

A8 All the Parish Councils were also contacted by letter.

A9 In parallel with the literature review and consultations, a systematic analysis of **map information and aerial photographic material** was undertaken. Maps of geology, landform and drainage and other landscape information were prepared, using Ordnance Survey 1:50,000 and geology, soils and agricultural land classification maps. Following this, landcover mapping was completed, using 1993 aerial photo coverage of the Leeds district and transferring the information onto a 1:25,000 map base.

A10 Landcover analysis is helpful in areas where landform is not always the dominant landscape factor. It is mainly concerned with the farmed landscape and land around the urban fringe but also identifies areas of semi-natural vegetation such as moorland and woodland. Essentially it consists of mapping different combinations of land use, field pattern and tree cover, using the up to date aerial photographs.

A11 The method used for the Leeds study was based on that developed as part of the Warwickshire Landscapes Project. It involves allocating parcels of land to appropriate categories by means of a simple coding system. Parcels are defined as areas of land bounded by roads, watercourses, parish boundaries and in places railways or canals. Although variable in size, parcels tend to be smaller where the landscape is complex, for example around the urban fringe, and larger where it is more uniform, for example in the farmland to the east of Leeds. The systems thus adjust automatically to reflect the scale and pattern of the landscape.

A12 For the Leeds study, parcels were coded using combinations of the following codes as appropriate:

- F : Cropped farmland
- P : Pasture
- L : Large scale field pattern
- S : Small scale field pattern
- (1) : Intact hedgerows
- (2) : Few hedgerows
- (3) : Intact walls
- (4) : Few walls
- 1 : Trees mainly in hedgerows
- 2: Trees mainly in woodlands
- 3: Few trees

A13 So, for example, the implications of particular combinations of codes would be:

PS11 Pasture, small scale field pattern, intact hedgerow pattern, with trees mainly in hedgerows.

PL32 Pasture, large scale field pattern, intact walls, trees mainly in woodland.

FL23 Cropped farmland, large scale field pattern, few hedgerows and few trees.

A14 After the initial coding, parcels with similar characteristics were grouped together and coloured up to enable a composite picture to be drawn up and broad patterns could be distinguished. This map was then reduced to 1:50,000 scale to enable direct overlay on the other maps containing information on topics such as landform and geology.

A15 On the basis of combined overlays a first approximation of landscape types was prepared to provide a basis for field survey.

Stage B: Field Survey

A16 The main purposes of a field survey are to record the visual character of the landscape and to confirm or modify landcover plotting and landscape character area boundaries. This complements and builds upon the desk study, which in itself provides a useful basis for planning the field work.

A17 For the Leeds study, a combination of three approaches were used to complete the landscape classification, to define the boundaries between landscape types and individual landscape units and to build up detailed descriptions of the landscape of each unit. These were:

- (i) **General familiarisation:** gradually becoming acquainted with the landscape unit by moving through it by car and on foot with the aid of maps, building up an initial impression, seeing each landscape from a different place, experiencing new areas, developing greater familiarity and a more lasting appreciation of the landscape and variation within it and making judgements on, for example, overall character and types. Observations were recorded as map annotations and field notes.
- (ii) **Structured survey:** formal observation at reasonably accessible points, designed to record a fixed range of information consistently at each point and to prepare a composite record for a particular landscape.

A copy of the structured survey form is included at the end of this appendix.

Information was recorded in the following ways:

- *Written description*, to record an overall impression of the landscape, the influence of factors such as landform, landcover, field pattern and settlement, the way in which the landscape is perceived, its aesthetic characteristics, any evidence of change and management problems and thoughts on opportunities for enhancement.
- *Checklists* to record characteristic or dominant features, particularly important associations and aesthetic and perceptual characteristics.
- *Photographs*, to record typical examples of landscape types.

(iii) **Visual appraisal:** a more detailed visual appraisal of the whole of the area, using the aerial photographs in conjunction with the field survey, to record on 1:10,000 map sheets, the following information:

- landcover
- key landscape features (positive and negative)
- intrusive features
- important views
- management problems
- use and condition of land at the urban edge
- nature of the urban edge

A18 This information has been incorporated into the separate map book which accompanies this report.

Stage C : Analysis

A19 On completion of the field survey, the next step was a process of analysis and collation of data. Having reviewed the landcover overlays and the associated field maps and field assessment sheets, the main task was to classify areas of similar character into landscape types and landscape units. Boundaries were drawn based on a mixture of field notes and map annotations, aerial photographs and map information and descriptions prepared drawing on all this information.

LEEDS LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT

FIELD SURVEY FORM

Map No.:

Form No.:

Surveyors:

Date:

Weather:

Viewpoint:

Direction of View:

Aesthetic factors - initial impressions of an area

SCALE	Intimate	Small	Medium	Large
ENCLOSURE	Confined	Enclosed	Open	Exposed
VARIETY	Complex	Varied	Simple	Uniform
TEXTURE	Smooth	Textured	Rough	Very Rough
COLOUR	Monochrome	Muted	Colourful	Garish
MOVEMENT	Remote	Vacant	Peaceful	Active
UNITY	Unified	Interrupted	Fragmented	Chaotic
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed	Restrained	Tamed	Disturbed

Historical and Ecological Associations

commons	stone walls	ancient earthworks	narrow lanes
old orchards	hedge banks	tumuli	wide verges
hamlets	water meadows	irregular fields	heathland
ancient field systems	historic ruins	regular fields	bracken
ridge and furrow	old pollards	parkland trees	green lanes
field ponds	tree avenues	ancient trackways	
moats	defence works	thorn hedges	
mine workings	hedgerow oaks	mixed hedges	

Description of Landscape Character

DESCRIPTION, MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Landform

Land Use (Agricultural)

Management problems and opportunities

Land Use (Other)

Management problems and opportunities

Field Pattern/Field Boundaries

Management problems and opportunities

Trees and Woodlands

Management problems and opportunities

Buildings and Settlements

Management problems and opportunities

Water Features

Management problems and opportunities

Urban Edge (Study Area Boundary)

Management problems and opportunities

Linear Features

Management problems and opportunities

Views and focal points

Management problems and opportunities

Landmarks and eyesores

Management problems and opportunities

Other

CHECKLIST

PRESENCE AND CONTRIBUTION OF DIFFERENT LANDSCAPE ELEMENTS

LANDFORM FEATURES

hill
valley
cliff/precipice/overhang
plateau
ridge/slope/spur
bench/terrace
knoll
basin/hollow
plain/flat
rock outcrop/crags
other

LAND USE (AGRICULTURAL)

arable
horticulture/glass
permanent pasture
ley pasture
rough grazing

LAND USE (OTHER)

excavations/quarries
tips
car parks
picnic area
camping/caravan site
golf course

FIELD PATTERN/FIELD BOUNDARIES

large fields
small fields
hedges
hedgerow trees
walls
fences
drainage ditches
other

WOODLAND/TREES

coniferous plantation/forest
mixed plantation/forest
deciduous woodland/plantation
woodland edge
shelterbelt
tree clumps/avenues
parkland trees
scattered trees and scrub
other

LINEAR FEATURES

footpaths/bridleways
minor roads/tracks
trunk road
motorway
farm/forestry or sporting roads
railway tracks
power lines/high/low voltage
pylons
embankments
other

BUILDINGS AND SETTLEMENTS

settlement
farm buildings
church
castle/ruin
traditional buildings
modern buildings

WATER FEATURES

reservoir
river
canal
stream
other

VIEWS

distant
framed
intermittent
panoramic
corridor
other

CHECKLIST OF MANAGEMENT ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Agricultural management

- intensification
- extensification eg. Set-aside, Countryside Stewardship opportunities
- new crops/new technology
- field boundaries
 - removal
 - addition of new boundaries
 - condition/management (over-grown or low cut and gappy hedges/wall repair)
- farm buildings
 - evidence of redundancy
 - size/intrusion of new buildings

Trees and Woodlands

- management of existing woodlands
- regeneration of small woods
- field/hedgerow trees -
 - condition/health
- parkland trees - over-mature, need for re-planting
- stream/riverside trees - pollarding etc.
- opportunities for new woodland planting

Development

- existing road corridors - intrusion, scope for integration and screening
- new roads - possible intrusion
- impact of adjacent new development (residential/commercial)
- conversion of redundant farm buildings
- mineral extraction - type, scale, impact
- tall structures

Semi-natural habitats

- threats
- internal change e.g. succession
- management needs

Recreation/Tourism

- evidence of use
- wear and tear/erosion
- evidence of parking/car parks etc.
- potential
- golf courses - types, style, integration
- other sports activities

Introduction

A1 The method of landscape assessment used has evolved over the last seven years. The initial method was developed by LUC in a landscape assessment of the upland area of the Cambrian Mountains in Wales. It focussed on classification of the landscape into types of distinct character through a combination of desk study, involving overlays of landform and land cover and field survey. The method was incorporated into the Countryside Commission's guidance on landscape assessment, set out in CCD 18 *Landscape Assessment : A Countryside Commission Approach*.

A2 This has guided subsequent assessments, in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty for example, and has been developed and refined over the years, particularly in CCP 332, *Assessment and conservation of landscape character: the Warwickshire Landscapes Project approach*. In PPG 7 *The Countryside and the Rural Economy*, the Government advocates the use of landscape assessment as a basis for preparing development plans. The Department of Environment Circular 22/92 on *Indicative Forestry Strategies* also recommends landscape assessment as a starting point for developing indicative forestry strategies.

A3 The most recent Countryside Commission guidance on landscape assessment is published as CCP423, *Landscape Assessment Guidance*. This pulls together previous advice, develops ideas about good practice and draws on examples of assessments that have been carried out at different scales. The work we have carried out in the Leeds area is fully in accordance with the Countryside Commission's recommended approach.

A4 The method of landscape assessment for the Leeds study involved a number of tasks, as detailed below:

Stage A : Desk Study

A5 A great deal of information can be gained from desk study of existing sources such as textbooks on the geography and history of the area, guidebooks, maps plans and air photographs. The first task of the Leeds study involved a **literature review**. For this, all relevant and available

published and unpublished material relating to the landscape of the area was assembled, including:

- (i) published and unpublished technical reports, which were received from Leeds City Council, and others which were supplied as a result of consultations,
- (ii) books, literary descriptions and material held by local studies collections and in local libraries.

A6 The literature review provided a useful starting point and assisted particularly in understanding the physical and human influences that have helped to shape the Leeds landscape of today. It is also a major source of information on the 'non-visual' aspects of landscape character such as archaeology, nature conservation and architecture; and on cultural perceptions and landscape change.

A7 The second task of the study involved a series of **consultations**, by letter, telephone or meetings, with interested parties. A range of organisations were consulted to see if they held additional information on the area and to find out about their views on change in the landscape and options for future management. The following organisations were contacted and the majority responded:

British Waterways;
 Council for the Protection of Rural England;
 Country Landowners Association;
 English Nature;
 Forestry Authority;
 Leeds Urban Wildlife Group;
 Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food;
 National Farmers Union;
 National Rivers Authority;
 Ramblers Association;
 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds;
 South Leeds Groundwork Trust;
 Sports Council;
 West Yorkshire Archaeology Service;
 West Yorkshire Ecological Advisory Service;
 West Yorkshire Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group;
 Yorkshire and Humberside Regional Tourist Board;
 Yorkshire Water;
 Yorkshire Wildlife Trust;

APPENDIX B: PUBLIC PERCEPTION SURVEY AND FOCUS GROUPS

The public perception survey

Introduction

B1 The purpose of this part of the study was to explore the perceptions of and attitudes towards local landscapes and landscape change, reflecting local perceptions as well as professional perceptions of the landscape. For the study, a questionnaire was designed to explore three main questions:

- (i) The extent to which the public perceive particular areas to have 'distinctive landscape character'.
- (ii) The ways in which the character of the landscape is perceived; in terms of their visual images, of the physical elements or features that characterise them and the adjectives used to describe them.
- (iii) The extent to which the public are aware of change in these areas and their reactions to possible directions for future change.

The survey

B2 The surveys took place during the weekend of 25th/26th September at four locations: the Chevin; Temple Newsam; Lotherton Hall; and Middleton Park. This involved 8 surveyors, (2 at each location), drawn from the landscape courses at the Leeds Universities. The surveyors took part in a training session on the preceding Friday, which enabled interviewing practice to be gained and any problems ironed out prior to the weekend. We completed 195 questionnaires over the weekend, (59 at Temple Newsam, 58 at Middleton, 40 at the Chevin and 39 at Lotherton), 5 short of our target of 200 interviews in 100 surveyor hours.

B3 Following receipt of the completed questionnaires, a database was designed to allow for input and suitable analysis of the results. The analysis has already been completed and a summary of the results is given below.

Survey results

B4 At the start of the survey, people were asked where they lived. Only respondents living in the study area were questioned for this survey. Every

council ward was represented by at least one person, although only seven wards were represented by more than 10 people. These were Beeston, Garforth and Swillington, Halton, Headingley, Middleton, Otley and Wharfedale and Rothwell.

B5 Catchment areas of the survey locations varied with the majority of people questioned at Middleton Park and Temple Newsam, living locally, in the neighbouring wards. For the Chevin, the catchment area was wider, and although the majority of people questioned lived in areas close by, such as Otley and Horsforth, a significant number of visitors originated from areas within the City itself. Lotherton also had a wide catchment with small numbers of people originating from throughout the Leeds City Council area.

B6 At the start of the survey, each of the 195 respondents was asked to think of up to three areas of countryside in the City Council area, which they thought of as having their own particular landscape character. In total, 57 different areas were suggested, although 33 of these areas were only mentioned by one or two respondents. Areas mentioned by more than two people included the following:

Name	Number of resps.	Name	Number of resps.
The Chevin	45	Wetherby/Boston Spa area	4
Temple Newsam	40	Hetchell area	4
Roundhay	34	The Hollies	4
Golden Acre Park	21	Temple-Swillington	3
Lotherton	21	Parlington	3
Middleton Park	18	Cockersdale area	3
Meanwood Valley	13	Middleton area	3
Wharfedale	8	Lower Aire	3
Harewood	7	Otley-Bramhope	3
Kirkstall Valley	7	North East valley villages	3
Otley area	7	Chevin and area	3
Eccup Reservoir	6	Eccup and north to Wharfe	3

B7 The other areas named by less than three people included the following: South Morley; Woodlesford Canal; the North West Plateau; Aberford; Fairburn Ings; Linton Common; Lofthouse; North of Roundhay; Upper Aire; Calton Common; Yeadon Tarn; South West Leeds; Wike

area; Howley Hall; Bramhope North; Horsforth - Airport; Allerton Bywater; Farnley Park; Ponders Field; Pool; Hawksworth Moor; Calverley area; Breary Marsh; Arthington-Adel Road; Rothwell area; and the Garforth area.

B8 The next stage in the interview asked the respondents to draw a map of the areas they had referred to. As the majority of people referred to the parks around Leeds, such as Middleton, Roundhay and Golden Acre, the boundaries were often accurately recorded. Boundaries drawn for areas other than parks, for example, Wharfedale, and Eccup Reservoir varied, although it was these that revealed the most interesting information about perceived extent and location of chosen areas.

B9 For the areas they had chosen, respondents were then asked to describe the landscape or scenery to a friend who had no idea what it was like. Initially, the question was put in an open ended way, in order not to impose constraints or pre-determined ideas. Following this, however, the respondents were given lists to choose from, both of adjectives which might be used to describe the landscape and elements that might make up a landscape.

B10 Over half the people who described the Chevin, for example said it was interesting, scenic, natural, unspoilt, hilly, beautiful, peaceful, with woods and distant views. Temple Newsam was described as interesting, scenic, popular, beautiful, peaceful, and with distant views, grass and pasture, cattle grazing, woods, farms and people. Roundhay, like Temple Newsam, was described as interesting, scenic, wooded, popular and beautiful, with other elements, such as sports fields being mentioned by over half of the respondents. Lotherton was described as interesting, scenic, wooded, peaceful and popular, with people, grass/pasture, cattle grazing, large fields, woods and distant views. For Middleton, although many words were used to describe the area, only wooded, peaceful, natural and golf courses were mentioned by over half of the respondents.

B11 Meanwood Valley and the Hollies, like many of the other parks and 'green spaces', were described as peaceful, interesting, natural, beautiful, and characterised with streams and woods. In addition, over 90% of people called the Valley scenic. Kirkstall Valley, the other green 'finger' of land extending into the city was also described as peaceful and interesting, with the most noted elements being stone walls, rivers and pylons. Wharfedale was felt to be scenic, beautiful, rolling, wooded, peaceful and interesting

with hedges, rivers, grass/pasture, woods, valleys and distant views. Elements such as small fields, stone walls, farms and tree clumps were also mentioned by about half of the respondents.

B12 The most commonly used words to describe Harewood were interesting, scenic, and cultivated, with grass/pasture, woods and farms being noted by over 70% of people. Other words noted by over half the respondents included gentle, popular, and beautiful, with stone walls, streams, parks, large fields, hedgerow trees, sheep grazing and distant views. The nature of Harewood being a designed or 'man-made' landscape was mentioned by 29% of respondents with the attractions such as the house noted by almost half.

B13 Eccup Reservoir was noted as being open, with wetlands, woods, farms and hedgerow trees. In contrast, areas such as the Lower Aire, were described by over half the respondents as being flat, with pylons and spoil tips particular features of note.

B14 Respondents were then asked whether they thought of the areas they had chosen as being attractive or not. For all the parks mentioned (ie. Temple Newsam, Roundhay, Middleton, Lotherton, Golden Acre and the country park at the Chevin), the majority of respondents felt that they were quite attractive or very attractive. The Chevin had the greatest percentage of respondents (73%) describing it as very attractive. Only small numbers of respondents described the areas as unattractive.

B15 Outside the parks, the majority of people (85%), felt that the Meanwood Valley was quite or very attractive, with all the respondents saying the same for Wharfedale. In contrast, 57% of respondents who mentioned the Kirkstall Valley, were non-committal, saying that the area was neither attractive nor unattractive and for the Wetherby-Boston Spa area, all of the four respondents who noted it, described it as either a bit unattractive or very unattractive.

B16 The final questions relating to the chosen areas, asked people to what degree they felt the area had changed in the time that they had known it. If they felt it had changed, they were asked whether these changes had made the area more or less attractive. For all the parks mentioned, the majority of respondents felt that the changes noted had made the areas more attractive, although for Temple Newsam, Middleton and the Chevin, about a quarter of respondents felt that the area had become less attractive.

B17 For the Chevin and Roundhay, 44% and 41% respectively, said that the areas hadn't changed in the time they had known them. However, people's opinion differed significantly, with 40% saying that the Chevin had changed a little or a lot and 50% answering likewise for Roundhay. The changes at Roundhay, were felt by 60% of respondents to have made the area more attractive and at the Chevin, this figure was similar, at 56%. At Middleton and Golden Acre Park, a high percentage of respondents (78% and 72% respectively), felt that the areas had changed either a little or a lot. Again, in both cases, the majority felt that these changes had made the areas more attractive.

B18 Outside the parks, the majority of respondents (62%), felt that the Meanwood Valley area had not changed, but for the 23% that did, all of them felt that the changes they had noticed had made the area more attractive. In contrast, although most respondents felt that Wharfedale hadn't changed, the majority of those that had noticed changes, felt that they had made the area less attractive. Areas such as Harewood were generally not felt to have changed at all.

B19 The final part of the questionnaire, concentrated on the whole of the countryside around Leeds, and not just these chosen areas. When asked whether they had noticed any changes in the time they had known the area, 21% of people said they had noticed many changes, 39%, quite a few changes, 21% only a few changes and only 13% had not noticed any changes.

B20 The most commonly noted changes included new housing, noted by 54% of respondents, new industrial development (33%), new roads (28%), increased traffic (16%), tourism development (9%), leisure developments (8%), more mineral extraction (8%), more deciduous trees (7%), and hedge removal (7%). For changes such as new housing, new industrial development, new roads, increased traffic, more mineral extraction and hedgerow removal, the majority (over 78% in each case), felt that these changes had made the countryside less attractive to them. Only changes such as more deciduous trees, greater accessibility and the countryside becoming cleaner were felt by the majority to have made a positive contribution. Ideas over changes such as tourism and leisure development (eg. golf courses) were mixed, with some feeling that these changes had made the countryside more attractive and a similar number holding the opposite view.

B21 Changes which people would like to see in the countryside varied considerably, with the most

commonly mentioned changes including control over development and greenbelt protection, noted by 21%, greater accessibility (20%), cleaner (14%), better interpretation and signage (9%), improvements in visitor facilities (8%), more wildlife (8%), hedgerow management and planting (7%) and better public transport (7%).

B22 The range of issues raised in this questionnaire were discussed in greater detail in the two focus groups which were held as part of this exercise. The outcome of these groups is summarised in the following the following section of this report.

The focus group meetings

Introduction

B23 As part of the public perception survey, two focus groups were held to discuss views and perceptions about local landscape in greater detail. Participants were identified through the questionnaire survey and invited along to a focus group in their local area. The first group took place on the evening of October 11th at Morley Town Hall, with eight local residents, drawn from the south and south east attending. The second took place on October 12th at Horsforth Mechanics Institute, with five people attending, drawn from the north and west of Leeds. The following paragraphs summarise the discussion and outcome of these focus groups.

The extent of the countryside around Leeds

B24 Initially, the participants in the focus groups were asked what they thought of or understood as 'landscape around Leeds', as this term had been introduced during the questionnaire survey. For some, there seemed to be surprise at how far the Leeds City Council boundary extended and how much land was therefore classified as 'land around Leeds'. The countryside or landscape around Leeds was felt by some to be the land closest to the urban area such as the parks. One person felt that if they were planning to go to the country, they would tend to think of the national parks, such as the Peak District, Yorkshire Moors and the Dales and noted that:

"I never before thought of the land around the edge of the city as country....because in Leeds there are so many parks, that if I'm going within the city I will go to a park and if I'm going to the country I will get in the car, or on a train or bus and go out to the moors...."

B25 For some people, the 'landscape around Leeds', did not include areas such as Harewood, Lotherton Hall, the Aire Valley and the Chevin, which were instead, noted by one to "...to belong elsewhere". Areas which were felt to 'belong' to Leeds typically included the parks, such as Roundhay, and Temple Newsam, which were familiar to all the participants and felt to be easily identifiable with the City. Other participants however, seemed to have a greater awareness of the extent and nature of the countryside around Leeds and it tended to be these people who valued the areas of countryside in the Leeds district which lies inbetween the parks and those areas of countryside further afield, such as the National Parks. One such person noted that:

"there was no point having to drive further afield as nice quiet places where one can wander around in woods could be found all around Leeds".

Areas and character of countryside around Leeds

B26 As in the questionnaire survey, the participants in the focus groups were asked which places they went to, or could think of in their area, and asked to describe or summarise their thoughts about these areas. The parks were mentioned by many, with Middleton Park being a clear favourite with one of the groups, where the majority of the participants had been drawn from the South Leeds area. The park was felt to be particularly good for dog walking with *"lovely walks through the woods and glorious autumn colours"* mentioned by one, and another person who lived locally to the park noted that Middleton Woods was *"unspoilt and well maintained"*. This viewpoint was not shared by everyone, however, with one participant saying that the park had a *"derelict feel to it"*, being *"rubbish-tip rough, rather than wild rough"*.

B27 Temple Newsam was noted for its farm and *"the glorious colours of the rhododendrons in the spring"* and Roundhay was described as being *"absolutely wonderful"*. Another park, Rothwell Park, was felt to be *"nice with beautiful views across the valley over to Temple Newsam"*. Golden Acre was described as *"shut in and limited"* by one person but another described the gardens there as *"beautiful"*.

B28 Many other places other than the parks were mentioned by participants as places they had been to and knew of. A range of positive and negative comments were given for the various areas. The area to the south of Swillington for example, was picked out as being *"particularly unpleasant"* and close by, Kippax was noted as having a *"lovely*

hill". The area around Tong-Cockersdale was little visited by people from one of the groups, with some remarking that it was *"industrialised, or consisting of private, inaccessible ground"*. One person who knew the area well, however, felt it was relatively unknown, and described it as *"quiet and special"*.

B29 The Meanwood Valley, in particular the Hollies were described as having *"lovely trees, birds and wildlife"*. The canals were used by some, particularly the Woodlesford stretch and around Kirkstall, which was described as *"muddy, but really lovely... but with abundant wild plants, more so than in the parks"*. The area around Wetherby, along the river was felt to be good for walks, with the river being *"clean"* and the landscape immediately around being *"open, rather than wooded"*. Villages such as Collingham and Linton were described by one as *"having attractive houses, but not being particularly attractive themselves, being more like up market housing estates or commuter villages"*. Barwick-in Elmet was noted as *"an attractive village to walk around"* unlike the area around Garforth which was felt to be *"quite attractive....but not a place you would get out and wonder around"*.

B30 Walks around Eccup, were not thought of as somewhere to go for a Sunday afternoon, because *"wherever you go there is private land around"*, even though there were *"glorious views"*. Yeadon Tarn was thought to be a *"pleasant place"*. The area mentioned most by the respondents in the questionnaire survey, the Chevin, was a popular place to visit for some of the participants, particularly because of the views. It was described as being *"wonderful...allowing you to look beyond at the countryside opening up.....with a feeling that things go on and on"*.

Landscape change

B31 As most of the participants had lived around Leeds for many years, they were asked about changes they had noticed in the area. The majority felt that things had improved over the years, both in the parks, which were thought to have improved over the last few years, and in the countryside in general, although litter was noted as a particular problem. Again, responses seemed to concentrate on local areas such as Middleton Park. Fly tipping was an issue at the park, exacerbated by unofficial motor access, and along with vandalism was felt to spoil an otherwise attractive area. Reactions over golf courses were mixed, with one participant describing them as *"green deserts"*. Others felt they were acceptable, with the course at Middleton being described as *"rather nice....with mature*

trees" and in general providing a barrier to further urban encroachment. The general consensus of opinion was that none should be closed down but no more should be developed as *"the land is far more valuable than to be developed for golf"*. When asked what the land should be 'developed' for instead, one participant replied that *"it should be planted up with trees.....for new forests woodlands and nature reserves"*. New tree planting around Middleton in particular was identified as being a good opportunity, both on a large scale and on a smaller scale around new housing and developments.

B32 New development, such as housing was noted as a major change, particularly over the last few years, in areas such as Beeston and Morley. There was a worry that Morley would soon be swallowed up by the rest of Leeds if development continued as it had done in the past. There were mixed views over the design of new housing, with some being described as looking *"false"*, and a general opinion that houses were built without green spaces in between. Numerous *"little green spaces or nooks and crannies between buildings"* were noted as having been lost through infill development with a general loss of green belt areas. Office space was felt by the participants to be excessive around Leeds, with many new buildings being built but not occupied. In addition, there was also felt to be an excess of supermarkets. New roads were felt to have changed the countryside in the past.

B33 In the countryside as a whole intensification of farming was noted as a change that was taking place, with some feeling that there had been a loss of trees and hedgerows, even in a short time over

the last few years. New hedge planting and stone wall repair had been noticed around Leeds, but not to any great extent. A slight increase in the amount of coniferous planting was noted, particularly in areas such as the Chevin. Diversification of farming activities had also been noticed, with barn conversions and development of wildflower meadows and lawn turf sales noted as a few examples.

B34 As in the questionnaire survey, all the participants were asked specifically if there were any changes they would like to see in the countryside. A desire for more green spaces in the built up areas was identified as a desirable change, with derelict sites being converted to nature reserves and open spaces, rather than being built on. One group mentioned a return to less intensive farming, more hedges and drystone walls and a preference for more deciduous planting was made to *"provide a greater fit into the landscape"*. Both groups felt that new planting around Leeds would be a good idea, although it would be dependent on the type of trees used and how it was designed. In particular, the area around Middleton and to the south of Leeds was felt to be the best place for planting, with further opportunities identified in the Aire Valley to the south of Temple Newsam. One advantage noted for having new planting in the south, was that it would be *"a forest for others and not just Leeds"*, whereas in the north it would be *"a forest for Leeds only"*. No landscapes were identified as being unsuitable for planting although a mix of wooded and open spaces was felt to be preferable in certain areas.

LEEDS LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT PUBLIC PERCEPTION STUDY

Questionnaire no: Location:..... Date of interview: Time of interview:
 Interviewer initials:

We are carrying out a survey for Leeds City Council on the different landscapes within the district. Part of this involves the ways in which members of the public see these differences in landscape. Not so much what you like as what you feel is important in making one bit of countryside seem different from another.

What we would like to do is to ask you some questions about the landscape around Leeds.

1. First, can you tell me if you live in the area shown on this map?

Yes (go to Q2)
 No (end interview)

2. Now, can you tell me where you live in the area?
 (tick box by relevant council ward - as shown on the large map)

(1)Aireborough	(7)City and Holbeck	(13)Headingley	(19)Morley North	(25)Richmond Hill	(31)Wetherby
(2)Armley	(8)Chapel Allerton	(14)Horsforth	(20)Morley South	(26)Roundhay	(32)Whinmoor
(3)Barwick and Kippax	(9)Cookridge	(15)Hunslett	(21)North	(27)Rothwell	(33)Wortley
(4)Beeston	(10)Garforth and Swillington	(16)Kirkstall	(22)Otley and Wharfedale	(28)Seacroft	
(5)Bramley	(11)Halton	(17)Middleton	(23)Pudsey North	(29)University	
(6)Burmantofts	(12)Harehills	(18)Moortown	(24)Pudsey South	(30)Wetwood	

3. Have you always lived within the area shown on the map?

Yes (go to Q5)
 No (go to Q4)

4. Roughly how many years have you lived here?

.....

5. Can you tell me what your occupation is? *Record occupation and note down degree to which it is typically agricultural or rural ie. dependent on or influencing landscape eg. farming, forestry, mining, recreation management etc.)*

.....
 Strongly agricultural or rural.....
 Partially agricultural or rural.....
 Not agricultural or rural

Now I would like to ask you some questions about the countryside in the Leeds City Council area - that is the area between the lines on this map. I'd like you to think of an area or a few areas of countryside in the City Council area which you think of as having their own particular landscape character. They might be places local to your home which you see every day, or where you go for walks; or areas that you travel to when you want to go out in the country; or you might know about them in some other way.

6. Is there a first/second/third place that you can think of? Can you show me roughly where it is and how big it is? *(Use the large map to help locate the area and draw it onto the small map. Where this presents difficulty, probe by landmarks or place names).*

7. Does this area have a name? If so, what is it? *(Record name where appropriate)*

Area 1

Area 2

Area 3

.....

.....

.....

Interviewer initials:.....Questionnaire no:

8. How would you describe the landscape or scenery of this area to a friend who had no idea what it was like? Record all adjectives and phrases for each area? *(Record all adjectives and/or descriptive phrases for each area)*

Area 1	Area 2	Area 3
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.

9. Now, here is a list with some words which might be used to describe different landscapes - can you tell me which ones you think apply to this area? *(Show prompt card A and tick the responses given for each area)*

	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3		Area 1	Area 2	Area 3		Area 1	Area 2	Area 3
(1)Wild				(11)Colourful				(21)Open			
(2)Wooded				(12)Remote				(22)Derelict			
(3)Peaceful				(13)Scenic				(23)Rolling			
(4)Cultivated				(14)Enclosed				(24)Disturbed			
(5)Industrial				(15)Exposed				(25)Beautiful			
(6)Regular				(16)Natural				(26)Bland/Boring			
(7)Bleak				(17)Unspoilt				(27)Ugly			
(8)Gentle				(18)Hilly				(28)Untidy			
(9)Interesting				(19)Varied							
(10)Flat				(20)Popular							

10. Here is a list of some things (elements or features) that you might find making up a landscape. Can you tell me which ones you think are typical in the area? *(Show prompt card B and tick the responses given for each area)*

	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3		Area 1	Area 2	Area 3		Area 1	Area 2	Area 3
(1)Small fields				(12)Grass/pasture				(23)Development			
(2)Stone walls				(13)Large fields				(24)Woods			
(3)Hedges				(14)Main roads				(25)Ditches			
(4)People				(15)Minor roads				(26)Moorland			
(5)Crops				(16)Sheep grazing				(27)Farms			
(6)Rivers				(17)Cattle grazing				(28)Tree clumps			
(7)Streams				(18)Horse pasture				(29)Golf courses			
(8)Hills				(19)Distant views				(30)Valleys			
(9)Flat land				(20)New housing				(31)Hedgerow trees			
(10)Railways				(21)Pylons				(32)Sports fields			
(11)Parks				(22)Wetlands				(33)Spoil tips			

Interviewer initials:.....Questionnaire no:

11. Can you tell me whether you think of this as being an attractive area or not. Is it...?
(tick one box for each area)

	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3
(1)Very unattractive			
(2)A bit unattractive			
(3)Neither attractive/nor unattractive			
(4)Quite attractive			
(5)Very attractive			

12. Do you think this area has changed in the time that you have known it. Has it....?
(tick one box for each area)

	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3
(1)Changed a lot			
(2)Changed a little			
(3)Not changed			
(4)Don't know			

13. If you think it has changed, do you think the changes have made the area....?
(tick one box for each area)

	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3
(1)More attractive			
(2)Less attractive			
(3)No difference			
(4)Don't know			

If respondent has mentioned more than one area in Q6, return to Q6 and repeat Q6 to Q13 for the second/third areas

14. Now, thinking about the whole of the countryside around Leeds (ie. the area shown on the map), have you noticed any particular changes in the landscape during the time you have known the area?

Yes, many changes
 Yes, quite a few changes
 Yes, but few changes
 No, no changes at all (go to Q16)
 Don't know (go to Q16)

Interviewer initials:.....Questionnaire no:

15. Can you tell me what these changes are ?(Record responses under the categories given below if appropriate. Record any additional responses under 'other')
 Have these changes you mentioned made the countryside more or less attractive to you, or have they made no difference? (Record responses) .

	Noted by respondent?	Less attractive	No difference	More attractive
(1)Hedge removal				
(2)Wall removal				
(3)New housing				
(4)New roads				
(5)Increased traffic				
(6)New industrial/commercial development				
(7)Leisure developments eg. golf courses				
(8)More trees - coniferous planting				
(9)More trees - deciduous planting				
(10)Fewer trees				
(11)More fencing of land				
(12)Different crops or livestock				
(13)More mining or quarrying				
(14)Agricultural buildings				
(15)Electricity pylons				
(16)Tourist development				
(17)Leisure development eg. scrambling				
Other (specify)				
.....				
.....				
.....				

16. Think about the landscape around Leeds. Are there any changes to the countryside that you would particularly like to see? (Record changes)

1..... 4.....
 2..... 5.....
 3..... 6.....

17. Are you a member of any society or organisation for the protection or enjoyment of the countryside or wildlife?

None Yes, one
 Yes, two Yes, more than two

18. Please can you tell me your name and phone number?

Name.....Tel. no.....
 (If necessary, explain that this is because a sample of those interviewed will be contacted by telephone to check that they have been interviewed)

19. Land Use Consultants, who are conducting this research for Leeds City Council would like to talk in depth to some people about some of the issues raised in this questionnaire. would you be willing to be contacted in the near future with a view to joining an informal group of other local residents for an evening, to take part in this discussion?

No
 Yes..... (check that name and telephone number are accurately recorded above)

Thank you for your time