mineral workings and quarries

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

SFRA Flood Zone:

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2827.36 Distance to bus stop (metres) 205.68 Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 12482

0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 2 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

The site is a disused part of the quarry to the west, it now has an agricultural use as grazing land. The eastern section borders the southern part of Micklefield, here the site slopes steeply upwards before levelling off once it is much higher than the settlement.

UDP Designation

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	94.99	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.03	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:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Yes

	Training Charles Caroguatum g Charl
Site	Site Type
Peckfield Quarry Micklefield	Quarries
Peckfield Quarry Micklefield	Landfill Sites

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?

Yes

Site Ref: 1270 Site Name: Land between Pit Lane and the Cresent Micklefield

Planning History

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
33/49/93/FU	Variation of conditions 1, 3, 5, 20, 25, 27, 33, 34, 48, and 57 of application no 88/33/00264 (limit of mineral extraction)	22/02/1993	30/07/1993	Α	16.07
H33/313/74/	Concrete block double garage.	07/08/1974	25/11/1974	W	71.59

Site Ref: 1270 Site Name: Land between Pit Lane and the Cresent Micklefield

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large	e built up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute rib	bon development?			
Would development result in isolated de	velopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up area	a (2+ boundaries with	n existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively	y "round off" the sett	ement pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a grarea and undeveloped land?	ood existing barrier b	etween existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
Low potential to lead to unrestricted spra	awl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from me	rging			
Would development of the site lead to p	nysical connection of	f settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a g development?	ood existing barrier/b	ooundary to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging of settlements				
Assist in safeguarding countryside fr	om encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary be	tween the site and t	ne existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the cour	ntryside?			
Does the site include local or national co	nservation designat	ed areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a a	gricultural land?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are	e these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Cond	<u>clusion</u>			
The site does not perform an important in	ole in safeguarding	he countryside from encro	achment	
Preserve the setting and special char	acter of historic tov	vns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conser historical feature?	vation area, listed bu	ilding or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclus	on:			
Development of the site would have no	effect on the setting a	and special character of his	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Site is set to the west of settlement and the quarry to the west which reduces po			irly well contained by	
Conformity with Core Str	ategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settl	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller se	ttlement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gate	way:	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

Site Ref: 1270 Site Name: Land between Pit Lane and the Cresent Micklefield

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** Rank (1-5) 4 buses per hour, 100% primary, 40% secondary, 100% health 4 Rank (1-5) **Access Comments** Frontage onto Moorleigh Drive 5 Rank (1-5) Local network comment Small site with no significant impact 5 Mitigation measure **Total score** 14 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: Yes **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: **Boundary Amendment** Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are Not supported (RED). Possible Magnesian Limestone grassland areas that will need to be removed - further botanical excluded and the boundary is amended as per survey required and Red areas will need to be assessed drawing RM/1270. Mitigation will still be required to against Local Wildlife Site (SEGI) criteria. ensure adjacent habitats are protected and enhanced. Parts of the site are potential Local Wildlife Site -**Natural England:** Education **Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments:** Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Utilities

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:	1270	Site Name:	Land between Pit Lane ar Micklefield	nd the Cresent
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herita	ane			
Leeds City (_			
_	hire Archaeology	Service:		
English Her	itage:			
Gypsy ₋ T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed		(Text)		
Would gyp		Yes	No	Maybe
travellers li	ive on the	(Text)		
Site:				
Proximity t		Yes	No	
gypsies an	d travellers	(Text)		
Experience	of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme		(Text)	1	
Conclusio	on of Asses	sment		
Conclusion su	ımmarv.			
		ent to an existing qua	arry and slopes steeply because of this	. Development would not
relate well to th	e existing settleme		et a precedent for further Green Belt spi	
linging there a	uo to tilo lioigili ai	.a o.opga.a.o o. a		
Site Capacity	(dwellings units):	: 333	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Co	onclusion:	Retai	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber		Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 430637 Area sq m: 3349.72 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 441689 Area Ha: 0.334972 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage **~** Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2406.52 Distance to bus stop (metres) 127.83 Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 2357 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:**

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Urban
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:

The site is the central section of a larger allotment site. Small and roughly square the site appears to have been vacant for some time, and is overgrown. Residential properties border the site to the east and west, access is also available via a road to the west.

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:	99.99	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

Planning History

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/898/79/	Outline application to erect d etached bungalow with garag e, to vacant site.(site area 0 .33ha)	01/11/1979	31/12/1979	R	79.48
H33/822/78/	Outline application to lay out access and erect resid ential development to vacant s ite (site area 0.34ha (0.	09/10/1978	02/01/1979	R	88.18
H33/867/78/	Outline application to lay out access road and erect seven detached houses to allotment site. (site area	18/10/1978	22/01/1979	W	78.72
12/02642/CLE	Certificate of Existing lawful use of allotments as vacant land	14/06/2012	09/08/2012	W	98.01
H33/351/87/	Outline application to erect r esidential development, to al lotments site. (site area 0.3 1ha)	23/12/1987	14/03/1988	Α	90.28

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	ge built up are	as			
Would development lead to/constitute i	ribbon developr	nent?			
Would development result in isolated d	levelopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up are	ea (2+ boundari	es with ex	isting built up area)?		
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" th	ne settleme	ent pattern?:		
Do natural/physical features provide a area and undeveloped land?	good existing b	arrier betw	een existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Prevent neighbouring towns from m	erging				
Would development of the site lead to	physical connec	ction of set	ttlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing b	arrier/bour	ndary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
Assist in safeguarding countryside f	from encroach	ment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	petween the site	and the e	existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the co	untryside?				
Does the site include local or national of	conservation de	signated a	reas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlan significant unprotected tree/hedge covered tree/he		erows that	are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land	d?			
Does the site contain buildings?		Are the	ese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Cor	nclusion_				
Preserve the setting and special cha	aracter of histo	ric towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conse historical feature?	ervation area, lis	sted buildir	ng or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	s character?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	sion:				
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Conformity with Core St	trategy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00		Smaller sett	lement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:		0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gatew	ay:	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

Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11-	
Summary of Infractructure provider comments and other planning requires	
difficially of infrastructure provider comments and other planning require	ments
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	
Accessibility comment	Rank (1-5
Meets Core Strategy standards in most areas but falls short of secondary education	4
Access Comments	Rank (1-5
Has access onto Pondfields Drive	5
Local network comment	Rank (1-5
Spare capacity in this area	5
Mitigation measure	Total sco
None	14
Support? Need to combine with other sites: No No No No No No No No No N	elopment:
Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment	
Supported Detailed 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20	
Natural England:	
<u>Education</u>	
Drainage/Water/Flooding	
Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Workshire Water Waste Water Waste Water Treatment Workshire Water Waste Water Water Waste Water Water Waste Water Waste Water Water Waste Water Water Waste Water Wate	rks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:	
<u>Utilities</u> 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.

Electric:

Site Ref: 1321	Site Name:	Moorleigh Drive, So Kippax	outh of Pondfields Drive,
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy ₋ Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	ssment		
Conclusion summary:			
	pace section, page 28	8, question G10. Developmen	need to be considered through the nt would be set within the middle of the d.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 13	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 428414 Area sq m: 29027.55 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 440644 Area Ha: 2.902755 HMCA: Outer South East

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:

Other uses:

Site State: Mix

Site Detail Topography:

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3880.62Distance to bus stop (metres)245.64Nearest Railway StationWoodlesfordBus Stop ID1045SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Boundaries:

Existing well defined

No

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 4 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Flat

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

The site is flat, roughly square and joined by residential development to the east and the north. The land has a mix of uses, residential properties are located in the south west corner, and a farm building currently used as a kennels is to the south east. Above this to the north is vacant grassland. The site is contained to the west by a dense tree line and to the north by a public footpath.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.98	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?:

Planning History

Site Ref: 1357

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/489/75/	Outline application to erect o ne detached 3 bedroomed dormi bungalow with detached garag e, to smallholding	07/07/1975	06/10/1975	R	12.65
H33/707/78/	Outline application to erect h atchery unit, and to renov ate farmhouse, to smallholding.	21/08/1978	04/12/1978	R	11.98
H33/484/80/	Outline application to erect d etached bungalow and garag e to form small holding to vac ant site. (site area	23/07/1980	29/09/1980	R	13.34
H33/290/86/	Alterations including new stai rcase and roof light and 2 dor mer windows, to form 2 bedroom s and shower room inroof space	14/10/1986	12/11/1986	А	18.88
11/04310/FU	Retrospective use of land for siting of mobile home with associated works and retention of chicken shed, 2 single stables and dog pen	12/10/2011	23/02/2012	R	15.77
H33/508/80/	Outline application to erect e xtension to detached house.	08/08/1980	29/09/1980	R	11.39
H33/283/74/	Outline application to erect r esidential development, to si te of existing boarding kennel s (site area 2.h (4.7 acres	31/07/1974	04/11/1974	R	76.78
H33/73/81/	Alterations, to form enlarged bathroom, and extensions, to fo rm store and kitchen, to rear, and 2 bedrooms, to side of de	12/02/1981	27/02/1981	А	18.60
06/03910/FU	1 block of 6 stables to meadow land	26/06/2006	14/09/2006	R	13.23
H33/925/79/	Change of use of part of poult ry farm to agric ultural tool and contractors p lant store.	09/11/1979	31/12/1979	R	17.96
1 33/44/79/	Outline application to erect d etached bungalow to board ing kennels.	22/01/1979	23/04/1979	R	65.56
H33/688/77/	Detached block of boarding ken nels to site of exist ing boarding kennels.	11/10/1977	23/01/1978	Α	65.53
10/03982/FU	Detached stable block	31/08/2010	10/11/2010	Α	16.30
06/06384/FU	Erection of one block of 6 stables to vacant land	25/10/2006	18/12/2006	Α	13.23
H33/123/74/	Extension to kitchen and new b ay window to bedroom, to detac hed bungalow.	15/05/1974	24/06/1974	Α	65.53

12/03296/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5 and 6 for planning permission for Change of use of the land for the purposes of the stationing of caravans for human habitation, the creation of a a hardstanding by the deposit of hardcore, the erection of fencing and gates, timber sheds and generator housing and the parking of private motor vehicles ancillary to the residential use of the Land and commercial vehicles used in connection with the business of the	30/07/2012	22/10/2012	A	15.77
	commercial vehicles used in				

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	ge built up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute r	ribbon development?			
Would development result in isolated d	evelopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up are	ea (2+ boundaries with e	existing built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the settler	ment pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a garea and undeveloped land?	good existing barrier be	tween existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sp	rawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from m	erging			
Would development of the site lead to	physical connection of s	ettlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing barrier/bo	undary to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging of settlements				
Assist in safeguarding countryside f	rom encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	etween the site and the	existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the cou	untryside?		\checkmark	
Does the site include local or national of	conservation designated	l areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlan significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		at are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land?			
Does the site contain buildings?	✓ Are t	hese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Cor	nclusion_			
The site does not perform an important	role in safeguarding the	e countryside from encro	achment	
Preserve the setting and special cha	racter of historic town	ıs		
Is the site within or adjacent to a consensation historical feature?	ervation area, listed build	ding or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	s character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	sion:			
Development of the site would have no	effect on the setting an	d special character of his	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Strong links to settlement. Well contain	ned by tree to west reduce	cing potential for further s	sprawl.	
Conformity with Core St	rategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settl	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller se	ttlement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

HLAA C	Conclusions						
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determ	ne Ach	ievability:	Long term (11+ years)
ummary	of Infrastructu	ıre provide	er comment	s and othe	r planni	ng requir	rements
	/ Council Highway	s inc Metro					Dank (4 E)
Good acces	ty comment sibility						Rank (1-5)
	•						5
Access Co	mments						Rank (1-5
Access fron	n Ninevah Lane						5
Local netw	ork comment						Rank (1-5)
No issues							5
Mitigation I	measure ne would need improv	rements to widtl	h and nedestrian	facilities			Total scor
INITEVALI LA	ne would need improv	ements to wat	ir and pedesinan	lacilities			15
Support?		Need to comb	ine with other s	ites:	Suitability	for partial d	evelopment:
Yes with mi	tigation					<u> </u>	
lighways	Agency	<u>. </u>					
n/a							
<u>Network R</u>	<u>ail :</u>						
Biodiversi	<u>ty</u>						
	hire Ecology and LC			Boundary Am	nendment		
owther Nor	vith mitigation to protect th Site of Ecological a ve hedgerow and scru	nd Geological I	nterest				
Natural Eng							
Education							
<u>-uucation</u>							
Orainage/V	Nater/Flooding						
Environmer	nt Agency Comments	5 :	Envi	onment Agend	y Constra	ints:	
orkshire W	Vater Comments:		York	shire Water Wa	aste Water	Treatment V	Vorks Comme
.CC Flood I	Risk Management:						
<u>Jtilities</u>							

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.

Gas:

Site Ref: 1357	Site Name:	Ninevan Lane, Alle	rton Bywater
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	it	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. The site has stro	on all sides, the tree		al development to the east and the create a natural buffer that would
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 65	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not a	assessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 432359 Area sq m: 10561.27 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 439869 Area Ha: 1.056127 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Residential - Dwellings

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1486.27Distance to bus stop (metres)36.49Nearest Railway StationGarforthBus Stop ID3186

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way:

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Three separate sites all set along Selby Road. These are small, flat brownfield sites, two with existing houses on. The other is an access way into properties and some parking.

Yes

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.21	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

Planning History

Site Ref: 1366

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/417/76/	Outline application to erect d etached bungalow, to small holding.	02/06/1976	23/08/1976	Α	21.63
H33/411/80/	Outline application to erect d etached house to vacant site.	19/06/1980	08/09/1980	R	24.80
H33/587/74/	Outline application to erect o ne detached bungalow to va cant site (site area 0.61ha (1 .5 acres)).	19/12/1974	10/03/1975	R	23.25
H33/215/79/	Laying out of access and erect ion of detached 4 bedroomhouse, with integral double garage, to vacant site. (site area	23/03/1979	02/07/1979	Α	22.25
33/9/02/RM	Two detached dwelling houses	09/01/2002	02/08/2002	Α	15.01
08/05894/CLE	Certificate of Lawful use of land as a nursery	16/10/2008		APPRET	24.75
H33/347/77/	Detached bungalow, comprising 3 bedrooms, bathroom, hall, kitch en, and lounge, with integral ga rage, to smallholding(site area	26/05/1977	08/08/1977	А	21.73
H33/111/76/	Alterations, to form new acces s, to poultry farm.	17/02/1976	24/05/1976	Α	22.56
33/181/01/OT	Outline application to erect 2 detached houses	18/05/2001	18/09/2001	Α	15.41
H33/56/78/	Outline application to erect 2 detached bungalows, to vacan t site. (site area	25/01/1978	24/04/1978	R	18.64
H33/152/83/	Detached cattle shed to smallh olding.	01/06/1983	05/09/1983	Α	22.83
33/370/05/OT	Outline application to erect two detached dwellings to garden site	03/08/2005	28/09/2005	Α	10.87
H33/219/88/	Alterations, to form enlarged dining room, dormer windo w, to form bedroom in roof spa ce, to front and extensions	01/06/1988	11/07/1988	Α	27.96
H33/44/92/	Outline application to erect t wo detached bungalows to garde n site. (site area 0.13 ha)	12/02/1992	28/04/1992	R	10.07
H33/560/78/	Outline application to erect o ne detached bungalow and garag e, to site of existing residen tial caravan. (site area	10/07/1978	11/09/1978	Α	18.58
H33/429/81/	3 bedroom detached house with office, covered yard and g reenhouse to smallholding.	27/10/1981	08/02/1982	Α	24.75
33/84/97/FU	Removal of condition no 3 application no 81/33/429 (non occupancy of no 78)	03/04/1997	13/06/1997	Α	24.80
12/04381/CLE	Certificate of Existing Lawful Use for non compliance with an agricultural occupancy condition.	15/10/2012		PCO	12.29

Site Ref: 1366 Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Garforth, LS25 1

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 0.00 Major Urban Area: Major Settlement 1.00 0.00 Urban Extenstion Area: 1.00 Smaller settlement Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: 0.00 Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway:

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

Site Ref: 1366 Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Garforth , LS25 1

HLAA Conclusion	IS					
Availability: Short term (0-5	yrs) Suitability:	Yes		Achievability:	Medium term	n (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastr	ucture provide	er commo	ents and o	ther plann	ing requir	ements
Leeds City Council High	nways inc Metro					
Accessibility comment						Rank (1-5
4 buses per hour, 100% emp	oloyment, 100% prim	ary health &	secondary educ	cation		4
Access Comments						Rank (1-5
Adjacent sites needed						3
Local network comment						Rank (1-5
Cumulative issues						4
Mitigation measure						Total sco
						11
Support?	Need to comb	oine with oth	ner sites:	Suitabilit	y for partial de	evelopment:
Yes but adjacent sites					, .o. par a.	
needed						
n∕a <u>Network Rail :</u> <u>Biodiversity</u> West Yorkshire Ecology an	nd LCC Ecology Off	icer:	Boundary	/ Amendment		
Supported				,		
Natural England:						
<u>Education</u>						
<u> Drainage/Water/Floodin</u> Environment Agency Comr		E	Environment A	gency Constra	aints:	
				<u>, , </u>		
Yorkshire Water Comments			orkshire Wate	r Waste Wate	r Treatment W	orks Comme
_CC Flood Risk Manageme	ent:					
-						
<u>Jtilities</u> Sas:						

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.

Electric:

Site Ref: 1366	Site Name:	Land south of Selby	Road, Garforth , LS25 1
Telecom: Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	ner is surrounded by hallocated as Protected	houses. These have been subr	ment. Two sites contain existing mitted as a way to improve access the existing UDP, not within the
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 38	Floorspace sq m (Nor	residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 433840 Area sq m: 7202.16 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 441351 Area Ha: 0.720216 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: 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: Greenfield

Site Detail

Natural Landscape:

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 730.77 Distance to bus stop (metres) 259.59

Nearest Railway Station Garforth Bus Stop ID 4325

Significant Tree Cover

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Urban 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Vacant overgrown site sandwiched between residential dwellings to the east, employment to the west and north and a playing pitch to the south. Main road frontage is to the west which borders the site.

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?:	
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

Planning History

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
08/05287/FU	Block of 3 light industrial units	09/09/2008	24/10/2008	W	94.57
07/05432/FU	Use of vacant land to B1, B2 and B8 use and erection of 1.8m high fencing	29/08/2007		APPRET	94.65
PREAPP/07/00084		13/06/2007		PRECAP	94.56
10/00772/FU	Detached workshop to vacant land	19/02/2010	23/04/2010	R	99.91

Green Belt assessment	- only comp	oleted	where site is w	ithin Gree	n Belt
Check the unrestricted sprawl of late Would development lead to/constitute Would development result in isolated Is the site well connected to built up a Would development of the site effection Do natural/physical features provide a area and undeveloped land? Overall sprawl conclusion:	e ribbon developme development? area (2+ boundarie vely "round off" the	ent? s with exi	ent pattern?:		
Prevent neighbouring towns from a Would development of the site lead to Do natural/physical features provide a development? Overall Coalescence Conclusion:	o physical connect				
Assist in safeguarding countryside Is there a strong defensible boundary Does the site provide access to the country Does the site include local or national Does the site include areas of woodle significant unprotected tree/hedge country Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3 Does the site contain buildings? Overall countryside Encroachment Country	between the site ountryside? I conservation desands, trees, hedge ver? a agricultural land	and the e ignated a rows that ?	reas?		
Preserve the setting and special character Preservation Concording of the Steel Stee	servation area, listonis character?: Substitution:		g or other		
Conformity with Core S					
Major Urban Area: Urban Extenstion Area: Regeneration Priority Area:	0.00		Major Settlen Smaller settle		1.0 0.0
Inner South Leeds: Leeds Bradford Corridor: Fast Leeds		0.00 0.00	Aire Valley: West Leeds Gatewa	y:	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.

HLAA Conclus	ions						
Availability: Short term	(0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to detern	nine p	Achievability:	Medium term	n (6-10 years)
Summary of Infra	structure	provide	er commen	ts and oth	ner plann	ing require	ements
Leeds City Council	Highways ii	nc Metro					
Accessibility commen							Rank (1-5
4 buses per hour, 100%	primary, 100°	% health,					4
Access Comments							Rank (1-5
Landlocked site, require	es adjacent si	te for acces	s				3
Local network comme	ent						Rank (1-5
Local congestion issue	S						3
Mitigation measure							Total sco
Possible traffic signals	incorporating	other existir	ng junctions				10
Support?	Ne	ed to comb	oine with other	sites:	Suitability	y for partial de	evelopment:
No	Yes	6			No		
Highways Agency							
n/a							
Network Rail :							
<u> Biodiversity</u>							
West Yorkshire Ecolo	y and LCC E	cology Off	icer:	Boundary	Amendment		
Supported - but Great C	rested Newts	to consider					
Natural England:							
<u>Education</u>							
Orainage/Water/Floo	oding						
Environment Agency (Env	ironment Age	ency Constra	ints:	
orkshire Water Comm	nents:		Yorl	kshire Water	Waste Water	Treatment W	orks Comme
.CC Flood Risk Manaç	gement:						
<u> Itilities</u>							
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.

Electric:

Site Ref: 2032	Site Name:	Lotherton Way, Ash	Lane, Garforth
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
o o			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	-	
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?	(10,11)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Functions of annulous	Vaa	N ₀	I believe accomp
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
onoumpmonto			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
			have residential properties adjoining
the site. Highways concerns regindustrial uses. Without use of a			
industrial uses. Without use of a	ajacent playing pitent	33 Site there is little 300pe to lim	51046.
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	23	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 2040 Site Name: Temple Point, Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Storage

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Transport - Transport tracks & ways Neighbouring Use 1

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 **~** 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: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No No

Public Rights of Way:

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

Planning History

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
32/195/99/OT	Outline application to form access and erect a business park	20/08/1999	20/12/2001	Α	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	Α	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	Α	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	Α	95.24
32/449/04/OT	Variation of condition 2 of permission 32/195/99/ot (time limit)	30/11/2004	26/01/2005	Α	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

Site Ref: 2040 Site Name: Temple Point, Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton

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 Major Urban Area: 100.00 Major Settlement 0.00 0.00 Urban Extenstion Area: 1.00 Smaller settlement Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: 0.00 Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: East Leeds

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

HLAA C	onclusions						
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to dete	ermine	Achievability:	Medium term	(6-10 years)
ummary	of Infrastruct	ure provide	er comme	nts and o	ther plann	ing require	ments
	Council Highwa	ys inc Metro					
	y comment						Rank (1-5
Has Plannin	g Permission						5
Access Co							Rank (1-5
Has Plannir	ng Permission						5
Local netw	ork comment						Rank (1-5
Has Plannir	ng Permission						5
Mitigation ı	neasure						Total scor
Has Plannir	ng Permission						15
Support?		Need to comb	oine with other	er sites:	Suitability	y for partial dev	elopment:
Yes - has pl permission	anning	No			n/a		
Highways	Agency						
	cumulative impact in r.	combination wit	th other sites.	If site still inc	luded at next sil	ft assess as part	of East
Biodiversit	ty						
	— hire Ecology and L0	CC Ecology Offi	icer:	Boundar	y Amendment		
Supported	<u> </u>				<u>-</u>		
Natural Eng	land:						
<u>Education</u>							
	Vater/Flooding	I-	-	avironmont A	manay Canatra	·into	
Environmen	t Agency Comment	is:		IVII OIIIII EIIL A	gency Constra		
						_	
Yorkshire W	later Comments:		Y (orkshire Wate	er Waste Water	Treatment Wo	rks Comme
-CC Flood F	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.

Gas:

Site Ref: 2040	Site Name:	remple Point,	Bullertnorp	e Lane, Coiton
Electric: Telecom: Fire and Rescue Services: Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	· Service:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)		No	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No		Unknown
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary: Planning permission for resident	ial development grant	ed August 2012 Form	ner employment al	location on the existing LIDP
r talling permission for resident	ar development grant	54 / lagust 2012. 1 0111	ioi employment di	iocation on the existing GDT.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 86	Floorspace s	q m (Non resider	ntial):
Residential Conclusion: Green		I Conclusion: ssessed		Employment Conclusion: Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 433694 Area sq m: 17316.96 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 441359 Area Ha: 1.731696 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):687.44Distance to bus stop (metres)136.84Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID8628SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Urban 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Greenfield land with two playing pitches on site. Pitches are currently in use, some trees line the boundary of the site. A mix of employment and residential adjoin the site, the main road runs along the southern boundary with a smaller road along the west.

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?:	
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

Planning History

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 0.00 Major Urban Area: Major Settlement 1.00 0.00 Urban Extenstion Area: 1.00 Smaller settlement Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: 0.00 Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: East Leeds

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.

	(0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Medium term (6-10 years)
summary of Infras	structure	provide	er comments and	l other plann	ing requirements
,					3
<u>_eeds City Council H</u> Accessibility comment	<u>lighways ir</u>	nc Metro			Rank (1-5
1 buses per hour, 100%	orimary, 20%	secondary	, 80% health		4
					T
Access Comments					Rank (1-
Site frontage onto compl works might be needed	ex section of	A642, leve	el differences limit option	ns for access. Mitiç	gation 4
Local network commer	nt				Rank (1-5
Local congestion issues					3
Mitigation measure					Total sco
Possible traffic signals in	corporating o	other existir	ng junctions		11
Support?	Nee	ed to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitabilit	y for partial development:
Yes with possible mitigat	tion				
<u> Highways Agency</u>					
Potential for cumulative ir ₋eeds cluster.	npact in com	bination wit	h other sites. If site still	included at next si	ft assess as part of East
20000 01001011					
Network Rail :					
Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology	≀ and LCC E	cology Offi	icer: Boun	dary Amendment	
Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology	/ and LCC E	cology Offi	icer: Boun	dary Amendment	
Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology Supported	/ and LCC E	cology Offi	icer: Boun	dary Amendment	
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology Supported Natural England:	/ and LCC E	cology Offi	icer: Boun	dary Amendment	
Network Rail :	/ and LCC E	cology Offi	icer: Bound	dary Amendment	
Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology Supported Natural England: Education		cology Offi	icer: Bound	dary Amendment	
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology Supported Natural England:	ding	cology Offi		dary Amendment	nints:
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology Supported Natural England: Education Orainage/Water/Flood	ding	cology Offi			nints:
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology Supported Natural England: Education Orainage/Water/Flood	ding omments:	cology Offi	Environmen	nt Agency Constra	nints:
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology Supported Natural England: Education Orainage/Water/Flood Environment Agency Co	ding omments:	cology Offi	Environmen	nt Agency Constra	
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology Supported Natural England: Education Orainage/Water/Flood Environment Agency Co	ding omments: ents:	cology Offi	Environmen	nt Agency Constra	

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.

Gas:

Site Ref: 2091	Site Name:	Abertord Road, Gart	ortn, LS25
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		,
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	·	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		•
	<u> </u>		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Within existing settlement (not G			
pitch under the existing UDP. Lo greenspace section, page 28, qu		uld need to be considered throu	gh the greenspace review. See
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 55	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 431066 Area sq m: 88573.55 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 441884 Area Ha: 8.857355 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Significant Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1999.28Distance to bus stop (metres)296.85Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID13139SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site is heavily treed and adjoins the northern boundary of Kippax, set beyond the rear gardens of Sandgate Drive. The site slopes gently upwards to the North and eventually links to open fields. Access is possible from Bula Close and Baildon Avenue.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.01	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	99.99	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)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/388/75/	Outline application to erect r esidential development, to va cant site.(site area 11.09ha (27.4 acres)).	02/06/1975	10/01/1977	W	29.26

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 0.00 Major Urban Area: Major Settlement 0.00 Urban Extenstion Area: 1.00 Smaller settlement 1.00 Regeneration Priority Area:

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.

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

HLAA C	Conclusions						
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to deter	mine	Achievability:	Medium tern	n (6-10 years)
Summary	y of Infrastructu	re provide	er commer	its and ot	her plann	ing requir	ements
	y Council Highway	s inc Metro					Donk (4 E)
	ty comment hour, 40% primary hea	alth % primary	education, 90%	employment	:		Rank (1-5)
							4
Access Co							Rank (1-5)
Access via	Bula Close or Baildon	Avenue					5
Lassinstu							Dowle (4.5)
Cumulative	ork comment issues						Rank (1-5)
							4
Mitigation	measure						Total scor
							13
Support?		Need to comb	oine with other	sites:	Suitabilit	y for partial de	evelopment:
Yes						<u>.</u>	· ·
<u>Highways</u>	<u>Agency</u>						
n/a 							
Network R	<u>Rail :</u>						
<u>Biodiversi</u>	ty						
	hire Ecology and LC0			_	Amendment		
calcareous (UK BAP Pri	ed (RED). No site-spec grassland likely to be p prity Habitat, and it offe crub link to the nearby	resent on parts rs a valuable o	s of this site, open	Potential L	∟ocal Wildlife S	Site - needs to	be assessed.
Natural Eng	gland:						
Education	<u>.</u>						
Drainage/\	Water/Flooding						
Environme	nt Agency Comments	<u> </u>	En	vironment Aç	gency Constra	aints:	
Yorkshire V	Vater Comments:		You	kshire Wate	r Waste Wate	r Treatment W	orks 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.

<u>Utilities</u> Gas:

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmer	nt		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)			1
site?				
Dravimity to have d	Vac		T No.	
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)		No	
3,1				
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
The site is a Protected Area of Se		existing UDP, not with	in the Green Belt. Th	e site is well treed, which
could severely limit development	opportunities.			
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	285	Floorspace	sq m (Non residentia	al):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	Er	mployment Conclusion:
Amber	Red		Re	ed

Site Name: Moorgate Kippax

Site Ref: 2131

Site Details

Northing: 432247 Area sq m: 179964.30 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 439903 Area Ha: 17.99643 HMCA: Outer South East

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:

Other uses:

Site State: Mix

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1565.51 Distance to bus stop (metres) 149.76 Nearest Railway Station Garforth Bus Stop ID 3186 SFRA Flood Zone: 1.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: Environment Agency Flood Zone: 1.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Set just to the South of Selby Road the site is a mix of brownfield and greenfield with some dwellings and gardens within the curtilage. The majority of the site consists of fields, these are bordered by trees and a beck to the south east. A walkway which was once originally a railway line runs along the eastern boundary, the eastern section of the site slopes steeply downwards. The main access is from the west which links to a major roundabout.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.30	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	99.99	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)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
Tunning App 110.	Troposui	Receiveu	Decision	Siaius	Suc 70
H33/411/80/	Outline application to erect d etached house to vacant site.	19/06/1980	08/09/1980	R	18.45
H33/215/79/	Laying out of access and erect ion of detached 4 bedroomhouse, with integral double garage, to vacant site. (site area	23/03/1979	02/07/1979	Α	15.13
H33/132/91/	Alterations and extension, to form conservatory to rearof de tached bungalow.	03/05/1991	03/06/1991	Α	19.54
08/05894/CLE	Certificate of Lawful use of land as a nursery	16/10/2008		APPRET	18.45
H33/341/88/	Alterations and extension, to form conservatory and doubl e garage, to side and detached garage and 2 detached b	26/08/1988	12/12/1988	Α	19.47
H33/26/89/	Change of use of dwelling hous e and flats to resid ential home for the elderly.	26/01/1989	13/03/1989	R	13.41
H33/429/81/	3 bedroom detached house with office, covered yard and g reenhouse to smallholding.	27/10/1981	08/02/1982	Α	18.45
33/84/97/FU	Removal of condition no 3 application no 81/33/429 (non occupancy of no 78)	03/04/1997	13/06/1997	Α	16.99

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 0.00 Major Urban Area: Major Settlement 1.00 0.00 Urban Extenstion Area: 1.00 Smaller settlement Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:

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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

HLAA Conclusion	ns					
Availability: Medium term ((6-10 y Suitability: LDF	F to determin	ne Act	nievability:	Medium te	rm (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastr	ucture provider co	omments	s and othe	er plann	ing requ	rements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro					
Accessibility comment						Rank (1-5)
4 buses per hour, 10% prim	ary, 60% secondary, 40% ł	health				4
Access Comments						Rank (1-5)
Scale of development will re	equire more than one acce	ess, relatively	/ limited fronta	ge with high	nway	4
Local network comment	-					Rank (1-5)
Existing local congestion ar	nd significant cummulative	issues				3
Mitigation measure						Total scor
New through road within sit	e to bypass existing A63					11
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other si	ites:	Suitability	for partial	development:
Yes with mitigation						
Highways Agency						
Potential for cumulative impa Leeds cluster.	act in combination with other	er sites. If s	ite still include	d at next sit	t assess as	part of East
Network Rail :						
<u>Biodiversity</u>						
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:		Boundary Ar			
Not supported (RED). No sit Disused Railway to the east rich neutral grasslands occu with Water Vole records. Lin nature conservation value (S corridor. Needs to be considerations)	ern end and calcareous/sport of within the site together with sked to surrounding sites of SSSI) by disused railway with	ecies- rith ponds f high rildlife	Potential Loca	al Wildlife S	ite - needs t	be assessed.
(SEGI) criteria. Natural England:						
•						
<u>Education</u>						
Drainage/Water/Floodir Environment Agency Com	 -	Envir	onment Agen	cv Constra	ints:	
Environment Agency Com	monto.		Januari Agen	-,		
Yorkshire Water Comment		Yorks	shire Water W	aste 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.

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref: 2132	Site Name	Selby Ro	ad G	artorth	
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage					
Leeds City Council:	Camdaa				
West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:				
g.ion rionage.					
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessme	nt			
Could site be effectively	Yes		No		Maybe
managed	(Text)				
Would gypsies and	Yes		No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)				
Proximity to housed	Yes			No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)				
Experience of previous	Yes		No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)				
Conclusion of Asses	sment				
Conclusion summary:					
The site is a Protected Area of So steeply down towards a disused of difficult if in different ownerships. maximum of 200 units. Ecology of	railway line. The si Highways will only	ite contains sever	ral exte	ended gardens wh	hich could make development
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 200	Floors	pace s	sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Conclusion:	Ret	ail Conclusion:			Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not	assessed			Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 434075 Area sq m: 363360.33 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440788 Area Ha: 36.336033 HMCA: Outer South East

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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 473.61 Distance to bus stop (metres) 459.90 Nearest Railway Station Garforth Bus Stop ID 4418 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No Yes 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site is set just north of Garforth and is part of a wider collection of sites. Currently used for agriculture it is mainly fields with a few sporadic dwellings. Flat site that has a road frontage running along the western boundary. Some tree cover, mainly along the boundary but there are two small collections within the site. The site abuts a larger protected forest area to the east.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	98.85	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)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
33/234/94/FU	Stabilisation of proposed development land and reclamation of derelict land by opencast mining	11/08/1994	04/10/1995	Α	10.50
33/104/95/FU	Extraction of coal & fireclay by opencast methods & restoration to agricultural use	03/04/1995	11/03/1997	Α	47.30
33/105/95/FU	Extraction of coal & fireclay by opencast methods and restoration to agricultural use	03/04/1995	20/02/1997	W	47.30

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large	built up are	as				
Would development lead to/constitute rib	bon develop	ment?				
Would development result in isolated dev	elopment?					
Is the site well connected to built up area	(2+ boundar	ies with e	xisting built up area)?			
Would development of the site effectively	"round off" t	he settlen	nent pattern?:	No		
Do natural/physical features provide a go area and undeveloped land?	ood existing b	arrier bet	ween existing urban			
Overall sprawl conclusion: Low potential to lead to unrestricted spra	wl					
Prevent neighbouring towns from mer	ging					
Would development of the site lead to ph	nysical conne	ction of s	ettlements?			
Do natural/physical features provide a go development?	ood existing b	oarrier/bou	undary to contain	✓		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:						
No merging of settlements						
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	om encroach	ment				
Is there a strong defensible boundary be	tween the sit	e and the	existing urban area?			
Does the site provide access to the coun	tryside?			✓		
Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?						
Does the site include areas of woodlands significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		gerows tha	at are protected, or	✓		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a ag	gricultural lan	id?		✓		
Does the site contain buildings?	✓	Are t	hese in agricultural use?			
Overall countryside Encroachment Conc	<u>lusion</u>					
The site performs an important role safe	guarding cou	ntryside fr	om encroachment			
Preserve the setting and special chara	acter of histo	oric town	s			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conserve historical feature?	ation area, li	sted build	ling or other			
If yes, could development preserve this of	character?:					
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	on:					
Development of the site would have no e	ffect on the s	setting and	d special character of his	toric features		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Site is set beyond the railway line and lin sides reducing potential for further spraw		strial rath	er than residential area. '	Well contained on all		
Conformity with Core Str	ategy					
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ement	1.00	
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00		Smaller set	tlement	0.00	
Regeneration Priority Area:						
Inner South Leeds:		0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00	
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gatew	ay:	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: Medium term (6-10 y 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** Rank (1-5) Part of site 3 buses per hour, 40% primary, 40% secondary, 40% health, poor footway connection into Garforth Town Centre with little scope for mitigation due to restriction under nearby railway **Access Comments** Rank (1-5) The level of development would require multiple accesses to be provided, position of new junctions 4 would need to be considered in conjunction with access requirement for sites on opposite side of Barwick Road Rank (1-5) Local network comment Route into Garforth constrained by narrow railway bridge, capacity/congestion issues on wider network Mitigation measure **Total score** Unclear whether the local physical constraints on Barwick Road could be addressed. Significant 9 cummulative impact on local network with other large nearby sites Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No 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 crossing; asset protection issues. Contribution to Garforth station facilities **Biodiversity** West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: **Boundary Amendment** Not supported (RED). Parts of site recently assessed against Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas (Local Local Wildlife Site (SEGI) criteria and sufficient to be Wildlife Site) are excluded and boundary substantially designated, based on importance for Great Crested Newts. amended as per drawing RM/2156. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on Great Crested Newts are addressed - including protection an **Natural England:** Education Drainage/Water/Flooding **Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Comments: 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: 215	56 5	Site Name:	West of Hawks Nest Woo Lotherton Way, Garforth	d, North of
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue	Services:			
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Coun	cil:			
West Yorkshire A	Archaeology Sei	rvice:		
English Heritage	:			
Gypsy _Trave	eller Site A	ssessment		
Could site be e			No	Maybe
managed	(16	ext)		
Would gypsies			No	Maybe
travellers live o	on the	ext)		
Proximity to ho			No	
gypsies and tra	avellers (Te	ext)		
Experience of p	orevious Ye	es	No	Unknown
encampments	(Te	ext)		
Conclusion of	of Assessn	nent		
Conclusion summa	ary:			
			way to the north, consequently there i	
sprawl into the Gree local network, and n			te runs through the northern part of the cology concerns.	e site. Highway concerns re
Site Capacity (dwel	llings units):	954	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Conclu	sion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber		Not as	sessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 433499 Area sq m: 290630.63 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 443712 Area Ha: 29.063063 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2185.08Distance to bus stop (metres)148.61Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID6808

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3a Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large site that extends Micklefield to the West. Currently has an agricultural use, no bulidings are within the site which consists of fields and a small collection of trees. The site is flat and has a road running through the centre that separates the northern and southern sections.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.69	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)

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large b	uilt up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute ribbo	n development?			
Would development result in isolated development	opment?			
Is the site well connected to built up area (2	+ boundaries with ex	kisting built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effectively "r	ound off" the settlem	ent pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	existing barrier betw	veen existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from mergi	ng			
Would development of the site lead to phys	ical connection of se	ttlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?				
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible boun	dary			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	een the site and the	existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the country	side?		✓	
Does the site include local or national cons	ervation designated a	areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, t significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	rees, hedgerows tha	t are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agric	cultural land?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are th	ese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclus	<u>ion</u>			
The site performs an important role safegua	arding countryside fro	om encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special charact	er of historic towns	3		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation historical feature?	on area, listed buildi	ng or other		
If yes, could development preserve this cha	racter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:				
Development of the site would have no effe	ct on the setting and	special character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Large site but well linked to settlement. No settlements and could lead to further spraw		to west which reduces s	eparation between	
Conformity with Core Strat	egy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ment	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller sett	lement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

HLAA Conclusio	ns			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infrast	ructure provider co	mments and ot	her planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council Hig	ghways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Poor buses, 20% rail,				2
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
	will require multiple access with access to large develop		s need to be	4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Significant cummulative is	sues			3
Mitigation measure				Total score
				9
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for par	tial development:
No				
Network Rail : Biodiversity	uire significant physical mition		<i>r</i> Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floodi	ng			
Environment Agency Cor	nments:	Environment Aç	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Commer	nts:	Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water Treatm	ent Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managen	nent:			
<u>Utilities</u>				
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.

Electric:

West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:					
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessr	nent				
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)		No		Maybe	
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes (Text)		No		Maybe	
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)		N	0		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)		No		Unknown	
Canalysian of Asses	omont.					
Conclusion of Asses	sment					
Conclusion summary:						
Green Belt site. Site 2157 has be that has the most potential for de would extend Micklefield to the w the Green Belt gap between Garf	velopment. The	e site is flat w nd would nee	ith a long road fro	ontage that runs th	rough the centre. Site	A
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	:	631	Floorspace sq r	n (Non residentia	I):	(
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Concl	usion:	En	nployment Conclusio	n:
Amber		Not assessed	d	No	t assessed	

Site Name: East of Ridge Road, Micklefield

Site Ref: 2157A

Fire and Rescue Services:

Telecom:

Built Heritage Leeds City Council:

Site Details

Northing: 433606 Area sq m: 1059180.50 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 443478 Area Ha: 105.91805 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1985.21Distance to bus stop (metres)402.07Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID6808

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:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:YesConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large site set between Garforth and Micklefield. Flat in an agricultural use, the only buildings present are part of a farm set along the western boundary. Roads surround the site on all sides except for part of the eastern boundary which adjoins onto SHLAA site 2157A.

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:	0.04		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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 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?	✓
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 history	oric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Large site out of scale with settlement. Site is contained by roads but would significantly between Garforth and Micklefield. Performs important role in safeguarding countryside.	reduce the separation

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

vailability: Suitability:	Achievability	v:
ummary of Infrastructure provider	comments and other plan	ning requirements
eeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
accessibility comment		Rank (1-5
oor buses, 20% rail, 30% primary		3
Access Comments		Rank (1-5
arge scale development, will require multiple acce considered in conjunction with access to large deve	ess points, access positions need to be elopment site opposite	4
_ocal network comment		Rank (1-5
Significant cummulative issues		4
Mitigation measure		Total scor
Jnknown - to be assessed through TA		11
Support? Need to combine	e with other sites: Suitabi	lity for partial development:
Yes with mitigation		
lighways Agency lajor impact - Likely to require significant physical n letwork Rail :		
/est Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office upported	er: Boundary Amendmen	nt
atural England:		
ducation		
Prainage/Water/Flooding		<u>-</u>
nvironment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Cons	traints:
orkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Wa	ter Treatment Works Comme
CC 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.

Electric:

Red	Not as:		Not assessed	
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusio	n:
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	2383	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):	C
well related to the existing settlen	nent and would result i	in a substantial incursion into	tionate to the settlement. It is not Green Belt, out of scale with & Garforth. The proposed HS2 ra	il
Conclusion summary:				
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Circumpinents				
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	INO		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No		
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe	
managed	(Text)	INO	iviaybe	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe	

Site Name: East of Ridge Road, Micklefield

Site Ref: 2157B

Fire and Rescue Services:

Telecom:

Built Heritage Leeds City Council:

Site Details

Northing: 428392 Area sq m: 33606.59 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440562 Area Ha: 3.360659 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Poorly defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3803.58 Distance to bus stop (metres) 307.03 Nearest Railway Station Woodlesford Bus Stop ID 1037 SFRA Flood Zone: 1.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 1.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 4 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Flat 'C' shaped site with an unusual boundary that doesn't relate well to the existing features on the ground. The main section of the site is part of a field to the west and a wooded area in the east. Long thin sections stretch further east and include a footway to the north east and further fields to the south east, including one dwelling.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	98.92	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
()		Rural Land - RL1:	
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rurai Land - RLT.	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:	0.21	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)

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large I	ouilt up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute ribb	on development	?		
Would development result in isolated deve	elopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries v	vith existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively '	round off" the se	ettlement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a goo area and undeveloped land?	d existing barrie	r between existing urban	✓	
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
High potential to lead to unrestricted spray	vl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from merg	ing			
Would development of the site lead to phy	sical connection	of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a goodevelopment?	od existing barrie	r/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible bou	ndary			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	n encroachmer	t		
Is there a strong defensible boundary betw	veen the site and	d the existing urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the country	yside?		✓	
Does the site include local or national con-	servation design	ated areas?	\checkmark	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	trees, hedgerov	vs that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agr	icultural land?			
Does the site contain buildings?	✓	Are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclu	<u>ision</u>			
The site performs an important role safegu	arding countrys	ide from encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special charac	ter of historic t	owns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conserva historical feature?	tion area, listed	building or other		
If yes, could development preserve this ch	aracter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	<u>n:</u>			
Development of the site would have no eff	ect on the settin	g and special character of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Most of site disconnected from settlement Provides access to countryside.	. No defensible l	poundary creating potential for	further sprawl.	
Conformity with Core Stra	tegy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller sett	lement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.0	OO Aire Valley:		0.00

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

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.

Achievability: Unknown Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years) Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro Accessibility comment Rank Busses per hour, 100% employment, 30% primary & secondary education, 30% primary health Access Comments Access from Ninevah Lane Local network comment Rank Solitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years) Rank Access City Council Highways inc Metro Rank Solitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years) Rank Solitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years) Rank Solitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years) Rank Solitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years) Rank Solitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years) Rank Solitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years) Rank Solitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years) Rank Solitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years) Rank Solitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years) Rank Solitability: LDF to determine Achievability: LDF to determine Achie
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro Accessibility comment Busses per hour, 100% employment, 30% primary & secondary education, 30% primary health Access Comments Access from Ninevah Lane Local network comment Rank
Accessibility comment Business per hour, 100% employment, 30% primary & secondary education, 30% primary health Access Comments Access from Ninevah Lane Cocal network comment Rank
Access Comments Access from Ninevah Lane Local network comment Rank Rank Rank
Access Comments Access from Ninevah Lane 5 Local network comment Rank
Access from Ninevah Lane 5 Local network comment Rank
Local network comment Rank
No icques
No issues 5
Mitigation measure Total :
Ninevah Lane would need improvements to width and pedestrian facilities
Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development
Yes with mitigation
lighways Agency /a letwork Rail : Biodiversity
Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment
Iot supported (RED). No site-specific designations but is mmediately adjacent to Lowther North SEGI, based on open vater for wintering wildfowl, that could be adversely impacted in by disturbance from residential development on this site.
latural England:
<u>Education</u>
Orainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:
Environment Agency Constraints.
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com
.CC Flood Risk Management:
<u>Itilities</u>

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.

Gas:

Site Ref: 3096	Site Name:	Land adjacent to The Bungalow, (4) Ninevah Lane, Allerton Bywater, Castleford, WF10			
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage					
Leeds City Council:					
West Yorkshire Archaeolog	y Service:				
English Heritage:					
Gypsy _Traveller Sit	e Assessmen	t			
Could site be effectively		No	Maybe		
managed	(Text)				
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe		
travellers live on the	(Text)	<u> </u>			
site?					
Proximity to housed	Yes	No			
gypsies and travellers	(Text)				
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown		
encampments	(Text)		<u>. </u>		
Conclusion of Asses	ssment				
Conclusion summary:					
boundary of site 1357 currently i	n place that acts as a	strong defensible boundary. Furt	the tree lined buffer on the western ther encroachment into the Green I Importance (SEGI) to the south of		
Site Capacity (dwellings units) : 76	Floorspace sq m (Non i	residential):		
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:		
Red	Not a	assessed	Not assessed		

Site Ref: 3100A Site Name: Land to rear 23-67 St Aidans Road, Great Preston, Leeds, LS26 8AY

Site Details

Northing: 429835 Area sq m: 19493.52 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440258 Area Ha: 1.949352 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: Being used for grazing

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage

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:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Greenfield site in Great Preston. Well connected to built up area with houses to east and west. Fields to north. Very steep sloping, and a significant amount of tree planting.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	98.89	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)

Site Ref: 3100A Site Name: Land to rear 23-67 St Aidans Road, Great Preston, Leeds, LS26 8AY

Site Ref: 3100A Site Name: Land to rear 23-67 St Aidans Road, Great Preston, Leeds, LS26 8AY

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of la	ge built up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute	ribbon development?			
Would development result in isolated	development?			
Is the site well connected to built up a	ea (2+ boundaries wit	h existing built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the sett	lement pattern?:	Yes	
Do natural/physical features provide a area and undeveloped land?	good existing barrier I	petween existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sp	orawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from n	nerging			
Would development of the site lead to	physical connection of	f settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing barrier/	boundary to contain	\checkmark	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging of settlements				
Assist in safeguarding countryside	from encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary	between the site and t	he existing urban area?	\checkmark	
Does the site provide access to the countryside?				
Does the site include local or national	conservation designat	ed areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodla significant unprotected tree/hedge cov		that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land?			
Does the site contain buildings?	Ar	e these in agricultural use	?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Co	nclusion			
The site does not perform an importar	t role in safeguarding	the countryside from encr	oachment	
Preserve the setting and special ch	aracter of historic to	wns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conshistorical feature?	ervation area, listed bu	uilding or other		
If yes, could development preserve th	s character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Concl	usion:			
Development of the site would have n	o effect on the setting	and special character of h	istoric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Well contained site and does not perfo	orm an imporant role is	safeguarding the country	rside.	
Conformity with Core S	trategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Set	tlement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller s	ettlement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	-	eway:	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

Site Ref: 3100A Site Name: Land to rear 23-67 St Aidans Road, Great Preston, Leeds, LS26 8AY **SHLAA Conclusions** Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Gypsy_Traveller Site Assessment Maybe Could site be effectively No Yes managed (Text) Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? Proximity to housed Yes No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown encampments (Text) **Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary:** development and does not relate particularly well to the existing settlement pattern. 0 Site Capacity (dwellings units): 0 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): **Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:**

Site split into A and B. Site A is the western half of the site and is within the Green Belt. Very steep gradient prohibiting

Not assessed Not assessed Site Ref: 3100B Site Name: Land to rear 23-67 St Aidans Road, Great Preston, Leeds, LS26 8AY

Site Details

Northing: 429960 Area sq m: 11620.88 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440346 Area Ha: 1.162088 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage

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:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Greenfield site in Great Preston. Connected to residential area to the south. Fields and countryside to the north.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	36.98	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)

Site Ref: 3100B Site Name: Land to rear 23-67 St Aidans Road, Great Preston, Leeds, LS26 8AY

Site Ref: 3100B Site Name: Land to rear 23-67 St Aidans Road, Great Preston, Leeds, LS26 8AY

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 rib	bon developme	nt?				
Would development result in isolated dev	velopment?					
Is the site well connected to built up area	(2+ boundaries	with exis	ting built up area)?	✓		
Would development of the site effectively	round off" the	settlemer	nt pattern?:	No		
Do natural/physical features provide a go area and undeveloped land?	ood existing barr	ier betwe	en existing urban			
Overall sprawl conclusion: Low potential to lead to unrestricted spra	ıwl					
Prevent neighbouring towns from mer	rging					
Would development of the site lead to ph	nysical connection	on of settl	ements?			
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	om encroachm	ent				
Is there a strong defensible boundary be	tween the site a	nd the ex	isting 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 significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		ows that a	are protected, or			
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a ag	gricultural land?					
Does the site contain buildings?		Are thes	se in agricultural use?			
Overall countryside Encroachment Conc	lusion					
The site performs an important role safeg	guarding country	side from	n encroachment			
Preserve the setting and special chara	acter of historic	towns				
Is the site within or adjacent to a conserve historical feature?	ation area, liste	d building	g or other			
If yes, could development preserve this of	character?:					
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	on:					
Development of the site would have no e	effect on the sett	ing and s	pecial character of hist	oric features		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
About a third of site in Green Belt. Perfor However, development could be contained				om encroachment.		
					J	
Conformity with Core Str	ategy					
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ment	0.00	
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller sett	lement	0.00	
Regeneration Priority Area:						
Inner South Leeds:	(0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00	
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gatew	av:	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

Site Ref: 3100B

Site Name: Land to rear 23-67 St Aidans Road, Great Preston, Leeds, LS26 8AY

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Suitability: Achievability:

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

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Site split into A and B. The majority of site B is within the existing settlement area, not Green Belt. A small part of the site to the north is within the existing Green belt. The site is well related to the settlement and no Highways issues raised.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 36 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Green Not assessed Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 429296 Area sq m: 231452.78 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440052 Area Ha: 23.145278 HMCA: Outer South East

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 - Allotment and city farm

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

☑
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3238.37 Distance to bus stop (metres) 155.12

Nearest Railway Station Woodlesford Bus Stop ID 9748

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large greenfield site to the south of Great Preston. Site cuts across several fields and has a poorly defined boundary. Houses and allotments to north, fields on remaining sides.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.66	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:	0.18	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.04	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.03		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/223/87/	Operation of two hydraulic sho vels and attendant dump truck s, on extended hours, to openc ast mine. m	11/08/1987	21/09/1987	Α	75.87
H33/281/86/1	Extension of temporary permiss ion regarding the hours of op eration of a second hydraulic shovel and 3 dump trucks to	06/01/1987	02/02/1987	Α	74.81
H33/696/80/	Tipping of colliery spoil, to opencast coal site.	26/11/1980	24/02/1981	А	76.07
H33/281/86/	Amendment to previous authoris ation involving the hoursof op eration of a second hydraulic shovel and 3 dump trucks to	29/09/1986	13/10/1986	Α	74.90

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 ribb	oon development?			
Would development result in isolated deve	elopment?			
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 settle	ment pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a goo area and undeveloped land?	od existing barrier be	tween existing urban	✓	
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
High potential to lead to unrestricted spra	wl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from merg	ging			
Would development of the site lead to phy	ysical connection of	settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a godevelopment?	od existing barrier/bo	oundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but would significantly reduce	the green belt gap			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	m encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary bet	ween the site and the	e existing urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the count	ryside?		✓	
Does the site include local or national cor	nservation designated	d areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?		nat are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a ag	ricultural land?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	✓ Are	these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclu	<u>usion</u>			
The site performs an important role safeg	uarding countryside	from encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special chara-	cter of historic tow	ns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservatistorical feature?	ation area, listed buil	ding or other		
If yes, could development preserve this cl	haracter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	on:			
Development of the site would have no ef	fect on the setting ar	nd special character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Green Belt site. Large site to the south w and, if developed, would set a precedent		. The site has no existing o	defensible boundary	
Conformity with Core Stra	ategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ment	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller settl	lement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Unknown Suitability: No		Achievability: Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider co	mmen	its and other planning requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
4 buses per hour, 100% employment, 70% primary healt	th & prima	nary / secondary education 4
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Wood Lane should provide access		5
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
spare capacity but cumulative issues		4
Mitigation measure		Total scor
		13
Support? Need to combine with	th other:	sites: Suitability for partial development:
yes		
<u> Highways Agency</u> <u>Network Rail :</u>		
Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:		Boundary Amendment
Not supported (RED). No site-based designations but paths are Lowland mixed deciduous woodland a UK Bapriority habitat. These blocks of woodland form importan between Hollinhurst Wood and Preston Hill SEGIs. Brow Hares to consider (UK BAP Priority species).	AP It links	Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is ammended as per Drawing RM/3101. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries with woodland by providing a 20 metre buffer (planted with native shrubs and small trees). Brown Hares to consider (UK BAP Priority species).
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	Envi	vironment Agency Constraints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorl	kshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

<u>Utilities</u>

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.

Electric: Telecom: Fire and Rescue Services: Built Heritage Ledes City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage: Could site be effectively managed Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Experience of previous encampments Experience of previous encampments Yes No Maybe (Text) Yes No Maybe (Text) (Text) Text) Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion of Assessment	Gas:			
Fire and Rescue Services: Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage: Gypsy_Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively	Electric:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage: Could site be effectively	Telecom:			
Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage: Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively Maybe Text (Text) Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Froximity to housed gypsies and travellers Experience of previous encampments Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. Large site to the south west of Great Preston. The site has no existing defensible boundary and, if developed, would set a precedent for further sprawl. Development would not relate well to the existing settlement pattern. Site contains mature tress, and public right of way. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 628 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Fire and Rescue Services:			
Could site be effectively Maybe (Text) Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Text) Experience of previous encampments Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. Large site to the south west of Great Preston. The site has no existing defensible boundary and, if developed, would set a precedent for further sprawl. Development would not relate well to the existing settlement pattern. Site contains mature tress, and public right of way. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 628 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): (Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Experience of previous encampments Yes No Unknown Experience of previous (Text) Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. Large site to the south west of Great Preston. The site has no existing defensible boundary and, if developed, would set a precedent for further sprawl. Development would not relate well to the existing settlement pattern. Site contains mature tress, and public right of way. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 628 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Experience of previous encampments Yes No (Text) Experience of previous (Text) Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. Large site to the south west of Great Preston. The site has no existing defensible boundary and, if developed, would set a precedent for further sprawl. Development would not relate well to the existing settlement pattern. Site contains mature tress, and public right of way. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 628 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Mavbe
Travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Yes No			, -	1 -2
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Yes	Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
Conclusion of Assessment Yes No Unknown		(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments Yes No Unknown Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. Large site to the south west of Great Preston. The site has no existing defensible boundary and, if developed, would set a precedent for further sprawl. Development would not relate well to the existing settlement pattern. Site contains mature tress, and public right of way. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 628 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. Large site to the south west of Great Preston. The site has no existing defensible boundary and, if developed, would set a precedent for further sprawl. Development would not relate well to the existing settlement pattern. Site contains mature tress, and public right of way. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 628 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. Large site to the south west of Great Preston. The site has no existing defensible boundary and, if developed, would set a precedent for further sprawl. Development would not relate well to the existing settlement pattern. Site contains mature tress, and public right of way. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 628 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:			No	Unknown
Green Belt site. Large site to the south west of Great Preston. The site has no existing defensible boundary and, if developed, would set a precedent for further sprawl. Development would not relate well to the existing settlement pattern. Site contains mature tress, and public right of way. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 628 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:				
Developed, would set a precedent for further sprawl. Development would not relate well to the existing settlement coattern. Site contains mature tress, and public right of way. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 628 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Conclusion summary:			
Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	developed, would set a preceder	nt for further sprawl. [Development would not rela	
	Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 628	Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0
Not assessed Not assessed	Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
	Red	Not as	sessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Land at junction of Preston Lane/Wood Lane,

Great Preston, Leeds, LS26 8AP

Site Ref: 3101

Site Details

Northing: 429847 Area sq m: 15229.51 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 442009 Area Ha: 1.522951 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3223.19
Distance to bus stop (metres) 202.87

Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 5586

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 2 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Greenfield site to the south of Kippax. Housing to the north, fields and countryside to the south. The site has a fairly sharp slope.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.05	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 Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/585/77/	Outline application to layout access roads and erect resid ential development, to agricul tural site. (site area	31/08/1977	31/08/1977	W	23.43
H33/721/78/	Outline application to layout sewer and erect resid ential development to agricult ural site. (site area 2.4ha	24/08/1978	13/11/1978	R	21.05

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large	built up area	s				
Would development lead to/constitute rible	bon developm	ent?				
Would development result in isolated dev	elopment?					
Is the site well connected to built up area	(2+ boundarie	es with exi	sting built up area)?	\checkmark		
Would development of the site effectively	"round off" the	e settleme	nt pattern?:	No		
Do natural/physical features provide a go area and undeveloped land?	od existing ba	rrier betwe	een existing urban	✓		
Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted spra	wl					
Prevent neighbouring towns from mer	ging					
Would development of the site lead to ph	ysical connec	tion of sett	lements?			
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?						
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:						
No merging of settlements						
Assist in safeguarding countryside fro	m encroachn	nent				
Is there a strong defensible boundary bet	ween the site	and the ex	kisting 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 significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?		rows that	are protected, or			
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a ag	ricultural land	?		✓		
Does the site contain buildings?		Are the	se in agricultural use?			
Overall countryside Encroachment Concl	<u>usion</u>					
The site performs an important role safeg	juarding count	ryside fror	m encroachment			
Preserve the setting and special chara	cter of histor	ic towns				
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservent historical feature?	ation area, list	ed buildin	g or other			
If yes, could development preserve this c	haracter?:					
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	on:					
Development of the site would have no ef	ffect on the se	tting and s	special character of hist	oric features		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Green Belt site to the south of Kippax. N the existing settlement form and could se				would not relate well to		
Conformity with Core Stra	ategy					
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ement	0.00	
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller sett	lement	1.00	
Regeneration Priority Area:						
Inner South Leeds:		0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00	
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gatew	av:	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

HLAA C	Conclusions	3					
Availability:	Unknown	Suitability:	LDF to determine	ne A	chievability:	Long term	(11+ years)
ummary	of Infrastru	cture provide	r comments	and oth	er plann	ing requi	rements
_	_	ways inc Metro					
	ty comment		l III 450/				Rank (1-5
ł buses per	hour, 100% emplo	oyment, 100% prima	ıry health,45% pr	imary & seco	ondary educa	ition	4
Access Co	mments						Rank (1-5
Access fron	n Park Lane looks	suitable					5
Local netw	ork comment						Rank (1-5
spare capa	city						5
Mitigation	measure						Total scor
							14
Support?		Need to combi	ne with other si	tes:	Suitability	y for partial o	development:
yes							
<u>lighways</u> letwork R							
<u>Biodiversi</u>	_						
Not supporte he site are l	ed (RED). No site Lowland mixed de	LCC Ecology Office b-based designations ciduous woodland a	but parts of UK BAP	Boundary /	Amendment		
oriority habit Natural Eng		of woodland form imp	portant links.				
Education							
<u>-uucanon</u>							
)rainage/\	Water/Flooding	L					
Environmer	nt Agency Comm	ents:	Envir	onment Age	ency Constra	nints:	
/orkshiro W	Vater Comments:		Vorks	hiro Water I	Wasto Wato	Troatmont	Norks Comme
O RSIIIIC V	vater comments.	<u> </u>	Torks	inic Water	vasie valei	Treatment	Works Comme
CC Flood	Risk Managemen	nt:					
<u>Jtilities</u>							
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.

Electric:

Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:			
Gypsy ₋ Traveller Site	Assessment		
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Conclusion of Asses Conclusion summary: Green Belt site to the south of Kip o the existing settlement form ar	opax. Sloping site. No e		ary. Development would not relate well awl.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 48	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Co Not asse	onclusion: essed	Employment Conclusion: Not assessed

Site Name: Park Lane, Kippax, Leeds, LS25 7AP

Site Ref: 3102

LS25 7

Site Details

Northing: 431013 Area sq m: 21365.40 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 442133 Area Ha: 2.13654 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2103.24 Distance to bus stop (metres) 340.78

Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 389

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 2 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Gently sloping site currently with an agricultural use. Adjoins a heavily treed area to the south, this separates the site from Kippax and prevents any road access being available. To the north there is no visible boundary on the ground, as the site cuts through a series of fields.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	98.43	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	1.57	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

LS25 7

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/388/75/	Outline application to erect r esidential development, to va cant site.(site area 11.09ha (27.4 acres)).	02/06/1975	10/01/1977	W	18.66

LS25 7

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large	built up are	eas			
Would development lead to/constitute ribb	on develop	ment?			
Would development result in isolated deve	elopment?			\checkmark	
Is the site well connected to built up area	(2+ bounda	ries with e	xisting built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively	"round off" t	the settlen	nent pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a goo area and undeveloped land?	od existing b	oarrier bet	ween existing urban	✓	
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
High potential to lead to unrestricted spraw	wl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from merg	ging				
Would development of the site lead to phy	sical conne	ection of se	ettlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a goodevelopment?	od existing t	oarrier/bou	undary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but there is no defensible bou	ındary				
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	m encroach	nment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	ween the sit	e and the	existing urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the count	✓				
Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?					
Does the site include areas of woodlands, significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?		gerows tha	at are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a ag	ricultural lar	nd?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are tl	hese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclu	<u>usion</u>				
The site performs an important role safego	uarding cou	ntryside fr	om encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special characteristics	cter of histo	oric town	s		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation historical feature?	ation area, li	isted build	ling or other		
If yes, could development preserve this ch	naracter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusio	<u>n:</u>				
Development of the site would have no eff	fect on the s	setting and	d special character of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Not connected to settlement. Provides implication further sprawl.	portant cour	ntryside pr	rotection, if development	would set precedent for	
Conformation with Cons. Ci	4 =				_
Conformity with Core Stra	ategy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00		Smaller set	tlement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:		0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gatew	ay:	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

LS25 7

HLAA Conclusion	ons			
Availability: Unknown	Suitability: LDF	to determine	Achievability: Long term (11+ years)
ummary of Infras	tructure provider co	mments and o	ther planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Hi	ighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment	. 			Rank (1-5
4 buses per hour				4
				4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
No highway frontage				
				3
Cumulative issues	<u>t</u>			Rank (1-5
Cumulative issues				4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				11
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial of	levelopment:
No	Yes			
Highways Agency				
n/a				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
	and LCC Ecology Officer:		y Amendment	
	site-specific designations but sland recorded on parts of thi		Local Wildlife Site - needs to	be assessed.
UK BAP Priority Habitat, a	and it offers a valuable open g	rassland		
link to the nearby Roach L be assessed.	imehills SSSI to the north. No	eeds to		
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flood	lina			
Environment Agency Co		Environment A	gency Constraints:	
			<u> </u>	
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water Treatment V	Vorks Comme
			_	
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ment:			
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.

Gas:

Site Ref: 3103	Site Name:	LS25 7	e Lane, Kippax, Leeds,
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	<u> </u>	
	ı		
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
manageu	(TOXI)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	(33	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	,	
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. The site is not corepresent an island of developmeneighbouring Protected Area of S	ent unrelated to the ex	xisting settlement. Developn	ss. Development alone would nent would only be possible through the
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 56	Floorspace sq m (N	Ion residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 430469 Area sq m: 56042.20 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 442368 Area Ha: 5.60422 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Natural Landscape:

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2691.27 Distance to bus stop (metres) 344.48

Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 11813

Limited Tree Cover

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 2 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Long, flat thin strip of agricultural land that adjoins Kippax to the west. No visible boundary to the east as the site boundary runs along fields. Public Right of Way runs through the centre of the site, however, there is no road frontage or access for vehicles.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	97.64	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:	0.75	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large buil	t up areas					
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon of						
Would development result in isolated developed	ment?					
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	boundaries wi	th existing built up area)?				
Would development of the site effectively "rou	nd off" the set	tlement pattern?:	No			
Do natural/physical features provide a good exarea 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	al connection o	of settlements?				
Do natural/physical features provide a good e development?	xisting barrier/	boundary to contain				
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:						
No merging but there is no defensible bounda	ry					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from er	ncroachment					
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, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	es, hedgerows	s that are protected, or				
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricul-	tural land?		✓			
Does the site contain buildings?	Α	re these in agricultural use?				
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>1</u>					
The site performs an important role safeguard	ling countrysid	le from encroachment				
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic to	wns				
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation historical feature?	area, listed b	uilding or other				
If yes, could development preserve this chara-	cter?:					
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:						
Development of the site would have no effect	on the setting	and special character of histo	oric features			
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Relates poorly to settlement and would create	a high potent	ial for further sprawl.				
Conformity with Core Strate	gy					
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ment	0.00		
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller settl	ement	1.00		
Regeneration Priority Area:						
Inner South Leeds:	0.00) Aire Valley:		0.00		
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00) West Leeds Gatewa	ау:	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

HLAA Conclusions					
Availability: Unknown Suitability	y: LDF to determi	ine	Achievability:	Long term (11	+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provi	der comment	s and ot	her plann	ing require	ements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	<u>o</u>				
Accessibility comment					Rank (1-5
4 buses per hour, 70% primary, 70%health					4
Access Comments					Rank (1-5
Very limited highway frontage with Sandgate F	Rise only				2
Local network comment					Rank (1-5
Cumulative issues					4
Mitigation measure					Total sco
					10
Support? Need to con	mbine with other s	ites:	Suitability	y for partial dev	/elopment:
n/a <u>Network Rail :</u> <u>Biodiversity</u> <u>West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology C</u> Supported	Officer:	Boundary	Amendment		
Natural England: Education					
Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:	Envir	ronment Ag	ency Constra	nints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorks	shire Water	Waste Water	Treatment Wo	orks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:					
<u>Utilities</u>					
Gas:					
Electric:					

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: 3104	Site Name:	Sandgate Lane, Kip	pax, Leeds, LS25 7
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Owner Traveller Cite			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	τ	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	1	,
site?			
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
gypsies and travellers	(TOXI)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	·	
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. The site has no Development would be unrelated			d lead to a high risk of further sprawl. ited road frontage.
·	-		•
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	147	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:		I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 430556 Area sq m: 20805.37 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 442187 Area Ha: 2.080537 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm

Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Agriculture

Other uses:

Site State: Mix

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2558.90Distance to bus stop (metres)143.59Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID11813

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 2 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site overlaps existing dwellings to the north and allotments in the southern section. The site is flat, set within the settlement and has a road frontage. Part of a larger allotment site with more plots immediately to the south. Fields are to the east, currently hidden from view by a line of trees along the boundary.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	3.47	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:	0.53	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/140/76/	Laying out of access roads and sewers, and erection of resid ential development, consisting of 78 semi- detached houses, eac	01/03/1976	09/08/1976	Α	32.44
H33/490/76/	Laying out of access roads and sewers, and erection of resid ential development consisting 64 semi- detached houses, ea	01/07/1976	04/10/1976	Α	31.23
H33/882/76/	Laying out of access roads and erection of 156 dwell ings, consisting of 5 detached and 84 semi-detachedhouses eac	13/12/1976	21/02/1977	Α	45.29

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large b	uilt up areas	5			
Would development lead to/constitute ribbo	n developme	ent?			
Would development result in isolated development	opment?				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2					
Would development of the site effectively "r	ound off" the	settlemen	t pattern?:		
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	en existing urban				
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Prevent neighbouring towns from mergi	ng				
Would development of the site lead to phys	ical connect	ion of settle	ements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?	ary to contain				
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	encroachm	ent			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	een the site a	and the exis	sting urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the country	side?				
Does the site include local or national cons	ervation des	ignated are	as?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, t significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	rees, hedge	rows that a	re protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agric	cultural land?	?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are these	e in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclus	sion_				
Preserve the setting and special charact	er of histori	c towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservat historical feature?	ion area, liste	ed building	or other		
If yes, could development preserve this cha	aracter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	<u>.</u>				
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Conformity with Core Street	001/				
Conformity with Core Strat	egy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ment	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00		Smaller sett	lement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:		0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gatew	ay:	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

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Unknown	Suitability: LD	OF to determine	Achievability: Long to	erm (11+ years)
ummary of Infrastru	cture provider c	omments and	other planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council Highy	vays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
4 buses per hour, 100% prima	ry, 100% health, 0% se	condary		4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Access available onto Keble (Sarth, 2nd point of acce	ss maybe needed for	r level of development	4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Cummulative issues				4
Mitigation measure				Total score
				12
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for par	tial development:
Yes, but 2nd access may be needed				
Highways Agency n/a Network Rail : Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Bound	lary Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Commo		Environment	Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Wa	ater Waste Water Treatm	ent Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	ıt:			
<u>Utilities</u>				
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.

Electric:

Site Ref: 3105	Site Name:	_	rdens betwee Lane, Kippax	
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy ₋ Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
conclusion summary:				
he site is designated as N1A all eed to be considered through th				
ite Capacity (dwellings units)	: 55	Floorspace	sq m (Non residen	itial):
esidential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed		Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 432466 Area sq m: 729973.16 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 438688 Area Ha: 72.997316 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Existing Use 3: Residential - Hotels, boarding and guest houses

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2280.60 Distance to bus stop (metres) 267.42 Nearest Railway Station Garforth Bus Stop ID 5040 SFRA Flood Zone: 1.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 1.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large ribbon site that extends to the west of Garforth and continues to the main urban area. The site is broadly flat and is a mix of fields and sporadic dwellings set along the main road. The site also includes a hotel, postal sorting office and other employment sites. To the south there is no visible boundary in place to mark the end of the site as the boundary curves through fields.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	98.99	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?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes
Site		Site Type	
Richmond Works, Silver Linings		Other (Waste) Specialist Miscellaneous	

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/344/74/	Outline application to erect r etail sales building (floo r area 5.200 sq.m.(57, 000 sq.f t.))and nine hole golf cours	03/09/1974	07/04/1975	R	11.57

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?	\checkmark
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?	\checkmark
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?	
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 history	oric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Development of the site would join Garforth with the main urban area. Land performs an role, as well as safeguarding countryside. High potential for further sprawl if developed.	important separation

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	1.01		Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00		Smaller settlement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	(0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	(0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
Fast Leeds				

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.

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Unknown Suitabi	lity: LDF to determine	Achievability: Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure prov	vider comments and ot	her planning requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Me	tro	
Accessibility comment	_	Rank (1-5
4 buses per hour, 50% secondary, 40% heal	th	4
Access Comments		Rank (1-5
Large site, will require multiple points of acc	ess	5
Local network comment		Rank (1-5
Significant cumulative issues		4
Mitigation measure		Total sco
		13
Support? Need to c	combine with other sites:	Suitability for partial development:
Yes, but likely significant external network capacity issues		
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combinatio Leeds cluster. Network Rail:	n with other sites. If site still inclu	ided at next sift assess as part of East
<u>Biodiversity</u>		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology	Officer: Boundary	Amendment
Supported		
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
	_	_
Drainage/Water/Flooding	Environment 4	rancy Constraints
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Ag	gency Constraints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water	r Waste Water Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		
<u>Utilities</u>		

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.

Gas:

Site Ref: 3106	Site Name:	Land adjacent to Selby F junction with M1 and jun	
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:	oci vioc.		
Liigiisii Heritage.			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	·	
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	INO	UTIKITOWIT
on our princing			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
encroaching into the Green Belt	to the west of Garfort	d would result in a significant isolated h, eroding the gap between Garforth a	and East Leeds. Preventing
encroaching into the Green Belt	to the west of Garfort s one of the purposes	h, eroding the gap between Garforth as of Green Belts. The site has no exis	and East Leeds. Preventing
encroaching into the Green Belt the coalescence of settlements is	to the west of Garfort s one of the purposes ed by the proposed H	h, eroding the gap between Garforth as of Green Belts. The site has no exis	and East Leeds. Preventing ting defensible boundaries.
encroaching into the Green Belt the coalescence of settlements is The western part of site is affecte	to the west of Garfort s one of the purposes ed by the proposed H	h, eroding the gap between Garforth a s of Green Belts. The site has no exis S2 rail route.	and East Leeds. Preventing ting defensible boundaries.
encroaching into the Green Belt the coalescence of settlements is The western part of site is affecte Site Capacity (dwellings units)	to the west of Garfort s one of the purposes ed by the proposed H : 1916 Retai	h, eroding the gap between Garforth as of Green Belts. The site has no exis S2 rail route. Floorspace sq m (Non resid	and East Leeds. Preventing ting defensible boundaries.
encroaching into the Green Belt the coalescence of settlements is The western part of site is affecte Site Capacity (dwellings units) Residential Conclusion:	to the west of Garfort s one of the purposes ed by the proposed H : 1916 Retai	h, eroding the gap between Garforth as of Green Belts. The site has no exis S2 rail route. Floorspace sq m (Non resid	and East Leeds. Preventing ting defensible boundaries. lential): Employment Conclusion:

Site Ref: 3107 Site Name: Lines Way(Path), Selby Road, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1LW

Site Details

Northing: 432064 Area sq m: 21971.14 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440241 Area Ha: 2.197114 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

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: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1610.28 Distance to bus stop (metres) 265.76 Nearest Railway Station Garforth Bus Stop ID 3002 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

The southern section of the site is part of a field whilst the northern end is heavily treed. No road frontage is in place. Along the eastern boundary is a disused railway line now used as a footpath, this is significantly lower than the site and is lined with trees along the embankment.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.82	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.18	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

Site Ref: 3107 Site Name: Lines Way(Path), Selby Road, Garforth,

Leeds, LS25 1LW

Site Ref: 3107 Site Name: Lines Way(Path), Selby Road, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1LW

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of	large built up areas	S		
Would development lead to/constitu	ute ribbon developm	ent?	✓	
Would development result in isolate	ed development?		✓	
Is the site well connected to built up	area (2+ boundarie	s with existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effective	ctively "round off" the	e settlement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide area and undeveloped land?	e a good existing bar	rrier between existing urban	✓	
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
High potential to lead to unrestricte	d sprawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from	n merging			
Would development of the site lead	to physical connect	ion of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provid development?	e a good existing ba	rrier/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible	ole boundary			
Assist in safeguarding countrysi	de from encroachm	nent		
Is there a strong defensible bounda	ary between the site	and the existing urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the	countryside?		✓	
Does the site include local or nation	nal conservation des	ignated areas?		
Does the site include areas of wood significant unprotected tree/hedge		rows that are protected, or	✓	
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 count	ryside from encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special	character of histori	ic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a cohistorical feature?	onservation area, list	ed building or other		
If yes, could development preserve	this character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Con	nclusion:			
Development of the site would have	e no effect on the se	tting and special character of hist	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion	on:			
Isolated from settlement. No links t	o built up area. No d	efensible boundary creating pote	ntial for further sprawl.	
Conformity with Core	Strategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ement	
Lirbon Extension Area:	1.00	Cmallar aatt		,

Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00		Smaller settlement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	(0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	(0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
Fast Leeds				

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: 3107 Site Name: Lines Way(Path), Selby Road, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1LW

ummary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro Access Sibility comment Rank (1-4 4 Access Comments No highway frontage Local network comment Existing local congestion and significant cumulative issues Mitigation measure Total sec 10 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No Yes West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Jetwork Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Journal of Carloth Disused Railway Local Nature Area. Boundary Amendment Supported (RED). No site-specific designations but mature accorded and boundary amended as per drawing RM3107. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed it. eprovide a buffer to adjacent woodland and disused railway. Wate Journal of Carloth Disused Railway Local Nature Area. Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Constraints:	HLAA Conclusions				
Access billity comment Access billity comment Access per hour Access Comments No highway frontage Access Comments No highway frontage Access Comment Existing local congestion and significant cumulative issues Mitigation measure Total scc 10 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No Yes Woterhial for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East eachs cluster. Hetwork Rail: Biodiversity Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Jordan Supported (RED). No site-specific designations but mature voodland along northern parts, a beek and ponds together with eigacent Garborth Disused Railway Local Nature Area. Boundary Amendment Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area excluded and boundary amended as per drawing accounted and accounted a	Availability: Unknown Suitabilit	y: LDF to determine	Achieva	ability: Long terr	m (11+ years)
Access Comments Access Comments No highway frontage Access Comments No highway frontage Access Comment Existing local congestion and significant cumulative issues Mitigation measure Total sectors 10 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Ves Wes Suitability for partial development: No Yes Boundary Amendment Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area exceeds cluster. Suitability for partial development: West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Suetwork Rail: Siddiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area exceeds cluster. Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area excluded and boundary amended as per drawing amended as per draw	summary of Infrastructure provi	der comments a	nd other p	lanning requ	uirements
Access Comments Access Comments No highway frontage Access Comments No highway frontage Access Comment Existing local congestion and significant cumulative issues Mitigation measure Total sectors 10 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Ves Wes Suitability for partial development: No Yes Boundary Amendment Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area exceeds cluster. Suitability for partial development: West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Suetwork Rail: Siddiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area exceeds cluster. Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area excluded and boundary amended as per drawing amended as per draw	eeds City Council Highways inc Metr	0			
Access Comments No highway frontage Local network comment Existing local congestion and significant cumulative issues Access Comments Rank (1-2 3 Mitigation measure Total sec 10 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No Yes Highways Agency Protential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East exist cluster. No Supported (RED). No site-specific designations but mature roodland along northern parts, a beck and ponds together with digacent Garforth Disused Railway Local Nature Area. Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area excluded and boundary amendment Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/3107. Mitigation will be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed i.e. provide a buffer to adjacent woodland and disused railway. Wate Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area leveluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/3107. Mitigation will be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed i.e. provide a buffer to adjacent woodland and disused railway. Wate Education Prainage/Water/Flooding Invironment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Constraints:	Accessibility comment	=			Rank (1-5)
No highway frontage Local network comment Existing local congestion and significant cumulative issues Mitigation measure Total sec 10 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Yes Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East eeds cluster. Notetwork Rail: Biodiversity Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported (RED). No site-specific designations but mature woodland along northern parts, a beck and ponds together with digacent Garforth Disused Railway Local Nature Area. Boundary Amendment Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area expected and boundary amended as per drawing RM/3107. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed i.e. provide a buffer to adjacent woodland and disused railway. Wate Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Constraints:	4 buses per hour				4
No highway frontage Local network comment Existing local congestion and significant cumulative issues Mitigation measure Total sec 10 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Yes Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East eeds cluster. Notetwork Rail: Biodiversity Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported (RED). No site-specific designations but mature woodland along northern parts, a beck and ponds together with digacent Garforth Disused Railway Local Nature Area. Boundary Amendment Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area expected and boundary amended as per drawing RM/3107. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed i.e. provide a buffer to adjacent woodland and disused railway. Wate Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Constraints:					
Local network comment Existing local congestion and significant cumulative issues Mitigation measure Total sectors Support? Need to combine with other sites: Yes Suitability for partial development: No Yes Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East deeds cluster. Note the strong of the s	Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Mitigation measure Total scc 10 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Yes Mighways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East eeds cluster. Aletwork Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but mature yoodland along northern parts, a beck and ponds together with adjacent Garforth Disused Railway Local Nature Area. Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area excluded and houndary amended as per drawing RM/3107. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed i.e. provide a buffer to adjacent woodland and disused railway. Wate Supported With mitigation if Red hatched area excluded and bloundary amended as per drawing RM/3107. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed i.e. provide a buffer to adjacent woodland and disused railway. Wate Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Constraints:	No highway frontage				3
Mitigation measure Total scc 10 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Yes Suitability for partial development: Yes Idighways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East eeds cluster. Siddiversity Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Idigination of the properties of the prope	Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Support? Need to combine with other sites: No Yes Suitability for partial development: Yes Suitability for partial development: Sidework Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East development and the site still included at next sift assess as part of East development. Sidework Rail: Sidework Rail: Sidework Rail: Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/3107. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed i.e. provide a buffer to adjacent woodland and disused railway. Wate Siducation Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	Existing local congestion and significant cumu	ulative issues			3
Support? Need to combine with other sites: No Yes Suitability for partial development: Yes Suitability for partial development: Sidework Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East development and the site still included at next sift assess as part of East development. Sidework Rail: Sidework Rail: Sidework Rail: Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/3107. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed i.e. provide a buffer to adjacent woodland and disused railway. Wate Siducation Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	Mitigation measure				Total score
No Yes Signatural Formulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East eeds cluster.					10
No Yes Signatural Formulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East eeds cluster.	Support? Need to se	mhine with other cites		itability for partia	development.
Alternative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East eeds cluster. Network Rail: Siodiversity Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but mature woodland along northern parts, a beck and ponds together with adjacent Garforth Disused Railway Local Nature Area. Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/3107. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed i.e. provide a buffer to adjacent woodland and disused railway. Wate Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:		mbine with other sites	o. Sui	itability for partia	ii developilient.
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East eeds cluster. Network Rail :					
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of East eeds cluster. Network Rail :					
Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but mature woodland along northern parts, a beck and ponds together with adjacent Garforth Disused Railway Local Nature Area. Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/3107. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed i.e. provide a buffer to adjacent woodland and disused railway. Wate Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	Potential for cumulative impact in combination Leeds cluster. Network Rail: Biodiversity	with other sites. If site	still included at	next sift assess a	s part of East
Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but mature woodland along northern parts, a beck and ponds together with adjacent Garforth Disused Railway Local Nature Area. Supported with mitigation if Red hatched area excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/3107. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats are addressed i.e. provide a buffer to adjacent woodland and disused railway. Wate Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:		Officer: Bo	oundary Amen	dment	
Education Orainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	Not supported (RED). No site-specific designa woodland along northern parts, a beck and por	tions but mature nds together with re Area.	ipported with micluded and bou M/3107. Mitigation pacts on adjace byide a buffer to	itigation if Red hat ndary amended a on will still be requ ent habitats are ad	s per drawing uired to ensure Idressed i.e.
<u>Orainage/Water/Flooding</u> Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	Natural England:	-			
<u>Orainage/Water/Flooding</u> Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	Education				
Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	<u>-cucation</u>				
Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	Drainage/Water/Flooding				
'orkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Environment Agency Comments:	Environ	ment Agency C	onstraints:	
'orkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme					
	Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshi	e Water Waste	Water Treatmen	it Works Comme

Itilities

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: 3107	Site Name:	Lines Way(Path), Selby R Leeds, LS25 1LW	oad, Garforth,
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		1 2922
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		mayaa
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	140	OTIKHOWH
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
	Omone		
Conclusion summary:		's the One or Belt considerable the second	Consolther and of Oreforth
Development would set a preced	ent for further unresti	in the Green Belt, unrelated to the exist ricted sprawl. There is no road frontage	
large portion of the site is covere	d with trees.		
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 58	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 3108 Site Name: Lines Way(Path), Selby Road, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1LW

Site Details

Northing: 432089 Area sq m: 5656.12 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440122 Area Ha: 0.565612 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

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: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1621.12
Distance to bus stop (metres) 287.46

Nearest Railway Station Garforth Bus Stop ID 3002

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Small square site covered in trees. A beck runs through the northern section of the site. There is no road frontage and it is surrounded by further trees and fields.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.64	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.33	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

Site Ref: 3108 Site Name: Lines Way(Path), Selby Road, Garforth,

Leeds, LS25 1LW

Site Ref: 3108 Site Name: Lines Way(Path), Selby Road, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1LW

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	ge built up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute i	ibbon development?			
Would development result in isolated d	evelopment?		✓	
Is the site well connected to built up are	ea (2+ boundaries with ex	xisting built up area)?		
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the settlem	ent pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a garea and undeveloped land?	good existing barrier betw	veen existing urban	\checkmark	
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
High potential to lead to unrestricted sp	orawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from m	erging			
Would development of the site lead to	physical connection of se	ttlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing barrier/bou	ndary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible b	ooundary			
Assist in safeguarding countryside f	rom encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	petween the site and the	existing urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the co	untryside?			
Does the site include local or national of	conservation designated a	areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlan significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		t are protected, or	✓	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land?		\checkmark	
Does the site contain buildings?	☐ Are th	ese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Cor	nclusion_			
The site performs an important role saf	eguarding countryside fro	om encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special cha	racter of historic towns	i		
Is the site within or adjacent to a consensatorical feature?	ervation area, listed buildin	ng or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	s character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	sion:			
Development of the site would have no	effect on the setting and	special character of hist	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Isolated site that isn't connected to the	settlement. High potentia	al for further sprawl.		
	<u> </u>	, 		
Conformity with Core St	rategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ment	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller sett	lement	0.0
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

Site Ref: 3108 Site Name: Lines Way(Path), Selby Road, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1LW

HLAA Conclus	ions			
Availability: Unknown	Suitability: LDI	F to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
ummary of Infra	astructure provider co	omments and o	ther planni	ng requirements
-	Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility commen	t			Rank (1-5)
4 buses per hour				4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
No highway frontage				3
Local network comme	ent			Rank (1-5)
Existing local congestion	on and significant cumulative is	sues		3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
				10
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
No	Yes			
n∕a <mark>Network Rail :</mark>				
<u>Biodiversity</u> Wast Yarkshira Esalas	gy and LCC Ecology Officer:	Roundar	y Amendment	
Not supported (RED). Nwoodland, a beck and p	lo site-specific designations but onds, all UK BAP Priority Habit	t	y Amendment	
Possible protected spec Natural England:	ies Water Voles.			
vaturar England.				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Floo	=	Environment A	gency Constra	into:
Environment Agency C	,omments:	Environment	gency constra	nus.
Yorkshire Water Comn	nents:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manag	gement:			
	,			
<u>Utilities</u> 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.

Electric:

Telecom: Fire and Rescue Services: Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
Leeds City Council:			
-			
West Yorkshire Archaeology			
	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy ₋Traveller Site	Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	,	•
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	,	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
		in the Green Belt, unrelated to the ricted sprawl. There is no road fror	
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	18	Floorspace sq m (Non re	sidential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 3109A Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds, LS25 2

Site Details

113114.86 431195 Northing: Area sq m: Ward Kippax and Methley 440555 Easting: Area Ha: 11.311486 HMCA: **Outer South East**

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage **~** Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2109.61 Distance to bus stop (metres) 364.69 Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 8392 SFRA Flood Zone:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

0.00

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large site that has been split into three parts. This section is located to the west of Kippax and adjoins the settlement along the boundary. The site slopes downwards towards the west and has an access road that runs through the centre. A small number of dwellings are situated along this road within the site. Along the western boundary is a tree lined public bridleway.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.89	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:	0.07	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)

No Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?: Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?: No Site Ref: 3109A Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds,

LS25 2

Site Ref: 3109A Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds,

LS25 2

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large but	ilt up areas				
Would development lead to/constitute ribbor	n developmer	nt?			
Would development result in isolated develo	pment?				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2-	boundaries	with existing	g built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "ro	ound off" the s	settlement p	pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	existing barri	ier between	existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl					
Prevent neighbouring towns from mergin	g				
Would development of the site lead to physi	cal connectio	n of settlem	ents?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?	existing barri	ier/boundar	y to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but there is no defensible bound	lary				
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	encroachme	ent			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	en the site ar	nd the existi	ng 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, tr significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	ees, hedgero	ows that are	protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agric	ultural land?			✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are these	in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusi	<u>on</u>				
The site performs an important role safegua	rding country	side from e	ncroachment		
Preserve the setting and special character	er of historic	towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation historical feature?	on area, listed	d building o	other		
If yes, could development preserve this char	acter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:					
Development of the site would have no effect	t on the setti	ng and spe	cial character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Links to settlement to the east. Fairly well conarrow the gap between Garforth and Kippa		however, p	otential for further sp	orawl to south. Would	
Conformity with Core Strate	PUV				
- The state of the	-9)				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ment	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller settl	ement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:	0	0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0	0.00	West Leeds Gatewa	ay:	0.00

East Leeds

Site Ref: 3109A Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds, LS25 2

HLAA Conclus	ions			
Availability:	Suitability:	A	chievability:	
ummary of Infra	structure provider co	mments and oth	er planning requ	uirements
Leeds City Council	Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility commen	t			Rank (1-5)
Mostly meets accessibil	ity standards			4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
	e - width less than 5.5m width in t any new development to 140 d		e-sac with 60	4
Local network comme	ent			Rank (1-5)
Existing local congestion	on and potential cummulative issu	ues		3
Mitigation measure				Total score
				11
Support?	Need to combine with	th other sites:	Suitability for partia	Il development:
Yes				
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecolog Supported with mitigatio	require significant physical mitigary gy and LCC Ecology Officer: In to protect and enhance the will Garforth Disused Railway LNA to	Boundary A	Amendment	
Drainage/Water/Floc Environment Agency C	=	Environment Age	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comn	nents:	Yorkshire Water \	Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manag	gement:			
<u>Utilities</u>				
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.

Electric:

Site Ref:	3109A	Site Name:	Land south of S LS25 2	Selby Road, Ki	ppax, Leeds,
Telecom:					
Fire and Res	cue Services:				
Dealle Handes					
Built Herita Leeds City C					
•	ire Archaeology	Sarvina			
English Herit		Service.			
Gypsy ₋ Tr	aveller Site	e Assessment	t		
Could site b	e effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	-	(Text)	*		
Would gyps	ies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers liv	e on the	(Text)			
site?					
Daniela la ca		V		1-	
Proximity to gypsies and		Yes (Text)		No	
gypoloo uno	· travolloro				
Experience	of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampmer	nts	(Text)			
Conclusio	n of Asses	cmont			
Conclusio	II OI ASSES	Sillent			
Conclusion sur	mmary:				
			opment of site A would		
			Belt terms. However, r release of land to the		
			ould be limited to a max		
Site Canacity (dwellings units):	: 140	Floorenace ea	m (Non residential):	: 0
	,				
Residential Co	nclusion:		Conclusion:	_	oloyment Conclusion:
Amber		Not as	ssessed	Not a	assessed

Site Ref: 3109B Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds, LS25 2

Site Details

Northing: 431766 Area sq m: 655666.00 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440766 Area Ha: 65.5666 HMCA: Outer South East

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:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1510.53Distance to bus stop (metres)259.85Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID8392SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large site that has been split into three parts. This section abuts Garforth to the north and Kippax to the south, a link road runs through the site which joins the two settlements. The majority of the site is used for agricultural purposes but has sporadic dwellings located around the site, as well as farm buildings and a nursery. The edges of the site relate poorly to features on the ground cutting through fields rather than existing boundaries.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.28	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:	0.01		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Site Ref: 3109B Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds, LS25 2

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/126/75/	Outline application to erect d etached house, garage, imple ment shed and agricultural pro duce store to part of agricul	27/02/1975	01/11/1976	R	13.93

Site Ref: 3109B Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds,

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	ge built up are	eas			
Would development lead to/constitute r	ibbon develop	ment?			
Would development result in isolated d	evelopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up are	ea (2+ boundar	ies with ex	isting built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" t	he settlem	ent pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a garea and undeveloped land?	good existing b	arrier betw	reen existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted sp	orawl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from m	erging				
Would development of the site lead to	physical conne	ction of se	ttlements?	✓	
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing b	oarrier/bou	ndary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
Coalescence/merging settlements					
Assist in safeguarding countryside f	rom encroach	nment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area? \qed					
Does the site provide access to the cou	✓				
Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?					
Does the site include areas of woodlan significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		gerows that	are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural lar	ıd?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	✓	Are th	ese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Cor	nclusion_				
The site performs an important role saf	eguarding cou	ntryside fro	m encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special cha	racter of histo	oric towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a consensation historical feature?	rvation area, li	sted buildir	ng or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	sion:				
Development of the site would have no	effect on the s	setting and	special character of his	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Development would merge Garforth an function.	d Kippax, two	separate s	ettlements. Green belt s	serves an important	
Conformity with Core St	rategy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller set	tlement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:		0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gatev	vav:	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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

Site Ref: 3109B Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds, LS25 2

HLAA Conclusions	3			
Availability:	Suitability:	A	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider co	mments and otl	her planning requ	uirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Mostly meets accessibility star	ndards			4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Scale of development will req	uire multiple access point	ts		4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Existing local congestion and	significant cummulative is	ssues		3
Mitigation measure				Total score
Unknown - to be assessed th	rough Transport Assessm	nent		11
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partia	I development:
Yes with mitigation				
<u>Network Rail :</u> <u>Biodiversity</u> West Yorkshire Ecology and	LLCC Ecology Officer	Roundary	Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to properties of the Garfort	rotect and enhance the wi	ildlife	Amendment	
west. Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
<u> Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>				
Environment Agency Comm	ents:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Vorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme
Tomorrator Comments.	·	TOTAGINIO Water	Trade Trate Headings	
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	ıt:			
<u>Utilities</u>				
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.

Electric:

Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment			
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe	
managed	(Text)	,		
			1	
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe	
site?	(TOXI)			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No		_
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown	
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	ement			
Ochelasion of Asses	Silicit			
Conclusion summary:				
			and currently serves an important	
Green Belt function in separating Belt policy, prevention of coalesc			ements would be contrary to Greer	1
, ,,,				
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 1721	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Cond	lusion:	Employment Conclusion	n:
Red	Not assesse	ed .	Not assessed	

Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds,

LS25 2

Site Ref: 3109B

Site Ref: 3109C Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds, LS25 2

Site Details

Northing: 431362 Area sq m: 90312.86 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 441419 Area Ha: 9.031286 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1686.26Distance to bus stop (metres)266.32Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID9206SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Urban 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large site that has been split into three parts. This section is set to the north east of Kippax with one boundary linking to the settlement. Site has an agricultural use, fields surround a farm in the centre. Limited amount of trees on site, most line the boundary and the edges of fields but there is a small collection to the east of the farm up until the boundary of the site.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.30	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

Site Ref: 3109C Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds,

LS25 2

Site Ref: 3109C Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds,

LS25 2

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large	ge built up are	eas			
Would development lead to/constitute	ribbon developi	ment?			
Would development result in isolated d	levelopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up are	ea (2+ boundar	ies with ex	isting built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" t	he settlem	ent pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a area and undeveloped land?	good existing b	arrier betw	een existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
High potential to lead to unrestricted sp	orawl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from m	erging				
Would development of the site lead to	physical conne	ction of se	ttlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing b	oarrier/bou	ndary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but there is no defensible I	boundary				
Assist in safeguarding countryside	from encroach	nment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	oetween the sit	e and the e	existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countryside?			✓		
Does the site include local or national	conservation de	esignated a	areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlar significant unprotected tree/hedge coverage.		gerows that	t are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural lan	ıd?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	✓	Are th	ese in agricultural use?	\checkmark	
Overall countryside Encroachment Cor	nclusion_				
The site performs an important role sat	feguarding cou	ntryside fro	m encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special cha	aracter of histo	oric towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a consensation is a consensation or adjacent to a consensation is a consensation or adjacent to a consensation is a consensation or adjacent to a c	ervation area, li	sted buildi	ng or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	s character?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	ısion:				
Development of the site would have no	effect on the s	setting and	special character of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Relates well to settlement, however, be	oundaries to no	orth and ea	st are poor and could le	ad to further sprawl.	
Conformity with Core Co	trotogy				
Conformity with Core St	trategy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller set	tlement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:		0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gatew	<i>a</i> y:	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

Site Ref: 3109C Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds,

SHLAA Conclusions Suitability: Availability: Achievability: Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements **Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro Accessibility comment** Rank (1-5) Mostly meets accessibility standards 4 Rank (1-5) **Access Comments** Access off Roach Grange Avenue ok for up to 200 dwellings 4 Local network comment Rank (1-5) Existing local congestion and potential cumulative issues Mitigation measure **Total score** 11 Support? Suitability for partial development: Need to combine with other sites: Yes **Highways Agency** Major impact - Likely to require significant physical mitigation Network Rail: **Biodiversity** West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: **Boundary Amendment** Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildlife corridor function of the Garforth Disused Railway LNA to the west. **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.

Electric:

West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment		
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. The original site I n the coalescence of Garforth an would be better related to the exis	d Kippax. There is ex	isting development to the w	Belt terms than B as it would not result est and south so development here poort a maximum of 200 units.
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	200	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not as		Not assessed

Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Kippax, Leeds,

LS25 2

Site Ref: 3109C

Fire and Rescue Services:

Telecom:

Built Heritage

Site Ref: 3110 Site Name: Land west of Green Lane, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 2

Site Details

Northing: 432348 Area sq m: 50380.44 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 441713 Area Ha: 5.038044 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 707.05 Distance to bus stop (metres) 325.86

Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 11002

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 2 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Flat site currently with an agricultural use. To the east is existing housing and to the west and south are further fields. Road access is available at the northern end of the site but this consists of a single tree lined track.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.74	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

Site Ref: 3110 Site Name: Land west of Green Lane, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 2

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
33/118/97/FU	Use of agricultural land as cricket pitch and two football pitches	14/05/1997	13/02/1998	Α	72.30
33/357/94/FU	Use of agricultural land as cricket football and rugby pitches	22/12/1994	21/12/1995	W	71.85

Site Ref: 3110 Site Name: Land west of Green Lane, Garforth, Leeds,

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	ge built up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute r	ibbon development?			
Would development result in isolated d	evelopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up are	ea (2+ boundaries with	existing built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the settle	ment pattern?:	Yes	
Do natural/physical features provide a garea and undeveloped land?	good existing barrier be	tween existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion: Low potential to lead to unrestricted sp	rawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from m	erging			
Would development of the site lead to	ohysical connection of s	settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing barrier/bo	undary to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging of settlements				
Assist in safeguarding countryside f	rom encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	etween the site and the	e existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countryside?			✓	
Does the site include local or national of	conservation designated	d areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlan significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		at are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are	these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Cor	<u>iclusion</u>			
The site performs an important role saf	eguarding countryside f	rom encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special cha	racter of historic towr	ıs		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conse historical feature?	rvation area, listed build	ding or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	sion:			
Development of the site would have no	effect on the setting ar	d special character of his	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Relates well to settlement and would re	ound off this section.			
Conformity with Core St	rategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settl	ement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller se		0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:		Smaller de		5.50
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gate	wav:	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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

Site Ref: 3110 Site Name: Land west of Green Lane, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 2

HLAA Conclusion	ons				
Availability: Unknown	Suitability: LDF	F to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ year	rs)
Summary of Infras	tructure provider co	omments and o	ther plannir	ng requiremen	its
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment				Rai	nk (1-5)
Poor buses, 95% rail, 10%	6 primary, 10% health				2
Access Comments				Rai	nk (1-5)
No frontage onto adopted	d highway, abuts larger poten	tial development site			3
Local network commen	t			Rai	nk (1-5)
Significant cumulative iss	ues				4
Mitigation measure				Tot	tal score
					9
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability	for partial developn	nent:
No	Yes		No		
Highways Agency					
Potential for cumulative in Leeds cluster.	npact in combination with other	er sites. If site still incl	luded at next sift	assess as part of Ea	st
Network Rail :					
<u>Biodiversity</u>					
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment		
Supported					
Natural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
Drainage/Water/Flood		Epidean *	ganay Caratral	nto.	
Environment Agency Co	mments:	Environment A	gency Constrair	115:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water 1	Freatment Works C	omme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ment:				
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.

Gas:

Site Ref: 311	0 Site I	Name: Land wes LS25 2	st of Green Lane,	Garforth, Leeds,
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue	Services:			
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Counc	cil:			
West Yorkshire A	archaeology Service:			
English Heritage:	:			
Gypsy _Trave	eller Site Asse	ssment		
Could site be et			No	Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies	and Yes		No	Maybe
travellers live o	n the (Text)			
site?				
Proximity to ho	used Yes		No	
gypsies and tra			1119	
Experience of p			No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion o	f Assessment			
Conclusion summa	<u> </u>			
developed. It is flat v	with no constraints apar	rt from access. Highways	h site 1244 would round on a concerns re no direct access options for such a	cess. Woud have to access
Site Capacity (dwel	lings units):	144 Floors	pace sq m (Non residen	tial):
Residential Conclus	sion:	Retail Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:
Amber		Red		Red

Site Name: **Site Ref: 3112** Fairview Farm, Wakefield Road, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1AS

Site Details

433112 94438.57 Northing: Area sq m: **Garforth and Swillington** Ward 439446 Easting: Area Ha: 9.443857 HMCA: **Outer South East**

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1310.97 Distance to bus stop (metres) 143.20 Nearest Railway Station Garforth Bus Stop ID 5745 SFRA Flood Zone:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

0.00

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Single field located to the west of Garforth, separated from the settlement by Wakefield Road which runs along the eastern boundary. Trees line the remaining sides to the north, west and south. Further fields are set beyond this as well as two farms, one to the north and the other to the west.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.97	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 Site Ref: 3112 Site Name: Fairview Farm, Wakefield Road, Garforth,

Leeds, LS25 1AS

Site Ref: 3112 Site Name: Fairview Farm, Wakefield Road, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1AS

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	e built up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute ril	bbon development?			
Would development result in isolated de	evelopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up are	a (2+ boundaries with	existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectivel	y "round off" the settle	ement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a g area and undeveloped land?	ood existing barrier be	etween existing urban	✓	
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
High potential to lead to unrestricted spr	awl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from me	erging			
Would development of the site lead to p	hysical connection of	settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a g development?	ood existing barrier/b	oundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible be	oundary			
Assist in safeguarding countryside fr	om encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary be	etween the site and th	e existing urban area?	\checkmark	
Does the site provide access to the cou	ntryside?		✓	
Does the site include local or national co	onservation designate	ed areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cove		hat are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a a	agricultural land?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are	these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Con-	clusion			
The site performs an important role safe	guarding countryside	from encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special char	acter of historic tow	ns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conser historical feature?	vation area, listed bui	lding or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclus	ion:			
Development of the site would have no	effect on the setting a	nd special character of histo	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Good links to settlement, however, devestrong defensible boundary. Potential fo		crossing the main road whi	ch currently acts as a	
Conformity with Core St	rategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ment	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller settl	ement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

Site Ref: 3112 Site Name: Fairview Farm, Wakefield Road, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1AS

HLAA Conclusions			
vailability: Unknown Suitability: No		Achievability: Long te	rm (11+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider co	mments and o	other planning red	quirements
eeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
buses per hour, 100% employment, 75% primary & se	condary education,	75% primary health	4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Long frontage with Wakefield Road should provide acce	ess		5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Local congestion and cumulative issues			3
Mitigation measure			Total sco
			12
Support? Need to combine wi	th other sites:	Suitability for part	ial development:
Yes			
otential for cumulative impact in combination with other eeds cluster. Ietwork Rail: Biodiversity	r sites. If site still ind	cluded at next sift assess	as part of East
Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Bounda	ry Amendment	
supported with mitigation provided that the ditch along the orthern boundary (which has a record of Water Vole - a NAP and UK protected species) is protected and enhance of the ditch, and urface water attenuation.	u UK ced		
latural England:			
ducation			
Prainage/Water/Flooding			
nvironment Agency Comments:	Environment A	Agency Constraints:	
Orkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wat	er Waste Water Treatme	ent Works Comme

Utilities

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.

Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:	Samiaa		
West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
English Heritage.			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assess	ment	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	-	
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		, may a
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	110	
Experience of provious	Voo	No	Unknown
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	UNKNOWN
•			
Conclusion of Asses	smont		
Conclusion of Asses	Silient		
Conclusion summary:			
	the northwest	of Garforth. There are no contraints	m, but along with sites 1100 and 1044 s on the site that would prevent
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	i !	243 Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber		Not assessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Fairview Farm, Wakefield Road, Garforth,

Leeds, LS25 1AS

Site Ref: 3112

Site Details

Northing: 433713 Area sq m: 4279.14 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 439562 Area Ha: 0.427914 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1095.47Distance to bus stop (metres)581.86Nearest Railway StationGarforthBus Stop ID2526

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 2 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Small, flat square shaped site set to the west of Garforth. Currently part of a field in an agricultural use, some trees line the east, north and west boundary. No features of note on site.

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
08/06203/FU	Two storey side and rear extension to bungalow to form five bedroom dwelling house	05/11/2008	29/12/2008	R	17.55
12/01567/FU	Replacement detached dwelling	10/04/2012	15/06/2012	R	17.55

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large	ge built up areas				
Would development lead to/constitute	ribbon developmer	nt?			
Would development result in isolated d	evelopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up are	ea (2+ boundaries	with exis	ting built up area)?		
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the	settleme	nt pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a area and undeveloped land?	good existing barr	er betwe	en existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted sp	orawl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from m	erging				
Would development of the site lead to	physical connection	n of sett	ements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing barr	ier/bound	dary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but there is no defensible b	ooundary				
Assist in safeguarding countryside f	rom encroachme	ent			
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	petween the site a	nd the ex	isting urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the co	untryside?			\checkmark	
Does the site include local or national of	conservation desig	nated ar	eas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlan significant unprotected tree/hedge coverage.		ws that a	are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land?			✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are the	se in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Cor	nclusion_				
The site performs an important role saf	eguarding country	side fron	n encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special cha	racter of historic	towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a consensation is to rical feature?	ervation area, listed	d building	g or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	s character?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	sion:				
Development of the site would have no	effect on the setti	ng and s	pecial character of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Doesn't relate well to settlement, howe	ver, could be cons	idered w	ith adjoining site 1044		
Conformity with Core St	trategy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00		Smaller sett	lement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:	C	0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	C	.00	West Leeds Gatew	av:	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

HLAA Conclusions					
Availability: Unknown	Suitability: LDF	to determine	Achievability: Long term	(11+ years)	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider co	mments and of	ther planning requ	irements	
Leeds City Council Highy	ways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)	
Landlocked site, Public Transp	oort standards not met			2	
Access Comments					
Requires development of adja	acent site for access			3	
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)	
Local congestion/capacity issistes	ues and potential for sign	ificant cumulative imp	act with other nearby	2	
Mitigation measure				Total score	
The potential for mitigation an with other nearby sites	d capacity improvements	s needs to be consider	ed with in conjuction	7	
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:	
No	Yes		No		
n/a Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	/ Amendment		
Natural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
Drainage/Water/Flooding					
Environment Agency Commo	ents:	Environment A	gency Constraints:		
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme	
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:				
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:					
- u3.					

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.

Electric:

Site Ref: 3113	Site Name:	Land to rear of Barr Lane, Garforth, Lee	owby Lodge, Barrowby ds, LS25 1NF
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	/ Service:		
Gypsy Travellar Sit	A A S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	4	
Gypsy ₋ Traveller Site			
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		Maybo
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. The site is smal orward with SHLAA site 1044 it north of the site. Highways cond	has some potential fo	r residential development. The	ement. However, if it is brought proposed HS2 rail line runs to the
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 18	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 434254 Area sq m: 25755.55 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 441062 Area Ha: 2.575555 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: Site State:

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 753.36
Distance to bus stop (metres) 695.00

Nearest Railway Station Garforth Bus Stop ID 8628

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 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?:	
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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
33/279/97/MIN	Variation of condition no 3 of application no 33/234/94/fu (to allow site operations to continue until 31-may-1998)	27/10/1997	19/12/1997	Α	100.00
33/234/94/FU	Stabilisation of proposed development land and reclamation of derelict land by opencast mining	11/08/1994	04/10/1995	Α	100.00
33/269/97/MIN	Variation of condition no 2 of application no 33/234/94/fu (approved drawings)	07/10/1997	19/12/1997	Α	100.00
33/103/97/MIN	Variation of condition no 2 of application no 33/234/94/fu (to modify the method of working of the site)	30/04/1997	17/06/1997	Α	100.00

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large I	ouilt up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute ribb	on development?			
Would development result in isolated deve	elopment?		✓	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with ex	kisting built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively '	round off" the settlem	ent pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a goo area and undeveloped land?	d existing barrier betv	veen existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
High potential to lead to unrestricted spray	vl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from merg	ing			
Would development of the site lead to phy	sical connection of se	ttlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a goodevelopment?	od existing barrier/bou	ndary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible bou	ndary			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	n encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary betw	veen the site and the	existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countr	yside?		✓	
Does the site include local or national con-	servation designated	areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	trees, hedgerows tha	t are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agr	icultural land?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are th	ese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclu	<u>ision</u>			
The site performs an important role safegu	uarding countryside fro	om encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special charac	ter of historic towns	s		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conserva historical feature?	tion area, listed buildi	ng or other		
If yes, could development preserve this ch	aracter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	<u>n:</u>			
Development of the site would have no eff	ect on the setting and	special character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Green Belt site. Site is isolated and unrela accessibility. The site provides access to defensible boundaries.				
Conformity with Core Stra	tegy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ment	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller sett	lement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

•	ıknown	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
		<u> </u>			
iummary of	f Infrastru	ture provide	r comments and	other plann	ing requirements
-	_	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility co					Rank (1-5)
andlocked site,	Public Transpo	ort standards not m	et, outside thresholds for	r local services	2
Access Comm	ents				Rank (1-5)
requires develo	pment of adjac	ent site for access			3
Local network	comment				Rank (1-5)
local congestion	n/capacity issu	es and potential for	significant cumulative in	npact with other ne	earby
sites					2
Mitigation mea	sure				Total scor
the potential for with other nearl		capacity improven	nents needs to be consid	lered with in conju	ction 7
Support?		Need to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
no		yes		no	
		i			
Highways Ag	<u>ency</u>				
Potential for cun Leeds cluster.	nulative impact	in combination with	h other sites. If site still i	ncluded at next sit	t assess as part of East
Network Rail	:				
	_				
Biodiversity					
West Yorkshire	Ecology and	LCC Ecology Offic	cer: Bound	lary Amendment	
Local Wildlife Si	te (SEGI) criter	te recently assesse ia and sufficient to ce for Great Creste	be	Local Wildlife Site	s criteria.
designated, basi	d:				
designated, basi Natural England					
Natural England					
Natural England					
Natural England Education Drainage/Wat					
Natural England		nts:	Environmen	t Agency Constra	ints:
Natural England Education Drainage/Wat		nts:	Environmen	t Agency Constra	ints:
Natural England Education Drainage/Wat	gency Comme	nts:			nints:
Natural England Education Drainage/Wate	gency Comme	nts:			
Natural England Education Drainage/Waten	gency 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.

Gas:

- 1			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessme	ent	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	110	Maybo
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		
site?			
Dravimity to have d	Vaa	No	
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
gypoloo ana navolloro			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	<u>. </u>	·
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
			d access and poor accessibility. The
site provides access to the count proposed HS2 rail line runs to the		Nest Wood. The site has no exi	sting defensible boundaries. The
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 68	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Re	tail Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red			

Site Name: Land at New Hold, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 2HH

Site Ref: 3115

Site Details

Northing: 433142 Area sq m: 56600.01 Ward Kippax and Methley Easting: 444150 Area Ha: 5.660001 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2576.77 Distance to bus stop (metres) 250.09

Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 11215

SFRA Flood Zone: 1.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 1.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3a Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Flat site set to the west of Micklefield. Field in agricultural use with no buildings within the site. Limited amount of trees in place along the boundaries. There is no road frontage.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.92	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?:	
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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of la	ge built up areas				
Would development lead to/constitute	ribbon development?				
Would development result in isolated	development?				
Is the site well connected to built up a	ea (2+ boundaries with	existing built up area)?			
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the settle	ement pattern?:	No		
Do natural/physical features provide a area and undeveloped land?	good existing barrier be	etween existing urban			
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
High potential to lead to unrestricted s	prawl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from n	nerging				
Would development of the site lead to	physical connection of	settlements?			
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing barrier/b	oundary to contain			
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 th	e existing urban area?			
Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?					
Does the site include local or national	conservation designate	ed areas?			
Does the site include areas of woodla significant unprotected tree/hedge cov		hat are protected, or			
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land?		\checkmark		
Does the site contain buildings?	Are	these in agricultural use	e? 🗌		
Overall countryside Encroachment Co	nclusion				
The site performs an important role sa	feguarding countryside	from encroachment			
Preserve the setting and special ch	aracter of historic tow	ns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conshistorical feature?	ervation area, listed bui	lding or other			
If yes, could development preserve th	s character?:				
Overall Character Preservation Concl	usion:				
Development of the site would have n	o effect on the setting a	nd special character of h	nistoric features		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Relates poorly to settlement, only con	nected partially on one	side. High potential for fu	urther sprawl.		
Conformity with Core S	trategy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Se	ttlement	0.00	
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller s	ettlement	1.00	
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00	
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gate	eway:	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

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Unknown Suitability: LD	F to determine	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastructure provider c	omments and	other planning req	uirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
Poor buses but 100% rail, 25% primary			3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
No frontage onto adopted highway, abuts larger poter	ntial development si	te	3
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Cumulative issues			4
Mitigation measure			Total score
			10
Support? Need to combine v	with other sites:	Suitability for partia	al development:
No Yes			
Highways Agency			
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with oth Leeds cluster.	ner sites. If site still i	included at next sift assess a	s part of East
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Bound	dary Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Land adjacent to school. Requires further investigation	٦.		
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environmen	t Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire W	ater Waste Water Treatmer	nt Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			

<u>Utilities</u> Gas:

Site Ref: 3116	Site Name:	•	Micklefield C of E Primary th Road, Micklefield, LS25
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	/ Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Sit	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	,	·
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion cummers			
Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. Adjacent to scho	ool. We are consultin	g Education on all sites and	any comments received will be
	lecisions on sites (ie.		nool expansion). Highways concerns re
access The linkage to adopted t	iigiiway.		
Site Capacity (dwellings units)): 127	Floorspace sq m (N	Ion residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 3117 Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1LF

Site Details

Northing: 431869 Area sq m: 12850.32 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440077 Area Ha: 1.285032 HMCA: Outer South East

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: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1844.39 Distance to bus stop (metres) 502.44 Nearest Railway Station Garforth Bus Stop ID 3002 SFRA Flood Zone: 1.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 1.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Triangular shaped site that covers roughly half of a field in agricultural use. The site is surrounded by further fields and has no road frontage or access. Trees line the south west boundary but this is the only side that is well defined. An old railway line currently used as a bridleway is just beyond the site to the east.

No

UDP Designation

Public Rights of Way:

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

Site Ref: 3117 Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Garforth, Leeds,

LS25 1LF

Site Ref: 3117 Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1LF

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large	e built up areas				
Would development lead to/constitute rik	bon development?		✓		
Would development result in isolated de	velopment?		✓		
Is the site well connected to built up area	a (2+ boundaries wi	th existing built up area)?			
Would development of the site effectively	y "round off" the set	tlement pattern?:	No		
Do natural/physical features provide a grarea and undeveloped land?	ood existing barrier	between existing urban	✓		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
High potential to lead to unrestricted spr	awl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from me	rging				
Would development of the site lead to p	hysical connection of	of settlements?			
Do natural/physical features provide a g development?	ood existing barrier	boundary to contain			
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but there is no defensible bo	oundary				
Assist in safeguarding countryside fr	om encroachment				
Is there a strong defensible boundary be	tween the site and	the existing urban area?	✓		
Does the site provide access to the countryside?					
Does the site include local or national co	onservation designa	ted areas?			
Does the site include areas of woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		that are protected, or			
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a a	gricultural land?		✓		
Does the site contain buildings?	A	re these in agricultural use?			
Overall countryside Encroachment Cond	<u>clusion</u>				
The site performs an important role safe	guarding countrysid	le from encroachment			
Preserve the setting and special char	acter of historic to	wns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conser- historical feature?	vation area, listed b	uilding or other			
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclus	ion:				
Development of the site would have no	effect on the setting	and special character of his	toric features		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
No links to the settlement, isolated site.	High potential for fu	rther sprawl.			
		,			
Conformity with Core Str	ategy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ement	0.00	
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller set	tlement	0.00	
Regeneration Priority Area:	-				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00) Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

Site Ref: 3117 Site Name: Land south of Selby Road, Garforth, Leeds, LS25 1LF

HLAA Coi	nclusions				
Availability: Ur	ıknown	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
ummary o	f Infrastruc	ture provide	r comments and	other planni	ing requirements
		ays inc Metro			
Accessibility c					Rank (1-5
The site fails all	the accessibility	/ criteria			1
Access Comm	ents				Rank (1-5
No frontage on	to adopted high	way, abuts larger p	otential development sit	е	3
Local network comment					
Existing local c	ongestion and s	ignificant cumulativ	ve issues		3
Mitigation mea	asure				Total sco
					7
Support?		Need to combi	ne with other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
No		Yes			
dighways Ag Potential for cur eeds cluster. Ietwork Rail Biodiversity	nulative impact	in combination with	n other sites. If site still i	ncluded at next sif	t assess as part of East
	Ecology and I	_CC Ecology Offic	er: Bound	lary Amendment	
Supported with	mitigation to pro	tect and enhance t metre buffer to the	he beck to	, /	
Natural Englan	d:				
Education					
Drainage/Wat Environment A	er/Flooding gency Comme	nts:	Environmen	t Agency Constra	ints:
	9 ,				
orkshire Wate	er Comments:		Yorkshire W	ater Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risi	k 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.

Gas:

Site Ref: 3117	Site Name:	Land south of Selby Road LS25 1LF	d, Garforth, Leeds,
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	/ Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Sit	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	·	
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	INO	OTIKITOWIT
Conclusion of Acces			•
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
		hin the Green Belt and development we re is no road frontage to the site for acc	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 40	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 3321 Site Name: Berry Lane/Preston Lane, Great Preston, Leeds, LS26 8AU

Site Details

429457 32330.51 Northing: Area sq m: **Garforth and Swillington** Ward 440357 Easting: Area Ha: 3.233051 HMCA: **Outer South East**

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring Use 3: Community Services - Education

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3556.94 Distance to bus stop (metres) 146.47 Nearest Railway Station Woodlesford Bus Stop ID 1393 SFRA Flood Zone:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Yes Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings:

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

0.00

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Partial infill site set in Great Preston. The site consists of a few fields, is relatively flat with no features of note, just a few trees along the boundaries. Road frontage is available to the north and west. The site wraps around a cricket ground / pitch to the north and further fields to the south.

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 Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.04		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?: No Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?: No Site Ref: 3321 Site Name: Berry Lane/Preston Lane, Great Preston,

Leeds, LS26 8AU

Site Ref: 3321 Site Name: Berry Lane/Preston Lane, Great Preston, Leeds, LS26 8AU

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	e built up area	S			
Would development lead to/constitute ri	bbon developm	ent?			
Would development result in isolated de	evelopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up are	a (2+ boundarie	es with ex	isting built up area)?	\checkmark	
Would development of the site effective	ly "round off" th	e settlem	ent pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a garea and undeveloped land?	lood existing ba	rrier betw	een existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Low potential to lead to unrestricted spr	awl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from me	erging				
Would development of the site lead to p	hysical connec	tion of set	ttlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a gdevelopment?	good existing ba	arrier/bour	ndary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but would significantly redu	ce the green be	elt gap			
Assist in safeguarding countryside for	rom encroachr	nent			
Is there a strong defensible boundary be	etween the site	and the e	existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the cou	intryside?				
Does the site include local or national c	onservation des	signated a	reas?		
Does the site include areas of woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		erows that	are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a a	agricultural land	?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are the	ese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Con	<u>clusion</u>				
The site does not perform an important	role in safeguar	rding the	countryside from encro	achment	
Preserve the setting and special char	racter of histor	ic towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conser historical feature?	rvation area, list	ted buildir	ng or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclus	sion:				
Development of the site would have no	effect on the se	tting and	special character of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Strong links to settlement. Developmen Bywater.	t wouold reduce	e separati	on between Great Pres	ton and Allerton	
Conformity with Core St	rategy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller set	tlement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:		0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gatew	<i>y</i> ay:	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

Site Ref: 3321 Site Name: Berry Lane/Preston Lane, Great Preston, Leeds, LS26 8AU

HLAA Conclusions	
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long to	erm (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	
Accessibility comment	Rank (1-5)
Mostly meets accessibility standards	4
Access Comments	Rank (1-5)
Potential access onto Preston Lane or Berry Lane	4
Local network comment	Rank (1-5)
Spare capacity within local network	4
Mitigation measure	Total score
	12
Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for part yes	ial development:
Network Rail : Biodiversity	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment	
Natural England:	
<u>Education</u>	
Drainage/Water/Flooding	
Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatments	ent Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:	
<u>Utilities</u> 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.

Electric:

Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy ₋ Traveller Site	e Assessment			
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe	
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe	
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Site?				
Dunalista ta hasaad	V	I NI -		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No		
gypsies and travellers	(· o.n.)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown	
encampments	(Text)	1.10	1 0	
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. The site is set in sites by housing. However, given between the two settlements with	the location so close to All	erton Bywater developr	o the settlement, bordered on three ment would reduce the separation	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 84	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Con	clusion:	Employment Conclusio	n:
Amber	Not assess	ed	Not assessed	

Site Name: Berry Lane/Preston Lane, Great Preston,

Leeds, LS26 8AU

Site Ref: 3321

Telecom:

Site Details

Northing: 429887 Area sq m: 124258.26 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440617 Area Ha: 12.425826 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3296.78Distance to bus stop (metres)210.35Nearest Railway StationEast GarforthBus Stop ID13049SFRA Flood Zone:1.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 1.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Greenfield site seperating Great Preston and Kippax. Hosuing on three sides and fields to north.

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?:	
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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	ge built up area	as			
Would development lead to/constitute r	ibbon developn	nent?			
Would development result in isolated d	evelopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up are	a (2+ boundari	es with exi	sting built up area)?	\checkmark	
Would development of the site effective	ly "round off" th	ne settleme	ent pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a garea and undeveloped land?	good existing ba	arrier betw	een existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sp	awl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from m	erging				
Would development of the site lead to p	ohysical connec	ction of set	tlements?	\checkmark	
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing ba	arrier/bour	dary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
Coalescence/merging settlements					
Assist in safeguarding countryside f	rom encroach	ment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	etween the site	and the e	xisting urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the cou	ıntryside?				
Does the site include local or national of	onservation de	signated a	reas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlan significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		erows that	are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land	ქ?		\checkmark	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are the	ese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Cor	clusion				
The site does not perform an important	role in safegua	rding the o	countryside from encro	achment	
Preserve the setting and special cha	racter of histo	ric towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conse historical feature?	rvation area, lis	sted buildir	g or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	sion:				
Development of the site would have no	effect on the se	etting and	special character of his	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Green Belt site. Development of the sit	e would lead to	further me	erging of Kippax and G	reat Preston.	
Conformity with Core St	rategy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settl	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller se	ttlement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:		0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gatev	way:	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

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF	to determine Achiev	vability: Long term (11	+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider co	mments and other	planning require	ments
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
4 buses per hour, 100% employment, 50% primary hea	lth, primary education & seco	ondary eductaion	4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
long frontage with Berry Lane should provide visibility			3
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
spare capacity but cumulative issues			3
Mitigation measure			Total score
improvement of junction of Berry Lane and Whitehouse	e Lane (currently mini-rounda	bout)	10
Support? Need to combine w	ith other sites: Si	uitability for partial dev	velopment:
yes			
Highways Agency			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amer	ndment	
Not supported (RED). Townclose Hills SSSI and Local Reserve are immediatley adjacent to the eastern and no boundaries, and the Lines Way disused railway immedithe west. These valuable habitats are vulnerable to addrecreation	orthern ately to		
Natural England:			
Education			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency	Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Wast	e Water Treatment Wo	orks 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:	3450	Site Name:	Land to North of Station I Great Preston	Road, Kippax /
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herit	<u>age</u>			
Leeds City				
West Yorks English Her	hire Archaeology itage:	Service:		
Gypsy ₋ T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	_	(Text)		
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers li	ive on the	(Text)		
site?				
Proximity t	o housed	Yes	No	
	d travellers	(Text)	INO	
_				
encampme	of previous	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
onoumpino		,		
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment		
Conclusion su				
Green Belt site	. Development of t	the site would lead to	further merging of Kippax and Great P	reston.
Site Capacity	(dwellings units):	326	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Co	onclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red		Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 3463 Site Name: North of Brigshaw High School, Allerton **Bywater**

Site Details

Northing: 429374 Area sq m: 47643.31 Ward Kippax and Methley 440791 Easting: Area Ha: 4.764331 HMCA: **Outer South East**

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Community Services - Education

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3749.69 Distance to bus stop (metres) 348.73 Nearest Railway Station East Garforth Bus Stop ID 8738

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: No No

Public Rights of Way:

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Greenfield site between Great Preston and Allerton Bywater. Housing to north.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.95	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 Site Ref: 3463 Site Name: North of Brigshaw High School, Allerton Bywater

Site Ref: 3463 Site Name: North of Brigshaw High School, Allerton Bywater

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 rik	bon development?			
Would development result in isolated de	velopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up area	a (2+ boundaries with ex	xisting built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effectively	round off" the settlem	ent pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a go area and undeveloped land?	ood existing barrier betw	veen existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
Low potential to lead to unrestricted spra	ıwl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from me	rging			
Would development of the site lead to pl	nysical connection of se	ttlements?	✓	
Do natural/physical features provide a godevelopment?	ood existing barrier/bou	ndary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
Coalescence/merging settlements				
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	om encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary be	tween the site and the	existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the cour	ntryside?			
Does the site include local or national co	nservation designated	areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		t are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a a	gricultural land?		\checkmark	
Does the site contain buildings?	☐ Are th	ese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conc	lusion			
The site does not perform an important r	ole in safeguarding the	countryside from encroa	achment	
Preserve the setting and special chara	acter of historic towns	i		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conser- historical feature?	vation area, listed buildi	ng or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	on:			
Development of the site would have no	effect on the setting and	special character of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Green Belt site. Development would lead is only a small existing gap separating the				
Conformity with Core Str	ategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller set	tlement	1.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

Site Ref: 3463 Site Name: North of Brigshaw High School, Allerton Bywater

HLAA Conclusio	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infras	tructure provider co	mments and of	her planning req	uirements
Leeds City Council Hi	ghways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
4 buses per hour, 80% em	ployment, 20% primary health	n, 100% secondary ed	lucation	4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
frontage with Brigshaw La	ane should provide visibility			4
Local network commen	t			Rank (1-5)
spare capacity but cumula	ative issues			3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
new footway along Brigsh	aw Lane required			11
Support?	Need to combine wi	th ather sites.	Cuitabilitu fan manti	al development.
Support? yes with mitigation	Need to combine wi	tn otner sites:	Suitability for partia	ai development:
Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology Supported	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	/ Amendment	
Natural England:				
Education _				
Drainage/Water/Flood		F		
Environment Agency Co	mments:	Environment Ag	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	nts:	Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water Treatmer	nt Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manager	nent:			
<u>Utilities</u>				
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.

Electric:

Site Ref:	3463	Site Name:	North of Brigshaw Bywater	High School, Allerton
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herit	age			
Leeds City	=			
West Yorks	hire Archaeology	Service:		
English Her	ritage:			
Gypsy ₋ T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	·	(Text)	,	
Would gyp		Yes	No	Maybe
travellers l site?	ive on the	(Text)		
Proximity t		Yes	No	
gypsies an	d travellers	(Text)		
Experience	e of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme	ents	(Text)		
onclusio	on of Asses	sment		
onclusion s	ummary:			
			scence of Great Preston and Antion is considered important.	Allerton Bywater. As there is only a
ite Capacity	(dwellings units)	: 125	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
esidential Co	onclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red		Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 432975 Area sq m: 3638.43 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440692 Area Ha: 0.363843 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Residential - Residential institution

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):646.80Distance to bus stop (metres)119.24Nearest Railway StationGarforthBus Stop ID12723SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Urban 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Small flat site set within Garforth in a residential area, previous use as a care home. Road frontage on three sides. Directly to the west are allotments, residential dwellings surround the remaining sides of the site.

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?:	
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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
12/00496/DEM	Determination for demolition of former care home	03/02/2012	28/03/2012	NR	98.69
H33/53/87/	Alterations to form 6 bedrooms , staff bedroom and bathr oom and extension to form enla rged lounge and addition o	11/03/1987	06/04/1987	A	77.81
08/00097/LA	Conservatory extension including addition of external access ramp to residential home	08/01/2008	25/02/2008	Α	71.13
08/9/00453/MOD	Conservatory extension including addition of external access ramp to residential home NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Installation of air conditioning unit.	17/10/2008	03/11/2008	M01	71.13

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 0.00 Major Urban Area: Major Settlement 1.00 0.00 Urban Extenstion Area: 0.00 Smaller settlement Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: 0.00 Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway:

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

Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infra	truoturo providor o		ing requirements
-	•	mments and other planni	ng requirements
Leeds City Council H Accessibility comment	ighways inc Metro		Rank (1-
Meets accessibility criteria	 a		
,			5
Access Comments			Rank (1-
Existing access to Churc	h Lane suitable for small deve	lopment	5
Local network commen	ıt		Rank (1-
Small site with negligible	local impact		5
Mitigation measure			Total scc
			15
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites: Suitability	for partial development:
Yes			
Highways Agency Support Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flood	ling		
Environment Agency Co	omments:	Environment Agency Constra	ints:
Yorkshire Water Comme	ante:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water	Treatment Warks Commo
TOTASTILE WATER COMMIS	ilio.	TOTASTILLE WATER WASIE WATER	Treatment WOLKS COMME
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ment:		
<u>Utilities</u>			
Gas:			
Electric:			

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.

Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		, ., .,
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
			,
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
0			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	settlement Originally:	an aged persons home. It is	s situated within a residential area
and residential development wou	ld be acceptable in prince	ciple.	s situated within a residential area
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 14	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Potail C	conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not asse		Not assessed
Olech -	INUL ASSE	;55CU	เพบเ สรรยรรยน

Site Name: Grange Court, Garforth

Site Ref: 4083

Telecom:

Site Details

Northing: 433519 Area sq m: 218094.77 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 439915 Area Ha: 21.809477 HMCA: Outer South East

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):745.72Distance to bus stop (metres)226.34Nearest Railway StationGarforthBus Stop ID5789SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Flat triangular site currently used for agriculture. It is set to the east of Garforth but bordered by housing to the east and north. Farms are located to the south west and further fields beyond. A small pylon runs along part of the northern boundary.

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H33/213/84/	Outline application to erect s upermarket, offices and p etrol filling station, with pl aying fields, changing f	28/06/1984	22/08/1984	R	35.88
H33/186/81/	Outline application to lay out accesses and erect super market including warehouse and offices, commercial	31/03/1981	17/06/1981	R	19.60
H33/126/84/	Outline application to erect s upermarket, shop units, offic es and petrol filling station, with playing field, changing f	19/04/1984	06/08/1984	R	35.83
H33/185/81/	Laying out of access and erect ion of supermarket inclu ding warehouse and offices, co mmercial garage and showroom,	31/03/1981	17/06/1981	R	19.60

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large b	uilt up areas				
Would development lead to/constitute ribbo	n developme	nt?			
Would development result in isolated development	opment?				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2	+ boundaries	with existing	ng built up area)?	\checkmark	
Would development of the site effectively "r	ound off" the	settlement	pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	l existing barr	ier betweer	n existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl					
Prevent neighbouring towns from mergi	ng				
Would development of the site lead to phys	ical connection	on of settler	ments?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?	d existing barr	rier/bounda	ry to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but there is no defensible boun	dary				
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	encroachme	ent			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	een the site a	nd the exis	ting 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, t significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	rees, hedgero	ows that are	e protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agric	cultural land?			✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are these	in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclus	ion_				
The site performs an important role safegua	arding country	side from e	encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special charact	er of historic	towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservat historical feature?	ion area, liste	d building o	or other		
If yes, could development preserve this cha	racter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	<u>:</u>				
Development of the site would have no effe	ct on the setti	ing and spe	ecial character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Relates well to settlement. Fairly well conta	ined reducing	g potential f	or further sprawl.		
Conformity with Core Strat	egy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ment	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller settl	ement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:	(0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	C	0.00	West Leeds Gatewa	ay:	0.00

East Leeds

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.

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability:	Suitability:	А	chievability:	
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provider co	mments and oth	er planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
not all of site meets requiremen A642 to reach local centre	ts for primary education	and health, difficult for p	pedestrian crossing	4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
size of site would require multi	ole accesses to be provi	ded		4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
local congestion issues and po	tential for significant cun	nulative impact with othe	er nearby sites	3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
unclear whether sufficient mitig	ation and capacity impro	ovements can be achiev	/ed	11
Support?	Need to combine wi	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
yes with mitigation				
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact Leeds cluster. Network Rail:	in combination with othe	er sites. If site still includ	led at next sift assess as	part of East
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	_CC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comme	nts:	Environment Age	ency 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.

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	Yes	No	Maybe	
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe	
travellers live on the	(Text)			
site?				
Durantanita ta bassa d	V	- I NI-		_
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No		_
gypsics and travellers	(10/11)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown	_
encampments	(Text)		1 -	
Conclusion of Asses	sment			١
Conclusion summary:				
potential for retail expansion of G		Iready considered as SHLAF	A site 1044 - see 1044 above, and	
р				
Site Capacity (dwellings units):		Floorspace sq m (Noi	n residential):	_
one capacity (uweilings units):		Floorspace Sq III (NOI	i residential).	(
Residential Conclusion:	Retail C	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:	
Green	Green		Red	

Site Name: Land Off Wakefield Road, Garforth

Site Ref: CFSM021

Site Details

Northing: 434083 Area sq m: 459962.51 Ward Garforth and Swillington
Easting: 440764 Area Ha: 45.996251 HMCA: Outer South East

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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 475.14 Distance to bus stop (metres) 439.16 Nearest Railway Station Garforth Bus Stop ID 4418 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Grade 3 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No Yes 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site is set just north of Garforth and is part of a wider collection of sites. Currently used for agriculture it is mainly fields with a few sporadic dwellings. Flat site that has a road frontage running along the western boundary. Some tree cover, mainly along the boundary but there are two small collections within the site. The site abuts a larger protected forest area to the east.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	94.89	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
33/104/95/FU	Extraction of coal & fireclay by opencast methods & restoration to agricultural use	03/04/1995	11/03/1997	А	38.86
33/105/95/FU	Extraction of coal & fireclay by opencast methods and restoration to agricultural use	03/04/1995	20/02/1997	W	38.86

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large be	uilt up areas				
Would development lead to/constitute ribbo	n developmen	it?			
Would development result in isolated development	opment?				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2	+ boundaries	with existir	ng built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "re	ound off" the s	settlement	pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	existing barrie	er betweer	existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl					
Prevent neighbouring towns from mergin	ng				
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	encroachme	nt			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	een the site an	nd the exist	ting urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countryside? ✓					
Does the site include local or national conse	ervation design	nated area	is?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, t significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	rees, hedgerov	ws that are	e protected, or	✓	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agric	cultural land?			✓	
Does the site contain buildings?]	Are these	in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclus	<u>ion</u>				
The site performs an important role safegua	arding countrys	side from e	encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special charact	er of historic	towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservati historical feature?	on area, listed	l building c	or other		
If yes, could development preserve this cha	racter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:					
Development of the site would have no effe	ct on the settir	ng and spe	ecial character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Site is set beyond the railway line and links sides reducing potential for further sprawl.	to an industria	al rather th	an residential area. V	Vell contained on all	
Conformity with Core Strat	egy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ment	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller settl	ement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:	0.	.00	Aire Valley:		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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

HLAA Conclusi	ons		
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infras	structure provider comments and	other planning requir	rements
Leeds City Council F	lighways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
	nary, 40% secondary, 40% health, poor footway or cope for mitigation due to restriction under nearby		3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
	t would require multiple accesses to be provided, lered in conjunction with access requirement for s		4
Local network commen	nt		Rank (1-5)
route into Garforth const network	trained by narrow railway bridge, capacity/congest	ion issues on wider	2
Mitigation measure			Total scor
	al physical constriants on Barwick Road could be local network with other large nearby sites	addressed. Significant	9
Support?	Need to combine with other sites:	Suitability for partial d	evelopment:
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:

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). This proposed allocation includes 6.25ha of the Hawksnest Wood Local Wildlife Site/SEGI a site with one of the largest known populations of great crested newts in West Yorkshire. There are also water courses, lowland mixed deciduous woodland blocks and a pond all of which are UK BAP priority habitats and which should be excluded from the allocation site to maintain habitat connectivity. There are additional hedgerow and another possible ponds which need to be incorporated into the landscaping for any development or mitigation provided elsewhere. Great Crested Newts are present in the Local Wildlife Site/SEGI to the east of the proposed site and there is another record probably for the pond to the south of Lowside Cottage. Great Crested Newts are known to move up to 500m from their breeding ponds to find feeding and hiberation sites. This makes this whole proposed allocation site high risk for this European protected species. The site also supports Brown Hare a UK BAP priority species and is likely to support 4 other species of amphibians which are UK or West Yorkshire BAP priority species. A habitat corridor should be maintained along the motorway boundary to provide connectivity to land to the west. Permanent newt fencing may be required between the LWS/SEGI and the new development to prevent protected species being killed on new roads and in gully pots.

Natural England:

Education

Boundary Amendment Supported with mitigation

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/CFSM028. Mitigation will be required to protect and enhance the boundaries with the LWS/SEGI and the excluded land through providing a minimum 20 metre buffer planted with native shrubs and small trees. Great Crested Newts, bats and Brown Hare to consider. Hedgerows across the site to be reatined and a 10 metre buffer provided on both sides to be planted with native shrubs and small trees.

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.

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: 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 No Maybe Yes (Text) managed Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) Proximity to housed Yes No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown encampments (Text) **Conclusion of Assessment** Conclusion summary: Mixed use submission for housing, industrial and office development. Housing is acceptable in principle. Already in SHLAA as site 2156, apart from eastern section. Site Capacity (dwellings units): Floorspace sq m (Non residential): **Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:** Red Green

Site Name: Land North of Garforth, Leeds

Site Ref: CFSM028