#### **Site Details**

Northing: 439489 Area sq m: 4501.74 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 421124 Area Ha: 0.450174 HMCA: Aireborough

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

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: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3315.39 Distance to bus stop (metres) 141.95 Nearest Railway Station Horsforth Bus Stop ID 9719 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 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: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site bounded on all sides by existing residential developments, which prevent direct access to the site. Site has limited tree coverage, mainly on the site boundaries, these are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). An allotment site lies to the north west 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 Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

#### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

## **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
29/126/05/FU	Laying out of access and erection of two 4 bedroom and three 5 bedroom detached houses to garden site	30/03/2005	15/06/2005	R	95.21
06/02335/FU	Laying out of access and erection of one 4 bedroom and five 5 bedroom detached houses with attached double garage to garden site	11/04/2006	15/12/2006	R	100.00

## 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 developn	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 ba	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	tlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing b	arrier/bour	ndary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
Assist in safeguarding countryside to	from encroach	ment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	oetween the site	and the e	xisting urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countryside?					
Does the site include local or national	conservation 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	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 consensatorical 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	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00		Smaller sett	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

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF	F to determine	Achievability:	Medium term (6-10 years
Summary of Infrastructure provider co	omments and	other plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment	111d- (222		Rank (1-
Good access to Public Transport, Education and Local	Health facilities.		4
Access Comments			Rank (1-
New access road requires retaining structures due to I	levels.		3
Local network comment			Rank (1-
Existing residential estate with some on-street parking	issues.		3
Mitigation measure			Total sc
Traffic Management measures?			10
Support? Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability	y for partial development:
Yes - with mitigation			
Highways Agency n/a Network Rail :			
Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Bounda	ry Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	Agency Constra	nints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:		ter Waste Water	Treatment Works Comm
√arious sewers towards western boundary of site	Esholt		
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: 12	Site Name:	Adjacent To Ivy Hous Rawdon	se, Off Larkfield Drive,
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	/ Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> 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)		, may a c
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		·
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
ccess would require removal of as only limited tree cover and th		here is a Tree Preservation Orde ed in detailed design.	r over the site, however, the site
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 6	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
mber	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 441344 Area sq m: 4191.32 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 420209 Area Ha: 0.419132 HMCA: Aireborough

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Residential - Residential institution

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space

Guiseley

Neighbouring Use 3:

Nearest Railway Station

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): 1605.76 Distance to bus stop (metres) 194.17

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 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 Yes No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Bus Stop ID

12345

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Flat site set within Nunroyd Park, surrounded by N1 greenspace. There is an exisiting building on site which would suit conversion. There is limited tree cover on 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:	0.01	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.01	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

## **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H28/130/85/	Change of use of dwelling hous e, to aged persons resid ential home.	16/07/1985	03/09/1985	W	77.70
09/02813/FU	Laying out of access and erection of 2 detached houses, a pair of semi detached houses and 4 terraced houses	26/06/2009	27/01/2010	R	99.64
H28/163/85/	Change of use of detached hous e, to aged persons home.	04/09/1985	28/10/1985	А	77.77
H28/326/80/	Outline application to erect d etached house with garageto ga rden site. (site area 0.09ha).	01/08/1980	13/10/1980	R	77.78
08/02055/FU	Erection of one 5 bedroom detached house and ten 4 bedroom semi-detached houses	04/04/2008	18/07/2008	W	99.72
H28/45/82/	Alterations and extension, to form laundry room, showerroom, lobby and porch and replaceme nt detached stone double gar	03/03/1982	22/03/1982	Α	77.84

## 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 an	ea (2+ boundaries with ex	kisting built up area)?	
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the settlem	ent pattern?:	
Do natural/physical features provide a area and undeveloped land?	veen existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:			
Prevent neighbouring towns from n	nerging		
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:			
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		t are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a	agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildings?	Are th	ese in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Co	nclusion		
Preserve the setting and special ch	aracter of historic towns	:	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conshistorical feature?	ervation area, listed buildi	ng or other	
If yes, could development preserve this	s character?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	usion:		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Conformity with Core S	trategy		
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 Conclusions		
Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: Yes	S Achievability: Medium te	rm (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider co	omments and other planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
Good access to bus services, no access to rail		4
Access Comments		Rank (1-5
The adopted highway would have to be extended from across the full extent of the site frontage onto the exist public right of way may require improvements.		4
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Good connection to Kirk Lane and Queensway via Pul	blic Footpath	4
Mitigation measure		Total scor
Extend adopted highway and improve PROW.		12
Support? Need to combine w  Yes - with mitigation	with other sites:  Suitability for partial of	development:
Highways Agency n/a Network Rail : Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported	Boundary Amendment	
Natural England:		
Education		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
Private water supply serves site from the south	Esholt Esholt	
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: 180	Site Name:	Brookfield Nursing Terrace, Yeadon	Home, Swaine Hill
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> 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:			
Plan). The building is a positive	building set within the the best use for the s	e conservation area and should	n the existing Unitary Development d be retained if possible. Conversion cation. Adopted highway would need
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 7	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 442605 Area sq m: 1832.78 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 418208 Area Ha: 0.183278 HMCA: Aireborough

#### **Site Characteristics**

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Mixed

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 801.84

Distance to bus stop (metres) 134.25

Nearest Railway Station

Guiseley

Bus Stop ID 1771

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 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** Yes No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Small site on the edge of established residential area. Northern section of the site has significant tree cover.

#### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.04	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

## **Planning History**

Site Ref: 1103

Planning Histor	<u>,                                      </u>				
Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
28/11/00/FU	Renewal of permission for museum shop and amusement arcade and new car park layout to restaurant	04/02/2000	04/04/2000	Α	89.58
28/217/93/FU	New canopy to front of shop and restaurant	04/11/1993	29/12/1993	Α	99.22
11/02169/FU	Supermarket with car parking and landscaping	25/05/2011	02/02/2012	Α	66.86
H28/234/88/	Alterations, including new fro ntage and addition of canop y to front of restaurant.	24/08/1988	03/10/1988	Α	68.27
H28/167/86/	Alterations, including part ne w frontage and new terra ce, to front and extension, to form store, cutting ro	09/10/1986	17/11/1986	Α	69.54
12/00979/FU	Erection of 4 houses with garages and new access, parking and landscaping	01/03/2012	29/05/2012	А	27.24
12/01791/FU	Six floodlight columns and three wall mounted floodlights to restaurant car park	19/04/2012	06/07/2012	Α	25.11
12/00517/ADV	Two internally illuminated wall mounted sings and one free standing internally illuminated sign to proposed supermarket	02/02/2012	13/04/2012	SPL	66.86
28/264/01/FU	Change of use of building to 4 flats and erection of 3 storey building containing 6 flats	12/12/2001	27/06/2003	Α	14.73
28/351/03/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	24/12/2003	14/03/2008	W	35.48
28/143/03/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	21/05/2003	28/07/2003	W	35.58
28/179/95/FU	Museum shop and amusement arcade and new car park layout to restaurant	04/09/1995	16/01/1996	Α	89.49
H28/137/91/	Alterations to form entrance I obby and two storey exten sion to form offices, to rear of existing offices.	10/07/1991	13/09/1991	Α	69.96
28/23/00/FU	Alterations to front new entrance lobby and canopy and new pitched roof to restaurant	21/02/2000	26/04/2000	Α	89.58
28/54/93/FU	Part two storey and part single storey extension and single storey extension to offices	04/03/1993	30/04/1993	Α	85.21
12/01183/ADV	Three internally illuminated letter signs, one internally illuminated fascia sign and two non illuminated entrance signs	14/03/2012	25/04/2012	А	30.98
H28/55/90/	Alterations and extension to f orm tea room shop, offic e, store and toilet, with land scaped area to restaurant	07/03/1990	02/07/1990	А	69.48
H28/208/85/	Change of use of dwelling to a ncillary offices.	28/10/1985	09/12/1985	А	69.15
28/65/00/FU	Laying out of access and erection of two storey 40 bedroom travel lodge	29/03/2000	06/02/2001	А	97.93

H28/195/74/	Addition of hard surfaced play area, with retaining wall, to childrens fun and adventur e park.	20/08/1974	18/11/1974	А	11.96
H28/165/91/	2 shop units with 2 bedroom ma nagers/caretakers flat over and covered way, to side of am usement arcade.	13/08/1991	21/10/1991	А	13.14
06/02484/FU	Amendment to condition No. 7 (Extractor system to adjacent resturants) of application No. 28/264/01/FU, Change of Use of building to 4 flats and erection of 3 storey building containing 6 flats	19/04/2006	28/09/2007	А	14.73
28/272/05/OT	Outline application to layout access road erect 18 flats and 5 houses and layout car park to adjacent restaurant	07/11/2005	06/02/2006	R	59.09
H28/235/88/	1 static internally illuminate d individual letter sign, size 7.5m x 2.5m, height above grou nd 5.5m (underside) and 1 inte	01/09/1988	27/10/1988	А	70.20
28/262/01/FU	Detached 5 bedroom house with detached block of 2 garages and workshop	10/12/2001	30/10/2002	А	14.60
11/04269/FU	6 houses with garages and new access, parking and landscaping	10/10/2011	02/12/2011	W	27.17
12/00771/FU	Single storey front extension and alterations to create new entrance lobby and take away area to front	17/02/2012	10/04/2012	Α	24.82
H28/274/90/	Alterations including new shop front, to form toile ts, and souvenir shop to part of restaurant.	31/12/1990	25/02/1991	Α	87.13
H28/179/90/	Laying out of car parks with 4 2 car parking spaces, picni c area, and play area, to vaca nt site.	26/07/1990	12/11/1990	Α	11.44
H28/276/88/	Alterations to shop and stone frontage to form two shops .	20/10/1988	28/02/1989	Α	11.41
13/00553/FU	Variation of condition 18 of planning approval 11/02169/FU (extend Monday to Saturday openings from 20:00 hours to 21:00 hours)	01/02/2013	18/03/2013	W	66.86

## 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 C	Conclusions					
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	Yes Physical	Achieva	bility: Short	term (0-5yrs)
ummary	y of Infrastructu	re provide	er commer	nts and other pl	anning re	quirements
l eeds City	y Council Highway	s inc Metro				
-	ty comment	S IIIC MICLIO				Rank (1-5
The site me	ets all accessibility sta	ndards				4
Access Co	mments					Rank (1-5
Access wou footway pro	uld be through the appovision.	roved housing	layout - some a	amendments may be re	equired to	4
Local netw	ork comment					Rank (1-5)
The small s	scale of development w	ould not impac	et on the local n	etwork.		5
Mitigation	measure					Total scor
						13
Support?		Need to comb	ine with other	sites: Suit	ability for pa	rtial development:
Yes						
<u>Highways</u>	Agency					
n/a <b>Network R</b>	<u> </u>					
D:!::	····					
Biodiversi West Yorks	t <u>y</u> hire Ecology and LC	C Ecology Offi	icer:	Boundary Amend	ment	
	but White-clawed Cray					
Notural Eng	vland.					
Natural Eng	jianu.					
Education	1					
Drainage/\	Water/Flooding					
Environmer	nt Agency Comments	:	En	vironment Agency Co	onstraints:	
Yorkshire V	Vater Comments:			rkshire Water Waste	Water Treatm	nent Works Comme
			Est	holt		
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: 1103	Site Name:	Harry Ramsdens off	Bradford Road, Guiseley
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gyncy Traveller Site	Accoccmon	4	
Gypsy _Traveller Site	ASSESSITIETT		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	110	Wayso
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	110	CHRIOWI
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Planning permission implemente			retail element from site. Site
considered suitable for residentia	ll development, and h	nas extant permission.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 4	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Green	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 440229 Area sq m: 22218.51 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 420272 Area Ha: 2.221851 HMCA: Aireborough

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

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

Existing Use 2: Agriculture

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Wholesale distribution

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Mixed

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2435.70Distance to bus stop (metres)218.36Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID5982

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:

Site north of Green Lane, just west of junction with Apperley Lane. Eastern side of the site is dominated by existing employment use and bounded by mixture of employment uses and residential development. Warm Lane frontage and west/northern area of the site is part of the city farm, opening onto further fields to the west.

#### **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)

**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?:	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?	$\checkmark$
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?	$\checkmark$
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:	
Green Belt site. Development of site 1104 in isolation would constitute urban sprawl, bu with sites 2162 and 3033 would be contained by development on 3 sides.	t development along

#### 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			

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF	to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider co	mments and	other planni	ng requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
Good access to Public Transport, Education and Local F	lealth facilities.		4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Site has an existing acceptable access point onto Warm Lane is substandard.	Lane but footwa	y provision along W	Varm 3
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Local congestion issues. Warm Lane is already traffic ca	almed (speed cus	hions).	2
Mitigation measure			Total score
Widen footway along site frontage			9
Support? Need to combine wit	h other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
Yes - with mitigation			<u> </u>
Highways Agency  n/a  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Bound	dary Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Duning and Alleston / Elegation			
Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:	Environmen	t Agency Constrai	ints:
		<u> </u>	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire W	ater Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
Combined and surface water sewers along southern boundary	Esholt		
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: 1104	Site Name:	Greenside Farm, Yea	adon, LS19
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)	110	
•••			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment		
Contraction of Acces	Omone		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. Existing city farm			constitute urban sprawl, but 3 sides. Highways consider that the
site can be suitably accessed.	z ana 3033 would be	5 contained by development on	o sides. Flighways consider that the
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 58	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Potai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber		ssessed	Not assessed
7.1112.01	ivot a	550030u	1101 03303350

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 441426 Area sq m: 19805.64 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 419046 Area Ha: 1.980564 HMCA: Aireborough

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

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

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

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):808.91Distance to bus stop (metres)284.08Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID8389

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 No

Public Rights of Way:

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Existing allotment site within residential area. Site is flat with limited tree cover. Road frontage along eastern side. Number of temporary structures associated with allotments across the site.

#### **UDP Designation**

Croopholt N22 (0)	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Orban Green Comdor - No (%).	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:	97.66	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 History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
28/99/04/FU	Siting of caravan to existing allotments	25/03/2004	20/05/2004	R	17.02
H28/55/76/	Use of allotment gardens, for temporary period of 3 years, as scrap metal storage area. (site area 0.38ha (0.	30/01/1976	01/03/1976	R	97.38
H28/342/89/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to va cant site. (site area 0.77ha)	14/12/1989	02/07/1992	W	38.21
H28/23/85/	Use of smallholding for storag e of scrap metal.	07/02/1985	01/04/1985	R	99.29

#### 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

HLAA C	Conclusions						
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determine	ne Ac	hievability:	Long term	(11+ years)
ummary	of Infrastruct	ure provide	er comments	s and other	er planni	na reau	rements
		•				<b>J</b> - 1	
	y Council Highway ty comment	<u>/s inc Metro</u>					Rank (1-5)
	o of railway station. 5	50% of site acce	ssible to buses. 5	50% of site with	thin accepta	ble	
	employment and town						3
Access Co	mments						Rank (1-5)
	ssible from Silverdale estrian access possib			•	ditional estat	е	5
Local netw	ork comment						Rank (1-5)
shortest rou	Ave, existing on street ute out, Coach Rd is no liverdale Mount and Pary.	arrow poorly su	rfaced road with r	o footways fo	r a distance		3
Mitigation	measure						Total scor
Traffic calm	ning may help but won	't provide the fu	ll solution.				11
							• •
Support?		Need to comb	ine with other si	tes:	Suitability	for partial	development:
yes - with m	nitigation						
Highwaya	Amanau						
<b>Highways</b> n/a	Agency						
Network R	Rail :						
<u>Biodiversi</u>	<u>ty</u>						
West Yorks	hire Ecology and LC	C Ecology Offi	cer:	Boundary A	mendment		
Supported							
Natural Eng	ıland:						
<u>Education</u>	<u>.</u>						
Drainage/\	Water/Flooding						
Environmer	nt Agency Comment	s:	Envir	onment Agen	cy Constra	ints:	
Yorkshira V	Vater Comments:		Vorks	hire Water W	laste Water	Treatment	Works Comme
TOTROTTIC	vater comments.		Eshol		rasic Water	Treatment	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:

Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessr	ment		
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)			
		1.1		1,,,
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No		Unknown
encampments	(10/11)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Loss of allotments would need to	ho considered	through the groonspace	roviow (Soo Groon	enace section page 22
question G8).	be considered	i tillough the greenspace	Teview. (See Green	space section page 25
Site Capacity (dwellings units):		71 Floorspac	e sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion:		<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red		Not assessed		Not assessed

Site Name: Land at Silverdale Avenue, Guiseley

Site Ref: 1113

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 442413 Area sq m: 205392.75 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 417776 Area Ha: 20.539275 HMCA: Aireborough

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

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):1101.42Distance to bus stop (metres)358.93Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID1771

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 Yes Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 23.91 Listed Buildings:

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large area of Green Belt land north west of Guiseley used for agriculture. Site is bounded to the east by Bradford Road, and to the southeast by Thorpe Lane. Site is bounded on all other sides by further agricultural land. Site slopes down from Thorpe Lane and has limited tree cover, which predominantly runs along field boundaries. Thorpe Lane has a significant tree 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:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	4.70		

#### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

## **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H28/225/81/	Alterations, to form lounge an d foyer, and extension, to fo rm toilets, games room, spirit s store and kitchen, to social	01/07/1981	03/08/1981	А	23.89
H28/277/80/	Alterations and extension to f orm 2 pump rooms and lift shafts, to hospital. (this ite m appears for informatio	26/06/1980	04/08/1980	Α	23.85
H28/434/80/	Alterations, to form wheelchai r toilets, and extension, to fo rm wheelchair toilets, to hosp ital. (this item	12/11/1980	15/12/1980	Α	23.56
H28/211/90/	Listed building application to carry out alterations tohospi tal.	18/09/1990	03/12/1990	Α	23.95
11/03516/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 11, 28 and 29 of Planning Application 28/198/03/FU	15/08/2011	08/02/2013	A	23.74
28/150/98/FU	Use of agricultural land as golf course and change of use & extensions of farm buildings to clubhouse & estate offices	20/08/1998	04/05/2000	А	75.27
28/79/93/FU	Use of agricultural land as golf course	22/04/1993	13/07/1993	Α	73.17
11/9/00039/MOD	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitches, NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Minor modifications to scheme for building 13. Some consequential amendments to external openings and site planning	02/03/2011	04/05/2011	M01	23.74
11/9/00192/MOD	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitches NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 28/198/03/FU: Modifications to internal layout of building XVII, and amendments to external openings and site plan	31/08/2011	10/10/2011	M05	23.74
H28/330/88/	2 electricity sub-distribution boxes to hospital. (this item appears for information only being notificati	20/12/1988	23/01/1989	А	23.89
28/7/95/FU	Erection of football stadium and laying out of car parking and access road	23/01/1995	16/01/1996	R	71.90
H28/253/80/	Alterations and extension, to form mess room, staff room, rest room, showers, toilets a nd locker room. (this item	10/06/1980	14/07/1980	Α	23.85
28/84/05/RE	Renewal of permission 28/150/98/FU for golf course clubhouse and offices	30/03/2005	29/06/2005	A	76.74
H28/144/89/	Outline application to erect 2 dwelling houses to exist ing agricultural site.	18/05/1989	23/10/1989	R	76.33

	Guisei	ey			
H28/199/82/	Alterations and extensions, to form kitchen and bathr oom, to hospital. (this item a ppears for informatio	18/08/1982	20/09/1982	А	23.85
H28/123/82/	Erection of replacement single storey chapel, with meeti ng room, office, oratory, vest ries, store, toilets, a	18/05/1982	21/06/1982	A	23.63
10/9/00085/MOD	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitches, NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Minor modifications to internal layout of the planning approved conversion scheme to building 12. Some consequential amendments to external openings and site plan	12/04/2010	22/06/2010	M01	23.74
28/199/03/LI	Listed building application to alter and demolish part of hospital to form dwellings creche medical & offices	30/06/2003	27/05/2005	А	23.74
28/198/03/FU	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitches,	30/06/2003	26/01/2005	A	23.74
H28/552/79/	Alterations, to form lift, and extensions, to form pumproom and lift and pump room, to hos pital. (this item appears fo	21/08/1979	24/09/1979	Α	23.99
H28/227/85/	Alterations and first floor ex tension, to form 4 offic es and corridor link to hospit al. (this item	14/11/1985	09/12/1985	Α	23.74
H28/30/80/	Alterations, to form stores, s hower rooms and enlarged bathr ooms, and addition of 2 extern al staircases, to hospital.	22/01/1980	25/02/1980	A	23.88
28/123/98/RE	Extension of permission for use of agricultural land as golf course	13/07/1998	05/03/2002	Α	72.26
10/01445/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 26, 28 and 29 of Planning Application 28/84/05/RE	29/03/2010	28/05/2010	Α	76.74
28/71/96/OT	Laying out of enlarged proposed golf course	19/04/1996	23/09/1996	W	23.09
H28/98/81/	Alterations, to form toilets, cleaners rooms, bathr ooms, and shower rooms, to hos pital. (this item appears fo	16/03/1981	01/06/1981	Α	23.79
H28/159/90/	Listed building application to carry out alterations, to fo rm dust extraction plant room and addition of loading ba	04/07/1990	04/09/1990	А	23.90
10/04543/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 of Planning Application 28/199/03/LI	04/10/2010	04/02/2013	SPL	23.74
H28/259/81/	Alterations, to form lift shaft, and extension, to formlift shaft, to hospital. (this item	25/08/1981	21/09/1981	Α	23.80

H28/20/92/	Use of agricultural site to go If course and driving range with access and car parking.	30/01/1992	22/09/1992	R	73.13
12/02344/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 11 of Planning Application 28/198/03/FU	23/05/2012	12/07/2012	INT	23.74
12/9/00105/MOD	Change of use of hospital and new build to form 541 dwellings, offices, creche, assisted living facility of 84 self contained units, retail units and sports pitches NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT to 28/198/03/FU: Amendment to internal layout of building 1 which has led to consequential amendments to external openings and site plan	23/05/2012	27/07/2012	M01	23.74

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of	large built up area	as	
Would development lead to/constitu	te ribbon developm	nent?	
Would development result in isolate	d development?		
Is the site well connected to built up	area (2+ boundarie	es with existing built up area)?	
Would development of the site effec	tively "round off" th	e settlement pattern?:	
Do natural/physical features provide area and undeveloped land?	a good existing ba	arrier between existing urban	✓
Overall sprawl conclusion:			
High potential to lead to unrestricted	d sprawl		
Prevent neighbouring towns from	n merging		
Would development of the site lead	to physical connec	ction of settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide development?	a good existing ba	arrier/boundary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
No merging but would significantly re	educe the green be	elt gap	
Assist in safeguarding countrysic	de from encroachr	ment	
Is there a strong defensible boundar	ry between the site	and the existing urban area?	✓
Does the site provide access to the	countryside?		✓
Does the site include local or nation	al conservation des	signated areas?	
Does the site include areas of wood significant unprotected tree/hedge c		erows that are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or	3a agricultural land	<b>i</b> ?	
Does the site contain buildings?	$\checkmark$	Are these in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment (	Conclusion .		
The site performs an important role	safeguarding coun	tryside from encroachment	
Preserve the setting and special of	character of histor	ric towns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conhistorical feature?	nservation area, lis	ted building or other	✓
If yes, could development preserve	this character?:		
Overall Character Preservation Con	clusion:		
Development of the site would have	marginal effect on	the setting & special character of	historic features, which
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusio	n:		
Development of the site would resul towards Bradford. The Green Belt is Menston.			
Conformity with Core	Strategy		
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ment

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			

SHLAA Conclusions

LCC Flood Risk Management:

#### 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) Only approximately 50% of the site is within Public Transport accessibility standards, only approximately 30% of the site is within accessibility to other services, no footways on Thorpe Lane. **Access Comments** Rank (1-5) Access could be created on Thorpe Lane but no footways on Thorpe Lane at moment and trees will 4 need to be removed. Preferred access off Guiseley Drive with signals on Bradford Road but Guiseley Drive appears to be private for High Royds development, access onto Bradford Road not suitable. Local network comment Rank (1-5) Local congestion issues on A65. 3 Mitigation measure Total score Possible signals on Bradford Road from private Guiseley Drive, extend adopted highway on 9 Guiseley Drive, access improvements onto Thope Lane, footway required on Thorpe Lane, footway needs to be wider on Bradford Road, pedestrian/cycle access onto Bradford Road directly, bus service to divert into site if possible, junction capacity improvements along A65 likely Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: yes - with mitigation **Highways Agency** n/a **Network Rail: Biodiversity** West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: **Boundary Amendment** Not supported (RED). No designated sites but Mire Beck flows Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are through the site which is an important willdife corridor together excluded and boundary amended as per drawing with the adjacent grassland for breeding Curlew. White-clawed RM/1148. Mitigation will still be required to ensure Crayfish, Bullhead, Brown Trout to consider. impacts on adjacent habitat are addressed i.e. protecting and enhancing the wildlife corridor function of the Mire Beck, and pond towards southern boundary. **Natural England:** Education **Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:** Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme Yorkshire Water Comments: Large surface water sewer in north eastern corner of Esholt site

Site Ref: 1148	Site Name:	Land off Thorpe Lane / E Guiseley	Bradford Road
<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 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 (Text)	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
sprawl towards Bradford. The Grandenston. The site is attractive at	een Belt is necessar nd a designated Spe	in a breach of Thorpe Lane, an imports y to prevent coalescence between settl cial Landscape Area. Part of the site is ent would require footway improvement	ements of Guiseley and salso N6 greenspace in the
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	539	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 1180A Site Name: Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 441233 Area sq m: 11639.94 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 419075 Area Ha: 1.163994 HMCA: Aireborough

#### 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: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1003.72 Distance to bus stop (metres) 471.04

Nearest Railway Station Guiseley Bus Stop ID 8389

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** Yes No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Agricultural site south of junction with Coach Road and Spring Road (track). Site slopes towards Spring Road.

#### **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:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Site Ref: 1180A Site Name: Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20

**Planning History** 

Site Ref: 1180A Site Name: Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	ge built up areas	3		
Would development lead to/constitute r	ribbon developme	ent?		
Would development result in isolated d	evelopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up are	ea (2+ boundarie:	s with existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effective	•	•	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a garea and undeveloped land?	good existing bar	rier between 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 connecti	on of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?				
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible by	ooundary			
Assist in safeguarding countryside f	rom encroachm	ent		
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	petween the site a	and the existing urban area?	$\checkmark$	
Does the site provide access to the co	untryside?		$\checkmark$	
Does the site include local or national of	conservation desi	gnated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlan significant unprotected tree/hedge covers		ows 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 Cor	nclusion_			
The site does not perform an important	role in safeguard	ding the countryside from encro	achment	
Preserve the setting and special cha	racter of histori	c towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a consensatorical feature?	ervation area, liste	ed building 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 set	ting and special character of his	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Green Belt site. Site A (the northern so 2163A.	ection) relates we	ell to the urban area when consi	dered with 1311A and	
Conformity with Core St	rategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settl	ement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller se		0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:				

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

SHLAA Conclusions	S			
Availability:	Suitability:	,	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	ıcture provider co	omments and ot	her planning requir	ements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
The site is outside bus and ra	il accessibility standards	but accessible for health	n and education.	2
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Access could be created onto	o Coach Road with provis	sion of footway on fronta	ge.	5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Route through Silverdale esta street parking to houses on Straffic. As an alternative route footways for a distance betwee this site. Capacity issues at F	Silverdale Ave towards Pa e out, Coach Rd is unado een Silverdale Mount and	ark Road which prevents opted, narrow poorly surf d Park Road which can't	s two way free flow of aced road with no	3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Traffic calming throughout th requirements for a 25mph de near Park Road will remain.				8
Support?	Need to combine v	with other sites:	Suitability for partial de	evelopment:
Yes - with mitigation  Highways Agency  No objection  Network Rail :	Yes		Would prefer further redu	
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	d LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported - no objections				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding	=	Emidnem	anay Canatasints	
Environment Agency Comm	ents:	Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments	:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment W	/orks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	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.

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 site?	(Text)		
Siter			
Durantonito ta bassa d	V	- I NI-	
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
gypsies and travellers	(10/11)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	110	Cinalewii
•			
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. The site has been Highways concerns and the fact to			d unsuitable for development due to
comprehensive development alor	ng with sites 1311A & 216	3A would be appropriate	. Site A (the northern section) has a
road frontage and relates well to will put less pressure on the road			2163A. This smaller site (ie site A)
			·
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	37	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Con	nclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Amber	Not assess	sed	Not assessed

Site Name: Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20

Site Ref: 1180A

Electric:

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 441156 Area sq m: 27264.81 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 418970 Area Ha: 2.726481 HMCA: Aireborough

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage□Distance to Rail Station (metres):1062.80Distance to bus stop (metres)519.61Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID8389

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** Yes No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Agricultural site south of junction with Coach Road and Spring Road (track). Site slopes towards Spring Road. Tree coverage along field boundary lines.

#### **UDP** Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.87	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:	1.00		
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 b	uilt up areas				
Would development lead to/constitute ribbo	on development?				
Would development result in isolated deve	lopment?		✓		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2	2+ boundaries with ex	risting built up area)?			
Would development of the site effectively "	round off" the settlem	ent pattern?:	No		
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	d existing barrier betw	veen existing urban			
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
High potential to lead to unrestricted spraw	1				
Prevent neighbouring towns from merg	ing				
Would development of the site lead to physical	sical connection of se	ttlements?			
Do natural/physical features provide a goo development?	d existing barrier/bou	ndary to contain			
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but there is no defensible bour	ndary				
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	n encroachment				
Is there a strong defensible boundary betw	een the site and the	existing urban area?			
Does the site provide access to the country	yside?		✓		
Does the site include local or national conservation 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 agri	cultural land?		<b>✓</b>		
Does the site contain buildings?	Are th	ese in agricultural use?			
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclu	sion_				
The site performs an important role safegu	arding countryside fro	om encroachment			
Preserve the setting and special charac	ter of historic towns	<b>:</b>			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservary historical feature?	tion area, listed buildi	ng or other			
If yes, could development preserve this cha	aracter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	<u>ı:</u>				
Development of the site would have no effe	ect on the setting and	special character of hist	oric features		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Green Belt site. The site has been split in development due to the fact that developr					
Conformity with Core Stra	tegy				
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	

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	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
ummary of Infras	tructure provider co	omments and ot	her planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
This part of the site (Site	B) does not meet any of the a	ccessibility standards.		2
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Adequate access can be	provided through site A.			3
Local network commen	ıt			Rank (1-5)
The route through the Siv	verdale estate is not appropria	ate for this level of deve	elopment.	2
Mitigation measure				Total score
				7
Support?	Need to combine w	rith other sites:	Suitability for par	tial development:
No				
Highways Agency No objection Network Rail: Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Support - no objections				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flood	ling			
Environment Agency Co	emments:	Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Water	· Waste Water Treatm	ent Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ment:			
<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	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	Yes	No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown	
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
	hat development wou	ald not be well related to the ex	unsuitable for development due to kisting settlement pattern. The qua	
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	72	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion</b>	on:
Red	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed	

Site Name: Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20

Site Ref: 1180B

Telecom:

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 441646 Area sq m: 22238.41 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 417242 Area Ha: 2.223841 HMCA: Aireborough

#### 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: Woodland Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

✓

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1713.63 Distance to bus stop (metres) 1068.30

Nearest Railway Station Guiseley Bus Stop ID 3062

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:

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site located at junction of Thorpe Lane and Hawksworth Lane. Site is surrounded on 3 sides by green fields, residential use is established to the east, but Thorpe Lane provides a well defined boundary. Western border is heavily covered by trees, and there is no substantial boundary to the open green fields to the north. Site slopes towards Hawksworth Lane.

### **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:	1.00
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 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	(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 granea 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	rging			
Would development of the site lead to pl	nysical connection of s	settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a g development?	ood existing barrier/bo	oundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible bo	oundary			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	om encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary be	tween the site and the	e existing urban area?	V	
Does the site provide access to the cour	ntryside?			
Does the site include local or national co	nservation designated	d areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		nat 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	lusion_			
The site does not perform an important r	ole in safeguarding th	e countryside from encroa	chment	
Preserve the setting and special char	acter of historic tow	ns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservistorical feature?	vation area, listed buil	ding 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 ar	nd special character of hist	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Green Belt site. The site is not consider and acts a strong defensible boundary the precedent for urban sprawl.				
Conformity with Core Str	ategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ement	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

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

HLAA Conclusions	<u> </u>			
Availability: Short term (0-5yr	rs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider	comments and	other plannii	ng requirements
Leeds City Council Highy	ways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
No access to Public Transport	i.			1
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Access possible onto Thorpe	Lane and Hawkswort	h Lane.		4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Local congestion issues.				3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Unknown at this stage?				8
Support?	Need to combin	e with other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
No				
<u>Highways Agency</u> n/a <mark>Network Rail :</mark> <u>Biodiversity</u> West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Office	er: Bound	lary Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comm		Environment	t Agency Constrai	nte:
Environment Agency Commi			r rigorio, conocian	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire W	ater Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
		Esholt		
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:			
<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	ane,	lawksworth Lane	Land at Thorpe Lane - Guiseley LS20	Site Name:	1194	Site Ref:
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage:  Could site be effectively managed  (Text)  Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  (Text)  Experience of previous encampments  Yes No Unknown  (Text)  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Forein Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  Fite Capacity (dwellings units):  Set Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Exterience Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:						Telecom:
Leeds City Council:  West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage:  Gypsy _Traveller Site Assessment  Could site be effectively managed    Yes					escue Services:	Fire and Re
West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage:    Could site be effectively   Yes					<u>tage</u>	Built Herit
English Heritage:  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:  From Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  Sesidential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:					Council:	Leeds City
Could site be effectively managed  Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  Item (Text)  Would gypsies and travellers    Ves				Service:	shire Archaeology	West Yorks
Could site be effectively Maybe (Text)  Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  (Text)  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  (Text)  Experience of previous (Text)  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  See Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion: Employment Conclusions					eritage:	English Her
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  Text  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  Text  Text  Would gypsies and travellers  Yes No  Text  Unknown  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  Sesidential Conclusion:  Employment Conclusion:				e Assessment	Fraveller Site	Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  Text  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  Text  Text  Would gypsies and travellers  Yes No  Text  Unknown  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  Sesidential Conclusion:  Employment Conclusion:		Maybe	No	Yes	be effectively	Could site
Text)    Text   Text			'	(Text)	•	
Text)    Text   Text						
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  Yes (Text)  Experience of previous encampments  (Text)  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Fireen Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  File Capacity (dwellings units):  Sesidential Conclusion:  Retail Conclusion:  Employment Conclusions		Maybe	No	Yes		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers    Text   Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers   Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers   Proximity				(Text)	live on the	
Experience of previous encampments  Yes No Unknown  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urbar prawl.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  Sesidential Conclusion:  Retail Conclusion:  Employment Conclusion:						site?
Experience of previous encampments  Yes No Unknown  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  Seesidential Conclusion:  Retail Conclusion:  Employment Conclusion			No	Yes	to housed	Proximity t
Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  Sesidential Conclusion:  Retail Conclusion:  Employment Conclusion:				(Text)	nd travellers	gypsies an
Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  Sesidential Conclusion:  Retail Conclusion:  Employment Conclusion:						
Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  Sesidential Conclusion:  Retail Conclusion:  Employment Conclusion:		Unknown	No	Yes	e of previous	Experience
Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  Gite Capacity (dwellings units):  Sesidential Conclusion:  Retail Conclusion:  Employment Conclusion				(Text)		
Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and a strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  Gite Capacity (dwellings units):  Sesidential Conclusion:  Retail Conclusion:  Employment Conclusion						
Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  Gite Capacity (dwellings units):  Sesidential Conclusion:  Retail Conclusion:  Employment Conclusion				I		
streen Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban prawl.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  Sesidential Conclusion:  Retail Conclusion:  Employment Conclusion:				sment	on of Asses	onclusion
strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urbar prawl.  ite Capacity (dwellings units):  Sesidential Conclusion:  Retail Conclusion:  Employment Conclusion					summary:	onclusion s
Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion						strong defens
• •		dential):	Floorspace sq m (Non res	: 58	/ (dwellings units)	ite Capacity
	onclusion:	<b>Employment Concl</b>	onclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	esidential C
Not assessed Not assessed		Not assessed	essed	Not as		led

Site Ref: 1199 Site Name: Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge.

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 440361 Area sq m: 113633.55 Ward Adel and Wharfedale Easting: 424481 Area Ha: 11.363355 HMCA: Aireborough

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Forestry - Unmanaged Forest
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):1222.96Distance to bus stop (metres)438.07Nearest Railway StationHorsforthBus Stop ID5639SFRA Flood Zone:1.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 1.00 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 Listed Buildings: Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site bordering existing residential area to the south east. Bounded to the west by railway line and to the north by field boundary and dense tree coverage. Site is flat.

#### **UDP** Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	12.97	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	87.03	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:	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: 1199 Site Name: Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge.

LS16

Site Ref: 1199 Site Name: Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge.

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of lar	ge built up area					
Would development lead to/constitute	ribbon development?					
Would development result in isolated of	levelopment?					
Is the site well connected to built up ar	ea (2+ boundaries with e	xisting built up area)?				
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the settlen	nent pattern?:				
Do natural/physical features provide a area and undeveloped land?	good existing barrier bet	ween existing urban				
Overall sprawl conclusion:						
Prevent neighbouring towns from m	nerging					
Would development of the site lead to	physical connection of se	ettlements?				
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing barrier/box	undary to contain				
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 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	nese in agricultural use?				
Overall countryside Encroachment Co	nclusion_					
Preserve the setting and special cha	aracter of historic town	s				
Is the site within or adjacent to a consolistorical feature?	ervation area, listed build	ing or other				
If yes, could development preserve thi	s character?:					
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	ısion:					
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Majority of site PAS. Only 12% in gree	n helt (western section)					
Wagonty of site 1 Ao. Only 1270 in gree	ii belt (western section).					
Conformity with Core S	trategy					
Major Urban Area:	0.04	Major Settlement	0.00			
Urban Extenstion Area:	1.00	Smaller settlemen	nt 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: 1199** Site Name: Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge.

			L516				
HLAA Conclusi	ons						
Availability: Short term	(0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determ	nine A	chievability:	Medium term	n (6-10 years)
Summary of Infra	structu	re provide	er commen	ts and oth	ner plann	ing requir	ements
Leeds City Council I Accessibility comment		<u>s inc Metro</u>					Rank (1-5)
Portion of site accessible		ation and public	c transport but c	listant from loc	al services.		
							2
Access Comments							Rank (1-5)
Access via Moseley Wo	od Rise, li	mit capacity to	200. Requires	secondary link	ζ.		3
							3
Local network comme	nt						Rank (1-5)
Local congestion issues	i						3
							3
Mitigation measure							Total score
Unknown at this stage							8
Support?		Need to comb	oine with other	sites:	Suitabilit	y for partial de	evelopment:
yes		no					
<u> Highways Agency</u>							
n/a							
Network Rail: F/B at LEH1 5 miles 396 protection issues	yds to be	made equality	compliant (ram	ps)? Horsforth	station impro	ovements gene	eral asset
Biodiversity							
West Yorkshire Ecolog	y and LC	C Ecology Offi	icer:	Boundary A	Amendment		
Not supported (RED). No the Moseley Beck, semi- adjacent rank and wet gr function. Great Crested N	improved assland th	grassland area	as and	excluded ar RM/1199. N impacts on Newts are a	nd boundary a ditigation will adjacent hab addressed i.e	n if Red hatche amended as pe still be required itats and Great . minimum 20 r	er drawing d to ensure t Crested metres buffer
				habitat enha	ancement to last, pond crea	k protected an link beck to the ation near beck	woodland to
Natural England:							
Education_							
<u>—</u>							
Drainage/Water/Floo	ding						
Environment Agency C		:		ironment Age		aints:	
The vast majority of this:	site is in fl	ood zone 1 (lo	w FZ3	beck running	through site	-	

risk). A consultant (URS) has recently modelled this section of Moseley Beck to confirm the extent of flood zone 3 (non-development area).

#### **Yorkshire Water Comments:**

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Site Ref: 1199 Site Name: Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge. Various large sewers cross the whole site north/south Knostrop High Level east/west LCC Flood Risk Management: 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) site? Proximity to housed Yes No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** No Unknown Yes encampments (Text) **Conclusion of Assessment** 

#### Conclusion summary:

Protected Area of Search (PAS) site on existing UDP. Most of the site falls within North Leeds area, but capacity and area have been split between Aireborough and North Leeds on a pro-rata basis. However, the part of the site within Aireborough is Green Belt. The railway is considered to form a strong defensible boundary which would prevent further sprawl. Capacity limited to 200 due to access constraints (split over two areas).

Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Site Capacity (dwellings units): 200

**Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:** 

Green Red Red Site Ref: 1221 Site Name: Gill Lane, Yeadon LS19

#### **Site Details**

440562 59078.98 Northing: Area sq m: Guiseley and Rawdon Ward 420097 Easting: Area Ha: 5.907898 HMCA: Aireborough

#### 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 amenity & open space

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage **~** Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2063.68 Distance to bus stop (metres) 150.57 Nearest Railway Station Guiseley Bus Stop ID 1686 SFRA Flood Zone: 1.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Urban Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No

0.00

No

No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Green open space located between Greenlea Ave/Road, New Road and Gill Lane. Neighbouring land is in established residential use. Site is generally flat, with tree coverage concentrated towards the centre of the site. Site has an extended road frontage along New Road.

0.00

Listed Buildings:

### **UDP Designation**

Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):

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: 1221 Site Name: Gill Lane, Yeadon LS19

Site Ref: 1221 Site Name: Gill Lane, Yeadon LS19

# 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 devel	opment?				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2	2+ boundaries w	vith existing bui	It up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effectively "r	ound off" the se	ettlement patter	n?:	Yes	
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	d existing barrie	r between exist	ting 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	of settlements	?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?	d existing barrie	r/boundary to o	contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging of settlements					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	encroachmen	ıt			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	een the site and	d the existing u	rban area?		
Does the site provide access to the country	vside?				
Does the site include local or national cons	ervation design	ated areas?			
Does the site include areas of woodlands, t significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	rees, hedgerow	vs that are prote	ected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agric	cultural land?				
Does the site contain buildings?	] ,	Are these in ag	ricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclus	sion_				
The site does not perform an important role	in safeguardin	g the countrysic	de from encroa	achment	
Preserve the setting and special charact	er of historic t	owns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservat historical feature?	ion area, listed	building or othe	er		
If yes, could development preserve this cha	aracter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	<u>-</u>				
Development of the site would have no effective	ct on the setting	g and special c	haracter of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Green Belt site. Well contained site with st purposes of Green Belt.	rong connection	ns to the urban	area. Site per	forms well against the	
Conformity with Core Strat	egy				
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:	0.0	00 Aire	Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.0	00 Wes	t 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: 1221 Site Name: Gill Lane, Yeadon LS19

HLAA Conclusions	- defense."		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to	o determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider con	nments and o	other planni	ing requirements
eeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment Good access to Public Transport, Education and Local He	aalth facilities		Rank (1-
sood doods to Fusio Transport, Education and Education	saiti iaoiitios.		4
Access Comments			Rank (1-
/ehicle access onto Gill Lane not possible due to limited nave to be via A65 only and dependant upon level of dev			
Local network comment			Rank (1-
Local congestion issues on A65.			3
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Unknown at this stage?			11
Support? Need to combine with	other sites:	Suitability	/ for partial development:
res- with mitigation			·
/a letwork Rail : Biodiversity Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: supported	Bounda	ry Amendment	
latural England:			
Education			
Orainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:		Agency Constra	
his site lies in flood zone 1 on the EA Flood Map (low sk). However, any site specific Flood Risk assessment (FRA) must investigate the small nnamed watercourse as a source of flood risk. The evelopment layout plan must be amended ccordingly.	no constraints i	out drain running	, unough
orkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wat	er Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
fains and surface water sewer within north and astern boundaries	Esholt		

#### LCC Flood Risk Management:

# **Utilities**

Site Ref: 1221	Site Name:	Gill Lane, Yea	idon LS19	
_				
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
o T !! 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)			
Site?				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)	INO		Olikilowii
Conclusion of Asses	ement			
Conclusion of Asses	Silletti			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. Well contained spurposes of Green Belt. Access			rea. Site does perfo	rm well against the
		ŭ		
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	155	Floorspace s	sq m (Non residenti	al):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	E	imployment Conclusion:
Green	Not a	ssessed	N	lot assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 442306 Area sq m: 68380.06 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 420328 Area Ha: 6.838006 HMCA: Aireborough

#### 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: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1472.01 Distance to bus stop (metres) 304.07

Nearest Railway Station Guiseley Bus Stop ID 173

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:

Site A is to the north of site B which is to the rear of properties on northern side Coppice Wood Avenue/Crescent and Banksfield Crescent. Site slopes from east to west.

#### **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 %
28/11/93/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	28/01/1993	20/04/1993	R	99.53

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of lar	ge built up area	as			
Would development lead to/constitute	ribbon developn	nent?			
Would development result in isolated of	development?			✓	
Is the site well connected to built up ar	ea (2+ boundari	es with ex	sting built up area)?		
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" th	e settleme	ent pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a area and undeveloped land?	good existing ba	arrier betw	een existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
High potential to lead to unrestricted sp	prawl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from m	nerging				
Would development of the site lead to	physical connec	tion of set	tlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing ba	arrier/bour	dary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but there is no defensible	boundary				
Assist in safeguarding countryside	from encroach	ment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary	between the site	and the e	xisting urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the co	untryside?				
Does the site include local or national	conservation de	signated a	reas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlar significant unprotected tree/hedge cov		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 Co	nclusion				
The site does not perform an importan	t role in safegua	rding the	countryside from encro	achment	
Preserve the setting and special cha	aracter of histo	ric towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a consensatorical feature?	ervation area, lis	ted buildir	ng or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	s character?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	usion:				
Development of the site would have no	effect on the se	etting and	special character of his	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Development of site A would constitute	e urban sprawl.				
Conformity with Coro S	trotogy				
Conformity with Core S	trategy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settl	ement	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller se	ttlement	0.00
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

HLAA Conclusion	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
ummary of Infras	structure provider o	comments and ot	her planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
This part of the site is poo	orly served by Public Transp	oort and other services.		2
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
suitable as a single point	oor junction alignment with t of access to serve in exces isting on-street parking arou	ss of 400 dwellings (for si	te as whole).	2
Local network commen	nt			Rank (1-5)
Traffic management issu approach to the site via E	ies on Queensway. On-stree Banksfield Mount.	et parking within existing	development on the	1
Mitigation measure				Total scor
None that would overcon	ne site deficiencies.			5
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
No				
Supported with mitigation Deipkier Local Nature Are	and LCC Ecology Officer to protect and enhance the a. Provide a suitable buffer	adjacent	Amendment	
the north-east. Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Flood	dina			
Environment Agency Co	=	Environment Ag	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Water	r Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ement:			
<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:

#### **Built Heritage**

**Leeds City Council:** 

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

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 Assessment**

#### Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Site 1255 has been split into two sections, as the northern section is not considered suitable for development. By splitting the site in two the southern section relates better to the settlement and a lower capacity puts less pressure on the existing highway network. Development of site A would constitute urban sprawl.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 180 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red Not assessed Not assessed Not assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 442133 Area sq m: 89244.26 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 420315 Area Ha: 8.924426 HMCA: Aireborough

#### 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):1458.31Distance to bus stop (metres)136.63Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID173

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 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site B is to the rear of properties on northern side of Coppice Wood Avenue/Crescent and Banksfield Crescent. Site slopes from east to west.

### **UDP Designation**

	·		
Greenbelt - N32 (%):	98.47	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:	0.00	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 %
28/11/93/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	28/01/1993	20/04/1993	R	98.35

# 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	ea (2+ boundaries wit	h existing built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the sett	lement pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a area and undeveloped land?	good existing barrier l	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 o	f settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing barrier/	coundary 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 t	he existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the co	ountryside?			
Does the site include local or national	conservation designat	ed areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlar 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?	<b>✓</b> Ar	e these in agricultural use?	• 🗸	
Overall countryside Encroachment Co	nclusion			
The site does not perform an importan	t role in safeguarding	the countryside from encro	achment	
Preserve the setting and special ch	aracter of historic to	wns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a cons historical feature?	ervation area, listed bu	uilding or other		
If yes, could development preserve the	s character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclu	usion:			
Development of the site would have no	o effect on the setting	and special character of his	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Green Belt site which after splitting, si	te B relates well to the	exisitng settlement.		
Conformity with Core S	trategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settl	ement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller se	ttlement	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 Conclusio	115			
Availability:	Suitability:	Ad	chievability:	
ummary of Infrast	ructure provider c	omments and oth	er planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council High	ghways inc Metro			Rank (1-5
Only 65% of this site is with	nin acceptable access to Pu to School and Health facilit		pprox 55% of site is	3
Access Comments				Rank (1-
access to the site. Other a Howson Close all of which Regulation Order or the pr	or junction alignment with C iccess options include Bank i have existing on-street par ovision of off-street parking ent site 3029A depending o	sfield Mount, Coppice Working issues which could be spaces for existing reside	e resolved by Traffic ents. Site could be	4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Traffic management issue	s on Queensway. On-street	parking issues.		3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Traffic calming on Queens	way and provison of TRO's	and off-street parking for	existing residents.	10
Support?	Need to combine v	with other sites:	Suitability for partial of	development:
Yes - with mitigation	Yes		Yes	
Highways Agency				
lo objection <b>letwork Rail :</b>				
Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology a	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	mendment	
Supported with mitigation to	o protect and enhance the a	adjacent		
Natural England:				
<b>Education</b>				
Drainage/Water/Floodi	ng			
Environment Agency Con	nments:	Environment Ager	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Commer	nts:	Yorkshire Water V	Vaste Water Treatment	Works Comme
CC Flood Risk Managen	nent:		<del></del>	·

**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.

#### **Built Heritage**

**Leeds City Council:** 

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

**English Heritage:** 

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 Assessment**

#### Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Site 1255 has been split into two sections, as the northern section is not considered suitable for development. By splitting the site in two the southern section relates better to the settlement and a lower capacity puts less pressure on the existing highway network. Single point of access from Banksfield Mount limits site capacity.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 200 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Green Not assessed Not assessed

Site Ref: 1256 Site Name: Land at Wills Gill off Carlton Lane, Guiseley.

#### **Site Details**

442510 110950.63 Northing: Area sq m: Ward Guiseley and Rawdon 419801 Easting: Area Ha: 11.095063 HMCA: Aireborough

#### 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: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 987.26 Distance to bus stop (metres) 300.64 Nearest Railway Station Guiseley Bus Stop ID 2187 SFRA Flood Zone:

**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 Yes No 0.00

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Yes

Listed Buildings:

0.00

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large greenfield site to the north of the built up area. Some existing residential development across Carlton Road on the western boundary. Site slopes gently southwards. There is minimal tree coverage on site, and in the main trees exist only on field boundaries. Beyond the site to the north and east, is extended areas of open land.

### **UDP Designation**

Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):

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:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?: No Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?: No Site Ref: 1256 Site Name: Land at Wills Gill off Carlton Lane, Guiseley.

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
28/11/93/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	28/01/1993	20/04/1993	R	98.69
28/208/93/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	26/10/1993	22/02/1994	R	99.75

Site Ref: 1256 Site Name: Land at Wills Gill off Carlton Lane, Guiseley.

# 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?	<b>✓</b>
If yes, could development preserve this character?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:	
Development of the site would have marginal effect on the setting & special character of	historic features, which
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Green Belt site. The site is not well connected to the urban area, and would not constitut settlement. As such development would represent urban sprawl.	te rounding off of the
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: 1256 Site Name: Land at Wills Gill off Carlton Lane, Guiseley.

HLAA Conclusions						
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability: LDF to	o determ	ine A	chievability: Long	term (11+ ye	ars)
Summary of Infrastructu	ıre provider con	nmen	s and oth	er planning re	equireme	nts
Leeds City Council Highway	s inc Metro				_	
Accessibility comment					R	ank (1-5)
Only 50% of the site is accessible	to Public Transport, He	ealth and	education fac	cilities.		2
Access Comments					R	ank (1-5)
Only limited frontage to Carlton La Very substandard existing access Lane.						2
Local network comment					R	ank (1-5)
Local network poor i.e. Carlton La	ine and Moor Lane.					1
Mitigation measure					T	otal score
None that would overcome site de	eficiencies.					5
Support?	Need to combine with	h other :	sites:	Suitability for pa	rtial develor	oment:
No						
<b>Highways Agency</b> n/a						
Network Rail :						
Biodiversity						
West Yorkshire Ecology and LC	C Ecology Officer:		Boundary A	Amendment		
Not supported (RED). No site-specimproved grassland area in the no excluded from the site.			excluded ar drawing RM ensure adja	with mitigation if Red nd the boundary is ar l/1256. Mitigation wil cent habitats are pro ows and water cours	mended as pe I still be requi otected and e	er ired to nhanced,
Natural England:			ermanoca.			
<u>Education</u>						
Drainage/Water/Flooding						
Environment Agency Comments				ency Constraints:		
This site lies in flood zone 1 on the risk). However, any site specific Fl Assessment (FRA) must investiga unnamed watercourse as a source development layout plan must be a accordingly.	ood Risk te the small e of flood risk. The	Deck	runnig throug	ji i		
Yorkshire Water Comments:	_	York	shire Water	Waste Water Treatr	nent Works	Comme
Various sewers and mains in west boundaries	ern and southern	Esho	olt			

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 English Heritage:	Service:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessn	nent			
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 (Text)			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 not w As such development would repr	ell connected to esent urban spi	o the urban area, a rawl. The site has	nd would access c	I not constitute ro constraints.	unding off of the settlement.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: :	289 <b>Floo</b> i	space s	q m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion	:		Employment Conclusion:
Red		Not assessed			Not assessed

Site Name: Land at Wills Gill off Carlton Lane, Guiseley.

**Site Ref: 1256** 

# **Site Details**

Northing: 440446 Area sq m: 59638.12 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 420834 Area Ha: 5.963812 HMCA: Aireborough

# Site Characteristics

# Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Existing Use 3: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Neighbouring Use 1 Office

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

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):2628.03Distance to bus stop (metres)285.85Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID11710

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 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 Yes No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Brownfield site within built up area, residential development on 3 sides, with employment use to the west. Southern side of the side is dominated by existing employment buildings. Northern part of the site contains two ponds, with a moderately dense cover of trees in the eastern corner of the site. Site is flat.

# **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:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
28/139/92/FU	1.8m high boundary fence	15/07/1992	03/09/1992	Α	99.49

# 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 developmen	t?			
Would development result in isolated de	velopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up area	a (2+ boundaries v	with existi	ng built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively	y "round off" the s	ettlement	pattern?:		
Do natural/physical features provide a goarea and undeveloped land?	ood existing barrie	er betweer	n existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Prevent neighbouring towns from me	rging				
Would development of the site lead to pl	hysical connection	n of settler	ments?		
Do natural/physical features provide a g development?	ood existing barri	er/bounda	ry to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	om encroachme	nt			
Is there a strong defensible boundary be	tween the site an	d the exis	ting urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the cour	ntryside?				
Does the site include local or national co	onservation design	nated area	as?		
Does the site include areas of woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		ws that are	e 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	clusion_				
Preserve the setting and special char-	acter of historic	towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservistorical feature?	vation area, listed	building o	or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclus	ion:				
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Conformity with Core Str	ategy				
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
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

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: Yes	Achievability: Short term	(0-5yrs)
Summary of Infrastructure provider com	ments and other planning requi	irements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
Public Transport not in line with accessibility standards (co accessible to employment and town centres, site accessib		3
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Narrow footway, stone boundary wall and mature trees m without removal. Pedestrian linkage to Henconner Lane n		3
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Local congestion issues on A65 + Green Lane Harrogate Green Lane narrow and intermittent.	Road junction a problem. Footways on	3
Mitigation measure		Total score
To create vehicular access and improve pedestrian linkag	jes.	9
Yes - with mitigation  Highways Agency  n/a  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance open wa eatures. Bats and Great Crested Newts to consider, Great Crested Newts recorded on-site.  Natural England:  Education	Boundary Amendment	development:
Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Various culverted watercourses and surface water sewers with outfalls near to ponds. Water mains and sewers in southern road frontage  LCC Flood Risk Management:	Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Esholt	Works Comme
<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:

		Jennings Mill (	Off Green Lan	e , Yeadon
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessm	ent		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)	<u>,                                    </u>		
	I			
	<b></b>			
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
site?	(TOXI)			
	1			
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	1			
Experience of previous	Yes (Text)	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
	1			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Brownfield site in urban area. The			and trees) but these	e could be mitigated
against and would not prevent the	site coming form	vaiu.		
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 12	6 Floorenace so	n (Non residentia	N•
		•		
Residential Conclusion:		etail Conclusion:		ployment Conclusion:
Green	No	ot assessed	No	t assessed

Site Name: land to the Rear of and including Naylor

Site Ref: 1308

# **Site Details**

Northing: 441218 Area sq m: 11916.27 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 419242 Area Ha: 1.191627 HMCA: Aireborough

# 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: Industry and business - Wholesale distribution

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1066.53Distance to bus stop (metres)476.94Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID8394

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 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:

Site to the south of Coach Road, bounded by train line to east. Spring Road track makes up western boundary. Site is currently in agricultural use and is flat. Trees form a defensible boundary on all sides.

# **UDP** Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	94.35	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 Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of I	large built up areas	S		
Would development lead to/constitut	te ribbon developme	ent?		
Would development result in isolated	d development?			
Is the site well connected to built up	area (2+ boundarie	s with existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effect	tively "round off" the	e settlement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide area and undeveloped land?	a good existing bar	rier between existing urban	✓	
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
High potential to lead to unrestricted	l sprawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from	merging			
Would development of the site lead	to physical connect	ion of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide development?	a good existing ba	rrier/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging of settlements				
Assist in safeguarding countrysid	le from encroachm	nent		
Is there a strong defensible boundar	ry between the site	and the existing urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the	countryside?			
Does the site include local or national	al conservation des	ignated areas?		
Does the site include areas of wood significant unprotected tree/hedge compared to the site of the sit		rows that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3	3a agricultural land	?	✓	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment C	<u>Conclusion</u>			
The site does not perform an importa	ant role in safeguar	ding the countryside from encroa	chment	
Preserve the setting and special of	haracter of histori	c towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a corhistorical feature?	nservation area, listo	ed building or other		
If yes, could development preserve to	this character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Con-	clusion:			
Development of the site would have	no effect on the set	ting and special character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusio	n:			
Green Belt site. The site has been s 1180A and 2163A.	split in two. Site A r	elates well to the urban area whe	en considered with	
Conformity with Core	Strategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ment	1.0

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	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			

HLAA Conclusion	IS			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastr	ucture provider co	omments and o	ther planning requi	irements
Leeds City Council High	nways inc Metro			5 . 4 5
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
The site is outside bus and r not town centre/employment		but accessible to heal	Ith and education, but	2
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Access could be created on	to Coach Road with provis	sion of footway on fron	tage.	5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Route through Silverdale es street parking to houses on traffic. As an alternative rou footways for a distance betv this site. Capacity issues at	Silverdale Ave towards Pa te out, Coach Rd is unado veen Silverdale Mount and	ark Road which preven pted, narrow poorly su I Park Road which can	its two way free flow of infaced road with no	2
Mitigation measure	, ,			Total score
Traffic calming throughout t requirements for a 25mph donear Park Road will remain.	esign speed but won't prov			9
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
Yes - with mitigation	Yes		Would prefer further re	duction in size
Highways Agency No objection Network Rail: Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology ar	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Supported - no objections				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floodin	<u>g</u>			
Environment Agency Com	ments:	Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Vaukahina Watan Garana		Voulable: 14/ c	Na Marta Matar Tourism	Montes Occurr
Yorkshire Water Comment Surface water sewer in north		Esholt	er Waste Water Treatment	vvorks comme
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	ent:			

<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.

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 site?	(Text)		
Site?			
Durantanita ta bassa d	V	- I NI -	
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
gypsies and travellers	(10/4)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
·			
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. The site has bee			d unsuitable for development. A  . Site A (the northern section) has a
road frontage and relates well to	the urban area, when con	nsidered with 1180A and 2	2163A. This smaller site (ie site A)
will put less pressure on the road	network. Traffic calming	in Silverdale Estate wou	ld be required.
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 38	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Co	nclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Amber	Not asses	sed	Not assessed

Site Name: Land to the South of Coach Road, Guiseley

Site Ref: 1311A

Electric:

# **Site Details**

Northing: 441119 Area sq m: 12063.23 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 419237 Area Ha: 1.206323 HMCA: Aireborough

# Site Characteristics

# Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Storage

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1158.19 Distance to bus stop (metres) 568.68

Nearest Railway Station Guiseley Bus Stop ID 8394

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 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:

Site to the south of Coach Road, bounded by train line to east. Spring Road track makes up western boundary. Site is currently in agricultural use and slopes to the south. Trees form a defensible boundary on all sides.

# **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 Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas	
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in isolated development?	✓
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?	
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:	No
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?	
Overall sprawl conclusion:	
High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl	
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging	
Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?	✓
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:	
No merging of settlements	
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment	
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?	
Does the site provide access to the countryside?	
Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	<b>✓</b>
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:	
Development of the site would extend further into the green belt and not relate well to the pattern.	e existing settlement
Conformity with Core Strategy	
Comorning with Core Chategy	

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	0.00
Major Orban / II ca.	0.00	major Comomon	0.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	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			

HLAA Conclusion	IS			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
ummary of Infrastr	ucture provider co	omments and	other planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Higl	nways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-
The site is outside bus and r not town centre/employment		but accessible to hea	alth and education, but	2
Access Comments				Rank (1
Access could be created on be developed with 2163 with			ntage alternatively could	5
Local network comment				Rank (1-
Route through Silverdale es street parking to houses tow narrow poorly surfaced road Road which can't be addres	vards Park Road problema I with no footways for a dis	atic, as an alternative stance between Silver	route out, Coach Rd is dale Mount and Park	2
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				9
Support?	Need to combine v	with other sites:	Suitability for partial	develonment:
No	Need to combine v	vitir other sites.	Outtability for partial	uc ve iopinient.
No objection Network Rail : Biodiversity Nest Yorkshire Ecology ar	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Bounda	ry Amendment	
Supported - no objections				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floodin	g			
Environment Agency Com	ments:	Environment A	Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comment	s:	Yorkshire Wat	ter Waste Water Treatment	Works Comm
		Esholt		
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	ent:			
<u>Jtilities</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:

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 Conclusion summary:	sment			
Green Belt site. The site has bee Development of site B would exte				
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 38	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:	

Site Name: Land to the South of Coach Road, Guiseley

Site Ref: 1311B

# **Site Details**

Northing: 441003 Area sq m: 72283.81 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 419407 Area Ha: 7.228381 HMCA: Aireborough

# Site Characteristics

# Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 2: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

✓

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1328.48 Distance to bus stop (metres) 479.40

Nearest Railway Station Guiseley Bus Stop ID 3957

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

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 1.00 Agricultural Land Class: Urban Health and Safety Executive Hazard: 0.00 No Strategic Employment Buffer: 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:

Site in employment use, south of Guiseley. Railway line runs along the western boundary. Further employment sites are located to the north, with residential areas to the east. There is substantial tree coverage in the centre of the site, with no coverage beyond this. Site undulates.

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.01	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 Type

Milners Road (Aireborough Mini Skips)

General Waste Management Sites

Machells Reclamation, Guiseley Other (Waste) Specialist Misc - Loose Ends

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.

Stone Masons Milners Road, Yeadon Other (Waste) Specialist Misc - Building Materials

Milners Road Yeadon (SBT) General Waste Management Sites

Milners Road Guiseley (Tarmac) Asphalt and Concrete Plants

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H28/42/80/	Detached warehouse unit, with office, and kitchen to mills.	30/01/1980	17/03/1980	А	18.80
H28/392/75/1	Renewal of permission for sing le storey warehouse unit, with loading platform, ancill ary office, reception,	17/09/1980	03/11/1980	A	15.64
H28/206/74/	Alterations, to form two new s howrooms with toilet and singl e storey extension to form cou nter sales area, two store	05/08/1974	18/11/1974	Α	15.11
H28/7/84/	Alterations and extension, to form customer service area, staff room, office and toilet , with offices over, to w	11/01/1984	20/02/1984	Α	21.21
H28/146/85/	Change of use of first floor s tore rooms to builders merch ants, ancillary offices and wi th 3 car parking spaces.	09/08/1985	05/09/1985	ND	13.20
H28/132/81/	Alterations, to form toilet, a nd extensions, to form enlar ged showroom and enlarged stor e, to side and, store, to	31/03/1981	05/05/1981	Α	13.13
H28/449/80/	Alterations, to form toilets, and extensions, to form store room, to rear, and sales area office and enlargedstorage ar	27/11/1980	12/01/1981	R	15.14
H28/392/75/	Single storey warehouse unit, with loading platform, ancil lary office, reception, lobby, rest room and toilets to	29/07/1975	29/09/1975	А	15.14

# 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

# SHLAA Conclusions Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years) Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements **Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro Accessibility comment** Rank (1-5) 90% of the site is outside bus accessibility standards and all of the site is outside rail accessibility standards. 60% of site meets requirements for health and education, but only 10% town centre/employment. Rank (1-5) **Access Comments** Ghyll Royd functions as an industrial road and is not conducive to pedestrian movement from a 1 residential development. Milner Road is narrow with discontinuous footways and not capable of improvement. Rank (1-5) Local network comment Ghyll Royd and Milners Road are the only two means of access, both are unsuitable particularly for pedestrians. Local congestion on A65. Mitigation measure **Total score** None 4 Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No, unless significant mitigation. **Highways Agency Network Rail:** Drainage (beck under railway) capacity. Also general asset protection issues **Biodiversity** West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: **Boundary Amendment** Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance Engine Fields Local Nature Area (LNA). An appropriate corridor is needed to exclude any overlap with the LNA and provide a buffer. **Natural England:** Education **Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:** A significant proportion of the northern area of this site FZ3 large proportion of site is classified as flood zone 3 on the EA flood map (high flood risk). A sequential approach to the development layout should direct development to the flood zone 1 area **Yorkshire Water Comments:** Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme Esholt Many sewers of varying sizes and culverted

Many sewers of varying sizes and culverted watercourses within site including outfalls.

# 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: 2038	Site Name:	Low Mills, Gu	ilseley	
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)	1.10		ıaya c
site?				
<b>D</b> • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			L	
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)		No	
gypoloo ana navonolo				
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
	<u> </u>			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:	alla anta difa a a completi		an UDD. The site wa	ulal va avvina ai avaiti a avat
This is a brownfield site currently works to enable residential devel				
capacity. However, the site is no access and accessibility of the si	t in the green belt and	d is well contained. I	Highways have raised	d concerns regarding
need land from the Council's was		Cityii redad botii ladic	good lootway provisi	on, willion read would
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	144	Floorspace s	sq m (Non residentia	al):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	Conclusion:	Er	mployment Conclusion:
Amber	Not as	ssessed	No	ot assessed

# **Site Details**

Northing: 441609 Area sq m: 22766.35 Ward Otley and Yeadon Easting: 420857 Area Ha: 2.276635 HMCA: Aireborough

#### Site Characteristics

# Land Use

Existing Use 1: Other

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: Site is a Village Green

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2087.78Distance to bus stop (metres)262.11Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID12022SFRA 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:

Large greenfield site overlooking Guiseley. Site is designated as a Village Green and is used for recreation. Site has existing residential development on 3 sides, with a road frontage on Haw Lane. Site slopes generally southwards but also has a substantial gradient to the west. There is no tree cover.

#### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	100.00	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

# 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:** Protected Area of Search site, not Green Belt 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:

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

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

into account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

0.00

0.00

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Short term (0-5y	rs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Medium term (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastru	icture provide	r comments and	other plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			Rank (1-5
Accessibility comment Accessible to Public Transpor schools and healthcare.	rt, most of the site m	eets accessibility standa	rds for local servic	
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Vehicle access onto Haw Lar	ne OK with Manual F	For Streets standards.		5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Local congestion issues on A	A65.			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
None				13
Support?	Need to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitability	y for partial development:
yes				
<u>Highways Agency</u> n/a <u>Network Rail :</u>				
<u>Biodiversity</u>		_		
West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported	d LCC Ecology Offi	cer: Bound	dary Amendment	
Natural England:				-
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding	<u> </u>			
Environment Agency Comm	ents:	Environmen	t Agency Constra	ints:
Yorkshire Water Comments	:		ater Waste Water	r Treatment Works Comme
		Esholt		
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 English Heritage:	Service:		
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)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments  Conclusion of Asses	(Text)		
Conclusion summary:			
The site is a Protected Area of So Green and so is not considered s			e received designation as a Village
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 60	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail C	onclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not asse	essed	Not assessed

Site Name: Haw Lane, Yeadon

Site Ref: 2118

# **Site Details**

Northing: 439971 Area sq m: 10884.63 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 421428 Area Ha: 1.088463 HMCA: Aireborough

# 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 amenity & open space

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): 3105.76 Distance to bus stop (metres) 82.33 Nearest Railway Station Horsforth Bus Stop ID 5530 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 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

Public Rights of Way:

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Agricultural land to the north of Larkfield Dam. Existing residential development lies to the north of the site. The west of the site is bounded by Larkfield Road, which has residential development along it. This is also the only road frontage to the site. West boundary is open with no defensible boundary. Site slopes to the north west. There is no tree coverage on site.

0.00

Listed Buildings:

No

# **UDP Designation**

Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	100.00	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 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:** Protected Area of Search (PAS) site, not Green Belt. 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 (	Conclusions					
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Medium term	(6-10 years)
ummary	of Infrastructu	ıre provide	er comments and	other plann	ing require	ements
	y Council Highway ty comment	s inc Metro				Rank (1-5)
	s to Public Transport,	Education and	Local Health facilities.			4
Access Co	mments					Rank (1-5)
Site is loca	ted close to a brow an	d as such an ac	cceptable access does no	t appear to be po	ssible.	2
Local netw	ork comment					Rank (1-5)
None						1
Mitigation	measure					Total scor
None that v	vould overcome site d	eficiencies.				5
Support?		Need to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitability	y for partial de	velopment:
No					, . ,	
<mark>Highways</mark> n∕a	<u>Agency</u>					
Network R	tail :					
<u> Biodiversi</u>	=					
West Yorks Supported	hire Ecology and LC	C Ecology Offi	cer: Bound	ary Amendment		
Natural Enç	ıland:					
Education						
	<u>Water/Flooding</u> nt Agency Comments	<b>3</b> :	Environment	Agency Constra	ints:	
orkshire V	Vater Comments:		Yorkshire Wa	ater Waste Water	Treatment Wo	orks Comme
Vater mains	s in southern road fron	tage	Esholt			
-CC Flood	Risk Management:					
<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:	2119	Site Name:	Canada Road	l, Rawdon	
Telecom:					
	scue Services:				
Built Herita Leeds City C	<del></del>				
•	hire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heri		00.1100.			
· ·	•				
Gypsy _Ti	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
Could site I	be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	•	(Text)			
Would gyps	sies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers li		(Text)	INO		Iviaybe
site?					
Daniel III I		V		T N I -	
Proximity to	o nousea d travellers	Yes (Text)		No	
371					
Experience encampme	of previous	Yes (Text)	No		Unknown
encampine	iiis	(TOXI)			
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment			
Conclusion su	ımmary:				
The site is a Pr	otected Area of Se	earch (PAS) site in th	ne existing UDP. Whils	st the site is considered	ed to be well related to
the urban area,	, Highways object	to development of tr	ne site due to poor vis	sibility of site access.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units): 34 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):					
Residential Co	onclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Er	mployment Conclusion:
Red		Not assessed		No	ot assessed

#### Site Ref: 2160 Site Name: Ling Bob, Scotland Lane, Horsforth

# **Site Details**

440140 729148.30 Northing: Area sq m: Ward Horsforth 423998 Easting: Area Ha: 72.91483 HMCA: Aireborough

#### 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:

Natural Landscape:

Other uses: Airport Site State: Mixed

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Existing well defined

Road Frontage

**~** Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1086.37 Distance to bus stop (metres) 535.76 Nearest Railway Station Horsforth Bus Stop ID 6740

Limited Tree Cover

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 Yes 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large site to the east of Scotland Lane, to which there is an extended road frontage. Site includes a few private properties. Tree coverage is concentrated along field boundaries. The site generally slopes to the south with some undulations. Railway forms the eastern boundary.

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.57	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:	0.12		
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?:

Site Ref: 2160 Site Name: Ling Bob, Scotland Lane, Horsforth

Site Ref: 2160 Site Name: Ling Bob, Scotland Lane, Horsforth

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up area	
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?	<b>✓</b>
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?	<b>✓</b>
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	<b>✓</b>
Does the site contain buildings?	<b>✓</b>
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?	<b>✓</b>
If yes, could development preserve this character?:	Potentially
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:	
Development of the site would have marginal effect on the setting & special character of	nistoric features, which
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Listed buildings on site - impact on these would need to be considered. Large site that re settlement. Development would set a precedent for further sprawl.	lates poorly to

# **Conformity with Core Strategy**

Major Urban Area:	0.43	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			

Site Ref: 2160 Site Name: Ling Bob, Scotland Lane, Horsforth

SHLAA Conclusions				
	o determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)	
Summary of Infrastructure provider con	nments a	nd other plann	ing requirements	
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-	
Accessibility to Public Transport not in line with Core Stra	itegy standard	s for majority of site.	2	
Access Comments			Rank (1-	
Highway frontage but adequate access can not be achie	ved for level o	of development propo	sed.	
Local network comment			Rank (1-	
Local congestion issues.			3	
Mitigation measure			Total sco	
Unknown at this stage.			6	
Support? Need to combine with	h other sites:	Suitability	y for partial development:	
no		no		
Highways Agency  Network Rail:  F/B at LEH1 5 miles 396 yds to be made equality complia	ant (ramps)? F	lorsforth station impro	ovements general asset	
protection issues	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	·	J	
Biodiversity	_			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:		undary Amendment		
Not supported (RED). Includes Sims Pond Site of Ecolog and Geological Importance (SEGI), species-rich grasslan alongside the railway and Moseley Beck, and woodland a beck in the north of the site.	ds excluding a RM imp hec with	excluded and boundary amended as per drawing		
Natural England:				
Education				
Should this come to fruition, particularly in conjunction wit development for new school provision. Part of this site is				
Drainage/Water/Flooding		. ,		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environm	ent Agency Constra	ints:	
Apart from a very narrow section of flood zone 3 adjacent to the railway line, this site lies in flood zone 1 on the EA Flood Map (low risk). However, any site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must investigate	FZ3 along	railway no other con	straints	

**Yorkshire Water Comments:** 

accordingly.

risk. The development layout plan must be amended

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Water main crosses the southern part of the site Knostrop High Level LCC Flood Risk Management: 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) site? Proximity to housed Yes No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** No Unknown Yes encampments (Text) **Conclusion of Assessment** Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. The capacity and site area has been split - 27.6ha, 724 capacity in Aireborough, 45.33ha, 1189 capacity in North Leeds. Development of such a large site would represent unrestricted urban sprawl and Highways objections include local congestion that would arise if developed. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 1913 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): **Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:** 

Site Name: Ling Bob, Scotland Lane, Horsforth

Site Ref: 2160

Not assessed

Not assessed

Site Ref: 2161 Site Name: West of Westfield Mount, Yeadon

### **Site Details**

440796 31730.73 Northing: Area sq m: Ward Guiseley and Rawdon 419418 Easting: Area Ha: 3.173073 HMCA: Aireborough

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Existing Use 2: Other

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Wholesale distribution

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: SSSI on west part of site

Site State: Greenfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1523.68 Distance to bus stop (metres) 449.41 Nearest Railway Station Guiseley Bus Stop ID 10299 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:

Site wraps around existing employment site off Milner Lane. Eastern part of the site is adjacent to residential area, and is heavily treed. Western area of the site is more open, and is bounded by the railway line and further heavy tree cover. Site has no direct road access. Site is generally flat.

### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	62.14	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	
Stone Masons Milners Road, Yeadon		Other (Waste) Specialist Misc - Building Materials	
Milners Road Yeadon (SBT)		General Waste Management Sites	

Site Ref: 2161 Site Name: West of Westfield Mount, Yeadon

Milners Road Guiseley (Tarmac)

Asphalt and Concrete Plants

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H28/146/85/	Change of use of first floor s tore rooms to builders merch ants, ancillary offices and wi th 3 car parking spaces.	09/08/1985	05/09/1985	ND	12.86
H28/13/83/	Change of use of builders yard to outdoor shooting range.	21/01/1983	18/08/1983	W	12.82
H28/392/75/1	Renewal of permission for sing le storey warehouse unit, with loading platform, ancill ary office, reception,	17/09/1980	03/11/1980	Α	12.80
H28/206/74/	Alterations, to form two new s howrooms with toilet and singl e storey extension to form cou nter sales area, two store	05/08/1974	18/11/1974	Α	10.67
H28/383/78/	Laying out new access, and ere ction of single storey build ing, comprising double garage and store, to vacant sit	19/06/1978	07/08/1978	А	12.56
H28/90/86/	Laying out of access road and carrying out tipping withlands caping to former brick works. (site area 0.38ha)	21/05/1986	06/10/1986	Α	15.96
H28/132/81/	Alterations, to form toilet, a nd extensions, to form enlar ged showroom and enlarged stor e, to side and, store, to	31/03/1981	05/05/1981	Α	12.75
H28/449/80/	Alterations, to form toilets, and extensions, to form store room, to rear, and sales area office and enlargedstorage ar	27/11/1980	12/01/1981	R	12.83
H28/392/75/	Single storey warehouse unit, with loading platform, ancil lary office, reception, lobby, rest room and toilets to	29/07/1975	29/09/1975	A	10.01
H28/701/76/	Regrading, and reclamation of disused quarry.	15/11/1976	25/09/1978	А	58.45

Site Ref: 2161 Site Name: West of Westfield Mount, Yeadon

### 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 devel	opment?		✓	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2	2+ boundaries with ex	kisting built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "r	ound off" the settlem	ent pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	d existing barrier betw	veen 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	sical connection of se	ttlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?	d existing barrier/bou	ndary to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging of settlements				
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	vside?			
Does the site include local or national cons	ervation designated	areas?	$\checkmark$	
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?		<b>✓</b>	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are th	ese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclus	sion_			
The site performs an important role safegua	arding countryside fro	om encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special charact	er of historic towns	<b>S</b>		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservat historical feature?	ion area, listed buildi	ng or other		
If yes, could development preserve this cha	aracter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	<u>.</u> <u>-</u>			
Development of the site would have no effective	ect on the setting and	special character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
The western part of the site is Green Belt. development unrelated to the existing settle of Special Scientific Interest.				
Our family Man Comme				
Conformity with Core Strat	tegy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ment	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	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

Site Ref: 2161 Site Name: West of Westfield Mount, Yeadon

HLAA Conclusions	
Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: LDF to determine	ne Achievability: Long term (11+ years)
summary of Infrastructure provider comments	s and other planning requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	
Accessibility comment	Rank (1-5
Poor accessibility to all services.	2
Access Comments	Rank (1-5
Requires adopted highway and private road to be converted, poor	bend further up road.
Local network comment	Rank (1-5
Local congestion issues.	3
Mitigation measure	Total sco
highway works, signal improvements	8
Support? Need to combine with other si	tes: Suitability for partial development:
no no	yes
Highways Agency	
Network Rail :	
Biodiversity	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment
Not supported (RED). Yeadon Brickworks and Railway Cutting Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) covers most of this site, and the remainder is a mixture of lowland mixed deciduous woodland, a UK Biodiversity Priority Habitat and some grassland which is of unknown quality.	
Natural England:	
<u>Education</u>	
Drainage/Water/Flooding	
Environment Agency Comments: Envir	onment Agency Constraints:
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorks  Eshol	shire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:	

**Utilities** 

Gas:

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

Site Ref: 2161	Site Name:	west of westfield Mou	nt, Yeadon
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	y Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy ₋Traveller Sit	e Assessme	nt	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
ravellers live on the site?	(Text)	, .	1 2
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Sypsy _Traveller Sit	e Assessme	nt	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
ravellers 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:

Part Green Belt. The site has no road frontage and would require the development of the adjoining SHLAA site 2038 for access purposes. The western section of the site is a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and could not be developed. The eastern section is covered in dense trees and is also considered unsuitable.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

0

83

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red Not assessed Not assessed

Site Ref: 2161

Site Name: West of Westfield Mount, Yeadon

### **Site Details**

Northing: 440269 Area sq m: 27527.77 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 420126 Area Ha: 2.752777 HMCA: Aireborough

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: 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: Greenfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2320.25Distance to bus stop (metres)293.27Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID5982SFRA 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 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site to the north of Warm Lane, bounded to the north by Gill Lane. To the west of the site beyond a heavily treed area, is an established residential area. To the east there is more sporadic spread of mixed uses. The site has rfoad frontages with both Gill Lane and Warm Lane. Site is generally flat although there is a more undulating profile on the western boundary of the site. Tree coverage is concentrated to the northern limits of the site, with a small number of trees in the centre of the 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 %
H28/511/79/	Change of use of farm building s to 2 flats.	30/07/1979	16/10/1979	Α	10.95

# 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)?	<b>✓</b>
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?	
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:	
Green Belt site. Development of site 2162 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing development along with sites 1104 and 3033 would be contained by development on 3 s	
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			
Availability: Unknown Suitability: LDF to o	determine /	Achievability: Long	term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider comm	nents and otl	ner planning re	equirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			- · · · -
Accessibility comment  Not all of the site is within accessibility standard to Public T /Town Centres	ransport, accessible	e to employment	Rank (1-5)
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Gill Lane has no footways along the majority of its length in substandard forward visibility at points along its length and additional development. Access from Warm Lane may also and potential conflict with existing access points. If linked suitable access could be achieved.	is not considered to be difficult due to	o be suitable to serve the road alignment	2
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Local congestion issues. Warm Lane is already traffic calm	ed (speed cushions	s).	2
Mitigation measure			Total scor
None that would overcome site deficiencies.			6
Support? Need to combine with o	other sites:	Suitability for pa	rtial development:
Yes with mitigation, if linked with adjacent sites			
Highways Agency n/a Network Rail :			
Network Kall .			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:		Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildlift corridor function of Yeadon Gill towards north of the site - by providing a 20 metre buffer from the water course.			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatn	nent Works Comme
Culverted watercourse to north of site	Esholt		
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:

Site Ref: 2162	Site Name:	North of Warm Lane, Yea	don
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeolog	y Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Sit	e Assessmer	nt	
		No	Mouhe
Could site be effectively managed	(Text)	INO	Maybe
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?	( )		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
			J
Conclusion of Asses	ssment		
Conclusion summary:			
	of site 2162 in isolatio	n would be unrelated to the existing set	itlement pattern, but
		e contained by development on 3 sides	
one can be suitably decessed.			
Site Capacity (dwellings units	<b>):</b> 72	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	assessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 2163A Site Name: Sodhall Hill, South of Park Road, Guiseley

### **Site Details**

Northing: 441318 Area sq m: 28951.87 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 418894 Area Ha: 2.895187 HMCA: Aireborough

### 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):896.26Distance to bus stop (metres)353.96Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID8389

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 Yes No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: No No

Public Rights of Way:

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site has a road frontage with Coach Road. Site is in agricultural use, being mainly flat. Tree cover is largely along field boundaries.

### **UDP** Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.96	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:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Site Ref: 2163A Site Name: Sodhall Hill, South of Park Road, Guiseley

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H28/308/89/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to ag ricultural site. (site are a 2.14ha)	24/10/1989	22/01/1990	R	64.40
H28/173/74/	Outline application to erect o ne detached house with priva te driveway, to detached house	25/07/1974	09/12/1974	А	99.53

Site Ref: 2163A Site Name: Sodhall Hill, South of Park Road, Guiseley

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of la	arge built up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute	e ribbon developmen	t?		
Would development result in isolated	I development?			
Is the site well connected to built up a	area (2+ boundaries v	with existing built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effecti	ively "round off" the s	ettlement pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide area and undeveloped land?	a good existing barrie	er between existing urban	<b>V</b>	
Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted	sprawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from	merging			
Would development of the site lead t	o physical connection	of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide development?				
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible	e boundary			
Assist in safeguarding countryside	e from encroachmer	nt		
Is there a strong defensible boundary	y between the site an	d the existing urban area?	$\checkmark$	
Does the site provide access to the o	countryside?			
Does the site include local or national	al conservation design	nated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodle significant unprotected tree/hedge co		ws that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3	Ba agricultural land?		$\checkmark$	
Does the site contain buildings?		Are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment C	onclusion			
The site does not perform an importa	ant role in safeguardir	ng the countryside from encroad	chment	
Preserve the setting and special c	haracter of historic	towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a con historical feature?	servation area, listed	building or other		
If yes, could development preserve the	his character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Cond	clusion:			
Development of the site would have	no effect on the settin	ng and special character of histo	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion	ո։			
Green Belt site. Site A (the northern considered with 1180A and 1311A.	section) has a road f	rontage and relates well to the	urban area, when	
Conformity with Core \$	Strategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settler	ment	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller settl	ement	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

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

Site Ref: 2163A Site Name: Sodhall Hill, South of Park Road, Guiseley SHLAA Conclusions Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements **Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro Accessibility comment** Rank (1-5) Site A is just ouside Public Transport accessibility distances and meets other requirements. **Access Comments** Rank (1-5) Access could be created onto Old Hollings Hill with significant widening with the loss of a stone 4 boundary wall and mature trees. Coach Road frontage is onto the narrow section of Coach Road and doesn't have sufficient frontage to the west to improve the full substandard length, alternative route through Silverdale estate not suitable for large increase in traffic. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 1311A would be appropriate. Local network comment Rank (1-5) Old Hollings Hill would require significant widening with the loss of a stone boundary wall and 4 mature trees. Silverdale Ave, existing on street parking to houses towards Park Road problematic, as an alternative route out, Coach Rd is narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road which can't be fully addressed with this site. Capacity issues at Park Road / A65 Gyratory. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 1311A would be appropriate. Mitigation measure **Total score** Old Hollings Hill would require significant widening with the loss of a stone boundary wall and 11 mature trees. Traffic calming in Silverdale estate may help but won't provide the full solution. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 1311A would be appropriate. Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: 1180A & 1311A Yes with mitigation **Highways Agency** No objection **Network Rail: Biodiversity** West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: **Boundary Amendment** Supported with mitigation. Mitigation is required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats (potential Leeds Habitat Network) are addressed. **Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Comments:** 

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Yorkshire Water Comments: Water mains in east of site

Esholt

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Site Capacity (dwellings units)		
	: 76 Floorspace sq r	n (Non residential):
comprehensive development alor road frontage and relates well to	en split in two as the southern section is consign ng with sites 1180A & 1311A would be approp the urban area, when considered with 1180A network. Traffic calming in Silverdale Estate	oriate. Site A (the northern section) has a and 1311A. This smaller site (ie site A)
Conclusion summary:		
Conclusion of Asses	sment	
encampments	(Text)	
Experience of previous	Yes No	Unknown
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes No. (Text)	0
site?	(1974)	
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes No	Maybe
		_
managed	(Text)	Iwayoo
Could site be effectively	Yes No	Maybe
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment	
Liigiisii Heritage.		
West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:	
Leeds City Council:		
Built Heritage		
Fire and Rescue Services:		
Telecom:		
Electric:		
Gas:		
<u>Utilities</u>		

Site Name: Sodhall Hill, South of Park Road, Guiseley

Site Ref: 2163A

Site Ref: 2163B Site Name: Sodhall Hill, South of Park Road, Guiseley

### **Site Details**

Northing: 441135 Area sq m: 129881.98 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 418846 Area Ha: 12.988198 HMCA: Aireborough

#### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
Existing Use 3: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1078.25Distance to bus stop (metres)504.83Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID4411

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

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 1.00 Agricultural Land Class:

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

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Far eastern boundary is the railway line. Western edge of the site fronts Old Hollings Lane, though this is heavily treed. There is further dense tree coverage to the southwest of the site. Site slopes down to the east.

### **UDP** Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	64.75	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:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Site Ref: 2163B Site Name: Sodhall Hill, South of Park Road, Guiseley

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H28/173/74/	Outline application to erect o ne detached house with priva te driveway, to detached house	25/07/1974	09/12/1974	Α	27.21

Site Ref: 2163B Site Name: Sodhall Hill, South of Park Road, Guiseley

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large b	•				
Would development lead to/constitute ribbo	•	nt?			
Would development result in isolated devel					
Is the site well connected to built up area (2					
Would development of the site effectively "r	•	No			
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	l existing barri	er betweei	n existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted spraw					
Prevent neighbouring towns from mergi	ng				
Would development of the site lead to phys	ical connectio	n of settle	ments?		
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	encroachme	ent			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	een the site ar	nd the exis	ting urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the country	side?				
Does the site include local or national cons	ervation desig	nated area	as?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	rees, hedgero	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	ion_				
The site does not perform an important role	in safeguardi	ng the cou	ntryside from encroa	chment	
Preserve the setting and special charact	er of historic	towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservat historical feature?	on area, listed	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 margin	al effect on the	e setting 8	special character of	historic features, which	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Green Belt site. Development of Site B wo	uld not be well	l related to	the existing settleme	ent pattern.	
Conformity with Core Strat	egy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ment	1.00
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:	_	.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

Site Ref: 2163B Site Name: Sodhall Hill, South of Park Road, Guiseley SHLAA Conclusions Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements **Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro Accessibility comment** Rank (1-5) The site is outside bus accessibility standards and only a small proportion of the site falls within 800m of a train station. Only the edges of the site meet accessibility standards for health and education. Rank (1-5) **Access Comments** Access could be created onto Old Hollings Hill with significant widening with the loss of a stone 3 boundary wall and mature trees. Coach Road frontage is onto the narrow section of Coach Road and doesn't have sufficient frontage to the west to improve the full substandard length, alternative route through Silverdale estate not suitable for large increase in traffic. Local network comment Rank (1-5) Old Hollings Hill would require significant widening with the loss of a stone boundary wall and 3 mature trees. Silverdale Ave, existing on street parking to houses towards Park Road problematic, as an alternative route out, Coach Rd is narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road which can't be fully addressed with this site. Capacity issues at Park Road / A65 Gyratory. Total score Mitigation measure Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: Support? No **Highways Agency** No objection **Network Rail: Biodiversity** West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: **Boundary Amendment** Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but includes areas of woodland, a beck, pond and species-rich grassland (potentially part of the Leeds Habitat Network). **Natural England: Education** 

### Drainage/Water/Flooding

**Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Comments:** 

#### **Yorkshire Water Comments:**

Surfface water sewers adjacent to pond in north west of site

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme Esholt

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:			
O T U O'		•	
Gypsy _Traveller Site	: Assessmen	τ	
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)	1 -	
Experience of provious	Yes	No	Unknown
Experience of previous encampments	(Text)	INO	OTIKITOWIT
·			
Conclusion of Acces			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	that development wou	uld not be well related to the	ed unsuitable for development due to existing settlement pattern. The quality
· ·		,	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 76	Floorspace sq m (N	lon residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Sodhall Hill, South of Park Road, Guiseley

Site Ref: 2163B

#### Site Ref: 3026 Site Name: Land between Mire Beck and Ings Lane

### **Site Details**

442788 113340.51 Northing: Area sq m: Ward Guiseley and Rawdon 418248 Easting: Area Ha: 11.334051 HMCA: Aireborough

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Community Services - Education

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: Open Countryside

Site State: Greenfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 839.06 Distance to bus stop (metres) 158.66 Nearest Railway Station Guiseley Bus Stop ID 11896 SFRA Flood Zone:

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

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

1.00

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site to the north of the existing residential area of Guiseley, bounded to the east by a railway line, to the north by playing pitches, and west and south by existing development. Site is flat with very little tree cover. A small number of farm buildings occupy an area adjacent to Ings Lane.

### **UDP** Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.04	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
( )		,	
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?: No Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?: No Site Ref: 3026 Site Name: Land between Mire Beck and Ings Lane

Site Ref: 3026 Site Name: Land between Mire Beck and Ings Lane

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas	
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	
Would development result in isolated development?	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?	✓
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:	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 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 histo	oric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Green Belt site. Site is well contained. Development would round off the settlement.	
Conformity with Core Stratemy	
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: 3026 Site Name: Land between Mire Beck and Ings Lane

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability:	Suitability:	Achieva	bility:
ummary of Infrastructu	re provider con	nments and other pl	anning requirements
Leeds City Council Highways	s inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-
Via Ings Lane no bus service but 1	km to rail station and w	rithin town centre walk.	2
Access Comments			Rank (1-
Access from Ings Lane achievable service and improve accessibility in		cess to A65 which would res	olve bus 4
Local network comment			Rank (1-
Local congestion issues on A65.			3
Mitigation measure			Total sc
Unknown at this stage?			9
Support?	Need to combine with	n other sites: Suit	ability for partial development:
Yes - with mitigation			
n/a Network Rail : General asset protection issues Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC		Boundary Amend	ment
Supported with mitigation to protec wildlife corridor - retaining a minimubeck. Otter, White-clawed Crayfish consider.	um 20 metre buffer fron	e Beck in the	
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u> Environment Agency Comments	:	Environment Agency Co	onstraints:
This site lies in flood zone 1 on the risk). However, any site specific Flot Assessment (FRA) must investigat source of flood risk because the deabuts the watercourse. The develomust be amended accordingly.	ood Risk e Mire Beck as a velopment site	FZ3/2 de minimis	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water Waste	Water Treatment Works Commo
Large surface water sewer adjacen east	t to railway track at	Burley Menston	

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref:	3026	Site Name:	Land betwee	n Mire Beck and	Ings Lane
Built Herit Leeds City	Council: shire Archaeology	Service:			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	Assessmen	t		
	be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed		(Text)			
Would gyp		Yes	No		Maybe
travellers I site?	ive on the	(Text)			
Proximity t		Yes		No	
gypsies an	nd travellers	(Text)			
Experience	e of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampme	ents	(Text)			
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment			
Conclusion s	ummary:				
Green Belt site. Site is well contained. Development would round off the settlement. Highways concerns about local road congestion, mitigation measures would be required.					
Site Capacity (dwellings units):		535	Floorspace	sq m (Non residential)	:
Residential C	onclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Emı	oloyment Conclusion:
Amber					· <del>-</del>

### **Site Details**

Northing: 442765 Area sq m: 150829.67 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 419042 Area Ha: 15.082967 HMCA: Aireborough

### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space

Existing Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Mixed

### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 581.57 Distance to bus stop (metres) 437.02 Nearest Railway Station Guiseley Bus Stop ID 4836 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 Yes No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Substantial site to the rear of properties on Kelcliffe Lane and The Poplars. Site rises up above the existing residential areas, before becoming flat to the north. West side drops steeply to new development, and has significant tree cover and recreational value. Remainder of the site is largely in agricultural use, with little tree cover.

### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.75	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:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H28/621/77/	Laying out of enlarged car par king area to works.	10/11/1977	16/01/1978	Α	23.25
H28/543/79/	Replacement, 3, 814 litres liqu id oxygen storage tank to works.	10/08/1979	05/11/1979	Α	23.34
H28/779/79/	Addition of porch, to rear of semi- detached house.	12/11/1979	04/12/1979	Α	13.51
H28/106/75/	Demolition of stable, alterati ons and change of use of outbuildings, comprising stable, st ores, garage, w.c. and barn,	10/03/1975	09/06/1977	R	13.51
H28/578/75/	Re-siting of petrol pump, to w orks premises.	04/11/1975	01/12/1975	Α	23.25
H28/132/75/	Change of use of farm outbuild ings to residential accom modation.	25/03/1975	09/06/1977	R	13.51
H28/267/76/	Laying out of access road to I ink 2 existing car parks to wo rk premises.	28/04/1976	05/07/1976	Α	23.25
H28/621/79/	One 68, 190 litres and one 45, 4 60 litres oil storage tanks, to works.	14/09/1979	05/11/1979	Α	23.25
H28/407/76/	Application to erect one detac hed house to vacan t house. (site area 0.285 ha. (0.7 acre)).	24/06/1976	16/08/1976	R	13.51
H28/720/76/	Laying out of turning and vehi cular loading area, to wo rks premises.	25/11/1976	04/01/1977	Α	23.25
H28/774/79/	Demolition of existing office unit and loading bay, layin g out of enlarged access, and alterations, including	08/11/1979	17/12/1979	Α	23.38
H28/112/77/	Laying out of golf practice ar ea, to vacant site. (site area 2.27ha (5.61 acres)).	04/03/1977	18/04/1977	Α	14.67
H28/216/90/	Retrospective change of use of land and outbuildings toridin g school and off site highway improvements.	21/09/1990	13/06/1991	Α	27.96
H28/560/78/	Outline application to lay out access and erection of resid ential development to vacant s ite. (site area 3.85ha (9.	31/08/1978	16/10/1978	R	20.30

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large b	ouilt up areas				
Would development lead to/constitute ribb	on developmen	nt?			
Would development result in isolated deve	lopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up area (	2+ boundaries	with existin	g built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively	round off" the s	settlement p	pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a goo area and undeveloped land?	d existing barri	er 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 connectio	n of settlen	nents?		
Do natural/physical features provide a goodevelopment?	od existing barri	er/boundar	y to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but there is no defensible bou	ndary				
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	n encroachme	nt			
Is there a strong defensible boundary betw	veen the site ar	nd the exist	ing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countr	yside?			✓	
Does the site include local or national con-	servation desig	nated area	s?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	trees, hedgero	ws that are	protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agr	icultural land?				
Does the site contain buildings?	<b>✓</b>	Are these	in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclu	sion_				
The site performs an important role safegu	arding country	side from e	ncroachment		
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 o	r 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 setti	ng and spe	cial character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Green Belt site. Visible location above the to the existing settlement pattern.	e urban area.  C	Developmer	nt would constitute u	rban sprawl, unrelated	
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 Conclusions			
Availability: Unknown Suitability: LDF to	determine A	chievability: Long term (1	1+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider com	ments and oth	er planning require	ements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			5 1 (4 5)
Accessibility comment	alla litta a standarda standa		Rank (1-5)
Not accessible to public transport. Half site is within acces	sibility standards to s	ervices.	2
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)	
Landlocked, not clear why extra field to Moor Lane not inc	cluded.		1
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Local congestion issues on A65.			3
Mitigation measure			Total scor
Unknown at this stage?			6
Support? Need to combine with	other sites:	Suitability for partial de	evelopment:
No due to access, mitigation if access possible.			
Highways Agency n/a			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported	Boundary A	Amendment	
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding	Forting and Associated		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Age	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment W	orks Comme
Large abandoned water mains through the centre of the site	Esholt		
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: 3028	Site Name:	Kelcliffe Mount/West View Guiseley, LS20 9DE	v, Kelcliffe Lane,
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	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	,	,,
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	1.10	, may 20
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. Visible location existing settlement pattern. Higl		. Development would constitute urban g access.	sprawl, unrelated to the
Site Capacity (dwellings units	<b>):</b> 396	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 3029 Site Name: Land south of Wills Gill, Guiseley, LS20 9NG

### **Site Details**

Northing: 442279 Area sq m: 50591.50 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 419789 Area Ha: 5.05915 HMCA: Aireborough

### 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):932.75Distance to bus stop (metres)196.07Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID7412

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 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 Yes No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Agricultural land to the rear of properties on Shaw Lane Gardens. Track runs through part of the site. Site is flat, with some tree cover on boundaries. A public right of way runs along the western boundary. The site is within a conservation area.

### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.86	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:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Site Ref: 3029 Site Name: Land south of Wills Gill, Guiseley, LS20 9NG

Site Ref: 3029 Site Name: Land south of Wills Gill, Guiseley, LS20 9NG

# 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+ I	boundaries wi	th existing built up area)?	✓		
Would development of the site effectively "rou	nd off" the set	tlement pattern?:	Partial		
Do natural/physical features provide a good earea and undeveloped land?	xisting barrier	between existing urban			
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl					
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging	l				
Would development of the site lead to physica	al connection of	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 ea	ncroachment				
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	n the site and	the existing urban area?			
Does the site provide access to the countrysic	de?		✓		
Does the site include local or national conserv	ation designa	ted 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?	A	re these in agricultural use?			
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>n</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 hist	oric features		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Green Belt site. The site is well connected to countryside from further sprawl.	the urban are	a but does perform a role in s	safeguarding the		
Conformity with Core Strate	gy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ment	1.00	
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 Gatewa	ay:	0.00	

East Leeds

Site Ref: 3029 Site Name: Land south of Wills Gill, Guiseley, LS20 9NG

<b>HLAA Conclusions</b>				
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
ummary of Infrastruc	ture provider c	omments and of	ther planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
The majority of the site is within oit further afield.	walking distance of ac	cess to bus services. T	he Railway Station is a	3
Access Comments			<u>"</u>	Rank (1-5
Potential for direct access to Q requirements. Pedestrian link to 1255B depending on overall nu	o Shaw Lane Gardens			4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Traffic Managemnt issues on C	Queensway.			3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Traffic caliming on Queensway				10
Support?	Need to combine v	vith other sites:	Suitability for partial of	levelopment:
Yes - with mitigation	Yes		Yes	
<u>letwork Rail :</u> <u>Biodiversity</u> Vest Yorkshire Ecology and I	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	/ Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Flooding		Paratura		
Environment Agency Comme	nts:	Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water Treatment V	Vorks Comme
Combined sewers and water ma vestern boundary of the site	ains in north and	Esholt		
<b>_CC Flood Risk Management</b> :				
<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	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy Traveller Site	Assessmer	nt	
Could site be offertively	Vaa	Na	Marilea
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Mayba
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	(Text)	INO	Maybe
site?	(1011)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	110	
377			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		0
·			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. The site has been			
connected to the urban area but	does perform a role	in safeguarding the countryside	e from further sprawl.
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	133	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	nil Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red		assessed	Not assessed
	. 101 (		. 101 0000000

Site Name: Land south of Wills Gill, Guiseley, LS20 9NG

Site Ref: 3029

### **Site Details**

Northing: 441738 Area sq m: 38351.62 Ward Otley and Yeadon Easting: 420833 Area Ha: 3.835162 HMCA: Aireborough

#### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: Village Green
Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2029.95Distance to bus stop (metres)259.60Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID12022SFRA 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:

Site to the rear of properties on Banksfield Crescent, bounded to the east by Tarn Lane. Open land lies to the north. Site slopes steeply towards the south, and also falls away steeply to the east. A number of well used Public Rights of Way cross the site. There is no tree cover on the site.

### **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:	0.00		
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 %
H28/4/75/	Outline application to erect a pprox. 30 detached and 25 pa irs of semi-detached houses, w ith garages to vacant sit	07/01/1976	09/06/1977	R	58.96
H28/820/78/	Outline application erect deta ched bungalow with attac hed garage to vacant site. (site area	18/12/1978	19/03/1979	R	59.39

### 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 development	pment?		✓	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+	boundaries w	ith existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "ro	und off" the se	ttlement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	existing barrier	between existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from mergin	g			
Would development of the site lead to physic	cal connection	of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?	existing barrie	/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible bound	ary			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from 6	encroachmen	t		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	en the site and	the existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countrys	ide?	•	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site include local or national conse	rvation designa	ated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trosignificant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	ees, hedgerow	s that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricu	ultural land?			
Does the site contain buildings?	P	are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>on</u>			
The site performs an important role safeguar	ding countrysic	de from encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special characte	r of historic to	owns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation historical feature?	n area, listed b	ouilding or other		
If yes, could development preserve this char	acter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:				
Development of the site would have no effect	t on the setting	and special character of his	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Green Belt site. Part of the site also falls wit isolation would be unrelated to the existing s				
Conformity with Core Strate	adv.			
Comornity with Core Strate	y			
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	0 Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.0	0 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 Conclusion	าร			
Availability: Unknown	Suitability: No		Achievability: Long terr	n (11+ years)
ummary of Infrastr	ucture provider co	mments and o	ther planning requ	uirements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
60% of site meets Public Tra standards to local facilities,		ards, 40% of site meets	s accessibility	3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
	ne possible on 'country lane ntage, footways extended s		will need to be widened	4
Local network comment	_			Rank (1-5)
Local congestion issues on	A65.			4
Mitigation measure				Total score
Haw Lane widening and foo	otways, improve footpath lin	k to Bankfield Cres		11
Support?	Need to combine w	rith other sites:	Suitability for partia	l development:
yes - with mitigation	better if combined wi	ith 2118		
<u>Highways Agency</u> n∕a <u>Network Rail :</u>				
<u>Biodiversity</u> Neet Verkebire Feelegy o	ad I CC Faeleny Officer	Paus dan	v Amendment	
<b>West Yorkshire Ecology a</b> Supported	id LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Natural England:				
-				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floodin	ng			
Environment Agency Com	ments:	Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comment	s:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme
		Esholt		
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	ent:			
<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: 3030	Site Name:	Yeadon Banks, Haw	Lane, Yeadon, LS19 7
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
rife 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)	110	Mayso
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Olto .			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	1	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. Part of the site a be unrelated to the existing settle	also falls within the de ement pattern and cor	esignated Village Green. Develop nstitute urban sprawl.	oment of the site in isolation would
, and the second	•	•	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 101	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

### **Site Details**

Northing: 440546 Area sq m: 13089.67 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 419550 Area Ha: 1.308967 HMCA: Aireborough

### 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: Mixed

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1804.79 Distance to bus stop (metres) 306.98 Nearest Railway Station Guiseley Bus Stop ID 10299 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:

Site comprising two agricultural fields to the rear of Westfield Oval. Site slopes downwards along Ghyll Mount. Site includes properties at the end of Ghyll Mount which is an unpaved track, and the sole access to the site. There is tree coverage along the field boundaries, running down the centre of the site. Site is bounded to the north and east by residential development, with open fields to the south and west.

### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.35	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 %
H28/259/90/	Alterations and extension to f orm dining room and conse rvatory, to side of semi-detac hed house.	03/12/1990	09/01/1991	А	53.48
H28/689/77/	Amendment to previous applicat ion involving resiting of 2 detached link dwellings, to va cant site (previous applicatio	23/12/1977	06/02/1978	Α	56.11

### 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 developmer	nt?		
Would development result in isolated de	Nould development result in isolated development?			
Is the site well connected to built up area				
Would development of the site effectively	No			
Do natural/physical features provide a goarea and undeveloped land?	ood existing barri	ier between 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 pl	nysical connection	on of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a g development?	ood existing barr	ier/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible bo	oundary			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	om encroachme	ent		
Is there a strong defensible boundary be	tween the site a	nd the existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the cour	ntryside?			
Does the site include local or national co	nservation desig	nated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		ows that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a a	gricultural land?		$\checkmark$	
Does the site contain buildings?	✓	Are these in agricultural use	? 🗸	
Overall countryside Encroachment Cond	clusion_			
The site does not perform an important r	ole in safeguardi	ing the countryside from encr	oachment	
Preserve the setting and special char	acter of historic	towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservistorical feature?	vation area, listed	d building or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclus	ion:			
Development of the site would have no	effect on the setti	ng and special character of h	istoric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Green Belt site, not particularly well rela-	ted to the existing	g settlement pattern. Highwa	ys objections.	
Conformity with Core Str	ategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Set	itlement	

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			

HLAA Conclusions	5			
Availability: Unknown	Suitability: L	DF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
ummary of Infrastru	cture provider o	comments and	d other planni	ng requirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Poor access to Public Transpo	ort and Health facilities.	. Close to local Prima	ary and Secondary	Schools. 1
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Appears to be insufficient spa	ace to accommodate a	in adopted access ro	ad.	2
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
High levels of on-street parking	ng in Westfied Estate.	Congestion on A65.		2
Mitigation measure				Total sco
None that would overcome si	te deficiencies.			5
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
No				
Highways Agency n/a Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and	11 CC Feelogy Officer	·· Boun	dary Amendment	
Supported	1 200 200logy Omioci		adi y Americanieni	
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comm	=	Environme	nt Agency Constra	ints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	:	Yorkshire V	Vater Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
Culverted watercourse in east	ern part of site	Esholt		
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	Assessme	ent		
Could site be effectively		No		Mayba
managed	Yes (Text)	INU		Maybe
J				
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
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:				
Green Belt site, not particularly w		xisting settlement patter	n. Highways conce	erns re access - adoptable
highway not considered achievab	ile.			
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 41	Floorspace	sq m (Non residen	tial):
Residential Conclusion:	Re	tail Conclusion:	•	Employment Conclusion:
Red		t assessed		Not assessed

Site Name: Ghyll Mount, Yeadon, LS19 7GA

Site Ref: 3031

7DN

### **Site Details**

Northing: 439979 Area sq m: 81595.11 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 420267 Area Ha: 8.159511 HMCA: Aireborough

#### 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: Mixed

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2640.72Distance to bus stop (metres)353.99Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID4123

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 Yes No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Agricultural fields to the the south of Warm Lane and Apperley Lane junction. Site slopes downwards towards Warm Lane. A car sales area is located in the southern corner of the site, a private property to the north eastern corner and a farm is located to the north western corner. There is very little tree cover across the site. Area to the west and south is very open in nature.

### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.39	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:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

7DN

7DN

### 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	te ribbon developme	ent?		
Would development result in isolate	d development?			
Is the site well connected to built up	area (2+ boundarie	s with existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effect	tively "round off" the	e settlement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide area and undeveloped land?	a good existing bar	rier between existing urban	✓	
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
High potential to lead to unrestricted	d sprawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from	n merging			
Would development of the site lead	to physical connect	ion of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide development?	a good existing bar	rrier/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensib	le boundary			
Assist in safeguarding countrysic	de from encroachm	nent		
Is there a strong defensible bounda	ry between the site a	and the existing urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the	countryside?		✓	
Does the site include local or nation	al conservation des	ignated areas?		
Does the site include areas of wood significant unprotected tree/hedge of		rows that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or	3a agricultural land?	?	✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	$\checkmark$	Are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment	<u>Conclusion</u>			
The site performs an important role	safeguarding countr	ryside from encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special	character of histori	c towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a co historical feature?	nservation area, liste	ed building or other	$\checkmark$	
If yes, could development preserve	this character?:		Yes	
Overall Character Preservation Con	iclusion:			
Development of the site would have	marginal effect on t	the setting & special character of	historic features, which	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion	on:			
Green Belt site. Development of si but development along with sites 11				
Conformity with Core	Strategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ment	1.0

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			

7DN

HLAA C	conclusions	6			
Availability:	Unknown	Suitability: LDF to	o determine	Achievability: Long term	(11+ years)
Summary	of Infrastru	cture provider con	nments and ot	her planning requi	rements
Leeds City	Council High	ways inc Metro			
Accessibilit	y comment				Rank (1-5)
Poor access	to Public Transpo	ort, Health facilities, Local P	rimary and Seconda	ry Schools.	1
Access Co	mments				Rank (1-5)
substandard	d where it exists a oportunity for limit	ies for accesss along Appe nd there is generally no foo ed access on to Warm Lane	tway along the Appe	rley Lane site	3
Local netw	ork comment				Rank (1-5)
Congestion	on A65. Poor foot	tway connections on Apperl	ey Lane and Warm L	ane site frontages.	2
Mitigation i	measure				Total score
	provements and T ine may require ot	raffic Regulation Orders. For there measures.	ull assessment of imp	pact on A65 and	7
Support?		Need to combine with	n other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
Yes, with m	itigation				
<u>Highways</u> n/a <b>Network R</b>	<u>ail :</u>				
Biodiversit					
West Yorksl Supported	hire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported					
Natural Eng	land:				
Education					
<u>Drainage/V</u>	Vater/Flooding				
	t Agency Comm			gency Constraints:	
approach wildevelopment development soakaway; u substances; contaminated permitted un necessary, a adequate sa can be agree developers v proposed co	nderground storage sewage, trade and discharges to gless it can be derived the only option feguards against ped. Within Source will be expected to instruction of new	e consideration of the exception of the exception of the exception of the exception of the exception of the exception of the exception of the exception of the exception of the exception of the exception of the exception of the exception of the exception of the exception of the	SPZ2		

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.

High Fold Farm, Warm Lane, Rawdon, LS19 part of their proposals. **Yorkshire Water Comments:** Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme Surface water sewer in northern part of site 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 Yes No Maybe managed (Text) Yes Would gypsies and No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? Proximity to housed Yes No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** No Unknown Yes encampments (Text) **Conclusion of Assessment** Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. Development of site 3033 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, but development along with sites 1104 and 2162 would be contained by development on 3 sides. Highways consider that the site can be suitably accessed. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 214 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Site Ref: 3033

**Residential Conclusion:** 

Site Name:

**Retail Conclusion:** 

Not assessed

**Employment Conclusion:** 

Not assessed

### **Site Details**

Northing: 440375 Area sq m: 172326.38 Ward Otley and Yeadon Easting: 421684 Area Ha: 17.232638 HMCA: Aireborough

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 3: Other

Other uses: Local Nature Area

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3002.83Distance to bus stop (metres)307.46Nearest Railway StationHorsforthBus Stop ID1024SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 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: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site of Cold Harbour Farm and associated land to the south, commonly known as Rawdon Billings. Farm track runs through the middle of the site. There is little to no tree coverage on the site, which undulates. Western boundary is residential, open land stretches to the east.

#### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.77	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.08	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 %
H28/669/77/	Detached silage barn and cow c ubicle building to farm.	06/12/1977	06/02/1978	Α	12.09

### 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	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 effective	ly "round off" the settle	ement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a garea and undeveloped land?	good existing barrier be	etween 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	hysical connection of	settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a gdevelopment?	good existing barrier/b	oundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but would significantly redu	ce the green belt gap			
Assist in safeguarding countryside for	rom encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	etween the site and th	e existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the cou	intryside?		$\checkmark$	
Does the site include local or national c	onservation designate	ed areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		hat are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a a	agricultural land?			
Does the site contain buildings?	<b>✓</b> Are	these in agricultural use?	✓	
Overall countryside Encroachment Con	clusion			
The site performs an important role safe	eguarding countryside	from encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special char	racter of historic tow	ns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a consentistorical feature?	rvation area, listed bui	lding or other		
If yes, could development preserve this	character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclus	sion:			
Development of the site would have a s	ignificant effect on the	setting and special charac	eter of historic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Large site. Development would have a large area of urban sprawl. Site current nature area.				
Conformity with Core St	rategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ement	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

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

0.00

SHLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Unknown Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: Long	g term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provide	r comments and	d other planning r	requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
80% of this site is accessible to Public Transport, I services.	out only approx 30% of	the site is accessible to	2
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Bayton Lane too narrow and has no footway but nonly onto Bayton Lane. Access to Larkfield Road essential for larger site) but access not suitable duto Belmount Grove likely to be unsuitable due to justignalisation/road improvements are completed (v. Belmount Grove.	required through anoth ue to brow of hill acces unction with A658/B61	her site (this access ss visibility issues. Access 52 unless significant	2
Local network comment			 Rank (1-5)
Local congestion issues on A658, A65, Bayton La	ine.		2
Mitigation measure			Total score
No suitable mitigation for access onto Larkfield Modistribute trips on network, other mitigation around Grove.			
Support? Need to combi	ne with other sites:	Suitability for p	partial development:
No			
Highways Agency n/a			
Network Rail:			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	er: Bour	ndary Amendment	
Supported - Great Crested Newts to consider.			
Natural England:			
<b>Education</b>			
Should this come to fruition, we would request land	from part of the devel	opment for new school pr	rovision.
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environme	nt Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire V	Nater Waste Water Treat	tment 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: 3034	Site Name:	and Rawdon Billing	, Bayton Lane, Yeadon IS
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
O T	•		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	3 Assessmen	τ	
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:			
nature area. The site is large and	I development would The area and capacity	have a serious impact on the cy has been split - 2.66ha, cap	envelopes Billing Hill, a protected openness of the Green Belt and result acity of 70 in North Leeds housing
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 1888	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

### **Site Details**

Northing: 440811 Area sq m: 76431.91 Ward Otley and Yeadon Easting: 421966 Area Ha: 7.643191 HMCA: Aireborough

#### 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: SEGI on site.
Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2969.50Distance to bus stop (metres)326.37Nearest Railway StationHorsforthBus Stop ID11647SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 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 Yes Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings:

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site located between airport and Bayton Lane. Generally flat site with limited tree cover. North western side of the site contains Rawdon Ponds, an important Site of Ecological or Geological Interest (SEGI).

### **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:	0.01	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 %
H28/241/81/	Insulation of dwellings within the 45nni contour in accordance with condition 9, application number 77/28/00436	28/07/1981	24/08/1981	Α	24.57

### 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 ribb	oon development?			
Would development result in isolated deve	elopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up area	(2+ boundaries with ex	xisting built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively	"round off" the settlem	nent pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a goo area and undeveloped land?	od existing barrier bety	veen existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:				
Low potential to lead to unrestricted spray	vl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from merg	ging			
Would development of the site lead to phy	ysical connection of se	ettlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a goodevelopment?	od existing barrier/bou	ndary to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging of settlements				
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	m encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary bet	ween the site and the	existing urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the count	ryside?		<b>✓</b>	
Does the site include local or national cor	servation designated	areas?	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site include areas of woodlands significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?		at are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a ag	ricultural land?			
Does the site contain buildings?	Are th	nese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclu	<u>usion</u>			
The site performs an important role safeg	uarding countryside fro	om encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special charac	cter of historic towns	5		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation historical feature?	ation area, listed buildi	ng or other		
If yes, could development preserve this cl	haracter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	<u>on:</u>			
Development of the site would have no ef	fect on the setting and	special character of hist	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Green Belt site. The site contains a Site of suitable for development. The area not contain the site of the site o				
Conformity with Core Stra	ategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	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

HLAA Conclusion				
Availability: Short term (	0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: L	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infras	tructure provide	er comments and	d other planning	g requirements
Leeds City Council H Accessibility comment	ighways inc Metro			Rank (1-5)
Average accessibility to a	Il services.			3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Access onto adopted hig volumes of traffic.	hway achievable, Bayto	on Lane has narrow widtl	h and no footways for	
Local network commen	t			Rank (1-5)
Significant local congesti	on at peak times, unlike	ely to be able to mitigate.		2
Mitigation measure				Total score
highway works, signal im	provements			9
Support?	Need to comb	oine with other sites:	Suitability fo	or partial development:
no	yes with site 30 highway impro	034 and comprehensive vements	yes	
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversit <u>y</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology			dary Amendment	
Not supported (RED). The Rawdon Ponds Site of Ec (SEGI) - an important site Protected species). The s terrestrial feeding and hib	ological and Geological for Great Crested New ite includes breeding po	Importance ts (European		
Natural England:	-			
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flood	ling			
Environment Agency Co	emments:	Environme	nt Agency Constraint	ts:
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire V	Vater Waste Water Tr	reatment Works Comme
		Esholt		
	ment:			

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.

Utilities Gas:

Site Ref: 3326	Site Name:	Land north of Bayto	on Lane, Rawdon
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy ₋Traveller Site	e Assessmen	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)	110	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	140	Officiowii
•			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:	s a Site of Ecologica	al or Geological Interest (SEGI)	and is not considered suitable for
	ed by a SEGI is sepa		given the sensitive nature of the area
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 200	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not a	assessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 3329 Site Name: Land to rear of 22-66 Layton Lane, Rawdon, Leeds

### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 438903
 Area sq m:
 35700.67
 Ward
 Horsforth

 Easting:
 422303
 Area Ha:
 3.570067
 HMCA:
 Aireborough

#### 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:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2130.84Distance to bus stop (metres)245.03Nearest Railway StationHorsforthBus Stop ID2947

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 Yes 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Agricultural fields to the rear of properties on Layton Lane. The site is bounded to the east by a tree line, though there is limited tree coverage on the remainder of the site. Site slopes from north to 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:	1.00
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: 3329 Site Name: Land to rear of 22-66 Layton Lane, Rawdon, Leeds

Site Ref: 3329 Site Name: Land to rear of 22-66 Layton Lane, Rawdon,

Leeds

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of larg	e built up are	eas			
Would development lead to/constitute ri	bbon develop	ment?			
Would development result in isolated de	evelopment?				
Is the site well connected to built up are	a (2+ bounda	ries with ex	isting built up area)?	$\checkmark$	
Would development of the site effective	ly "round off"	the settleme	ent pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a garea and undeveloped land?	ood existing b	oarrier 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 conne	ection of set	tlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a gdevelopment?	good existing l	barrier/bour	ndary to contain	<b>✓</b>	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging of settlements					
Assist in safeguarding countryside for	rom encroacl	nment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary b	etween the sit	e and the e	xisting urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the cou	intryside?				
Does the site include local or national c	onservation d	esignated a	reas?		
Does the site include areas of woodland significant unprotected tree/hedge cover		gerows that	are protected, or	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a a	agricultural lar	nd?		✓	
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 safegu	arding the	countryside from encro	achment	
Preserve the setting and special char	racter of hist	oric towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conser historical feature?	rvation area, l	isted 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	setting and	special character of his	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Due to the enclosed nature of the site, of	development v	would have	limited impact on the (	Green Belt.	
Conformity with Core St	rategy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settl	ement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller se	ttlement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:		0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00	West Leeds Gate	way:	0.00

East Leeds

Site Ref: 3329 Site Name: Land to rear of 22-66 Layton Lane, Rawdon, Leeds

HLAA C	Conclusions					
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determ	nine Ad	chievability: Long ter	m (11+ years)
ummary	of Infrastruct	ture provider	commen	ts and oth	er planning req	uirements
Leeds City	/ Council Highwa	ays inc Metro				
Accessibili	ty comment					Rank (1-5)
Good acces	sibility to employmer	nt and Public Trans	sport, poor acc	essibility to loc	al services.	4
Access Co	mments					Rank (1-5)
between 24 between 64	ith side road off Layt  & 26 Layton Lane is & 68 but is private. nent c100 units. Sup	s wide enough to co A single point of ac	reate access t ccess would b	o the site, acce	ess also available	5
Local netw	ork comment					Rank (1-5)
Local conge	estion issues.					2
Mitigation	measure					Total scor
						11
Support?		Need to combin	ne with other	sites:	Suitability for partia	al development:
yes with mit	tigation	no				
Highways	Agency					
Network R	<u>ail :</u>					
Biodiversi	<u>ty</u>					
	hire Ecology and L			Boundary A	mendment	
beck corrido the hedgero and lowland Action Plan provided to t	rith mitigation to prot r that runs down the w/line of trees that ru mixed deciduous wo Priority habitats. A r he wooded areas ar A minimum 5 metre	eastern side of this uns across the site. codland are UK Bio minimum 20 metre and planted with nati	s site, and The beck odiversity buffer to be ve shrubs,			
valuable eas should be ke	ne of trees across the st-west habitat link and ept to an absolute mi edgerow planting els	nd any break in it fo inimum and mitigat	or access ed for by			
Natural Eng	land:					
Education						
Drainage/\	Water/Flooding					
Environmer	nt Agency Commen	its:	Env	ironment Age	ncy Constraints:	

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

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

**Yorkshire Water Comments:** 

Site Ref: 3329	Site Name:	Land to rear of Leeds	of 22-66 Layton	Lane, Rawdon,
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:			
<u>Utilities</u> 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:  Green Belt site. The site is well of	contained due to the	trees along the easter	n houndary which are	e protected by a Tree
Preservation Order and provide r impact on the Green Belt. The a site, access also available betwe level of development c100 units.	natural screening. Du dopted spur road bet	e to the enclosed nati ween 24&26 Layton L	ure of the site, develop ane is wide enough to	oment would have limited create access to the
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 93	Floorspace	sq m (Non residentia	):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Em	ployment Conclusion:
Green	Not a	ssessed	No	t assessed

Site Ref: 3331 Site Name: Land at Knott Lane/Layton Lane, Rawdon, Leeds, LS19 6JW

### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 438506
 Area sq m:
 10112.83
 Ward
 Horsforth

 Easting:
 422117
 Area Ha:
 1.011283
 HMCA:
 Aireborough

### 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 - Unmanaged Forest

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2389.26Distance to bus stop (metres)120.13Nearest Railway StationHorsforthBus Stop ID12849SFRA 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** Yes Yes 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Triangular site to the south of Knott Lane/Layton Lane junction. Site is bounded by trees to the south. There is some further tree coverage in the centre of the site, which acts as screening for small managed area of site. Site slopes 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:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Site Ref: 3331 Site Name: Land at Knott Lane/Layton Lane, Rawdon, Leeds, LS19 6JW

Site Ref: 3331 Site Name: Land at Knott Lane/Layton Lane, Rawdon, Leeds, LS19 6JW

### 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	levelopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up are	ea (2+ boundaries with e	existing built up area)?	$\checkmark$	
Would development of the site effective	ely "round off" the settle	ment pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a area 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	settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a development?	good existing barrier/bo	undary to contain	<b>✓</b>	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging of settlements				
Assist in safeguarding countryside	from encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary I	petween the site and the	existing urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the co	untryside?			
Does the site include local or national	conservation designated	l 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?		<b>✓</b>	
Does the site contain buildings?	☐ Are t	these in agricultural use	?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Con	nclusion_			
The site does not perform an important	t role in safeguarding the	e countryside from encro	pachment	
Preserve the setting and special cha	aracter of historic towr	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 hi	istoric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Green Belt site, but well contained and	would not constitute sp	rawl if developed.		
Conformity with Core St	trategy			
Major Lirbon Arass	0.00	Major Sett	Hamant	4.00
Major Urban Area:		•		1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller se	emement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:		Aima \ / = 11 =		0.00
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.

0.00

West Leeds Gateway:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

Site Name: Land at Knott Lane/Layton Lane, Rawdon, Site Ref: 3331 Leeds, LS19 6JW

HLAA Conclusion	ns			
Availability: Short term (0-5	Syrs) Suitability: LDF to	determine A	chievability: Long term	(11+ years)
ummary of Infrastr	ructure provider com	ments and oth	er planning requi	irements
_eeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment	<u>ayo mo mono</u>			Rank (1-5)
Good accessbility to all serv	rices.			5
				3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Frontage with Knott Lane g	ood, possible junction works v	vith A65.		5
				5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
_ocal congestion issues.				2
Mitigation measure				Total scor
J				
				12
Support?	Need to combine with	other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
yes with mitigation	no		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
lighways Agency				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity		D d		
Vest Yorkshire Ecology a	protect and enhance the woo		Amendment	
eck corridor that runs dowr	the eastern side of this site, a			
ooundary. The beck and low	of the way along the eastern land mixed deciduous woodla			
	Plan Priority habitats. A minimuto the wooded/beck corridor as			
planted with native shrubs, s				
latural England:				
Education				
<u> Drainage/Water/Floodir</u>		Paradeserve	man Canatasiat	
Environment Agency Com	ments:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
/orkshire Water Comment	łs·	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
The state of the s		70 Norme Water	Table Hater Heatinett	

## 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: 3331	Site Name:	Land at Knott Lane/Layton Leeds, LS19 6JW	n Lane, Rawdon,
Gas:			
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)		
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	ntly provide a realignr	stitute sprawl if developed. Could be de ment of Knott Lane to provide a 90 degr d.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 21	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Green	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 441405 Area sq m: 39030.78 Ward Otley and Yeadon Easting: 421790 Area Ha: 3.903078 HMCA: Aireborough

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space

Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Terminals and Interchanges

Other uses: Residential - Dwellings

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

☑

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3040.44 Distance to bus stop (metres) 195.57

Nearest Railway Station Guiseley Bus Stop ID 2046

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 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** Yes No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site adjacent to Yeadon Tarn, bounded by the airport to the north. There is existing residential use to the south. Site is

### **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:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H28/22/82/	Laying out of runway extension , enlarged apron area, roads , car and coach park, and erec tion of detached lighting c	03/02/1982	20/04/1982	Α	62.20
H28/241/81/	Insulation of dwellings within the 45nni contour in accordance with condition 9, application number 77/28/00436	28/07/1981	24/08/1981	Α	100.00

# 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 ril	bbon development	?		
Would development result in isolated de	evelopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up area	a (2+ boundaries w	vith existing built up area)?	<b>✓</b>	
Would development of the site effectivel	y "round off" the se	ettlement pattern?:	Yes	
Do natural/physical features provide a garea and undeveloped land?	ood existing barrie	r between existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:  Low potential to lead to unrestricted spray	awl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from me	erging			
Would development of the site lead to p		of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a g development?	•			
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 cour	ntryside?			
Does the site include local or national co	onservation design	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	agricultural land?			
Does the site contain buildings?		Are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Cond	<u>clusion</u>			
The site does not perform an important	role in safeguardin	g the countryside from encroa	achment	
Preserve the setting and special char	acter of historic t	owns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conser historical feature?	vation area, listed	building 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	g and special character of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Green Belt site. Self contained betweer rounding off of settlement.	n existing housing	and airport runway. Developr	nent would constitute	
Conformity with Core Str	rategy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settle	ement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller set	tlement	0.00
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

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

SHLAA Conclusions					
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to	o determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)				
Summary of Infrastructure provider com	nments and other planning requirements				
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro					
Accessibility comment  Poor accessibility to Public Transport and employment, go	Rank (1-5)				
	3				
Access Comments	Rank (1-5)				
Frontage with Victoria Avenue but access works required challenging. Site would need to be accessed from a new					
Local network comment	Rank (1-5)				
Significant local congestion at peak times, unlikely to be a this one.	able to mitigate all sites in area including				
Mitigation measure	Total score				
access signals/rdt will be required, poss cumulative fund	for congestion in area				
Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development:					
Yes, with mitigation no	yes				
Highways Agency  Network Rail:					
Biodiversity West Verlighting Foolers and LCC Foolers Officers	Davidani Amandurant				
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance Yeadon Local Nature Area (LNA) (immediately adjacent to north-van important site for wildfowl and passerine birds, amphibi and water voles. Provide a buffer zone between the development and the LNA of 20 metres.	west) -				
Natural England:					
<b>Education</b>					
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u> Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:				
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme				
Combined and surface water sewers cross the site and converge in the centre	Esholt				
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:	3366	Site Name:	Harrogate Road, Yeadon	(adjacent to Airport)
Electric:				
Telecom:				
	scue Services:			
Built Herita	200			
Leeds City C	_ <del>_</del>			
_	hire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heri				
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Tı	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed		(Text)		
Would gyps	sies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers li		(Text)	,	
site?				
Proximity to	o housed	Yes	No	
gypsies an		(Text)	110	
encampme	of previous	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
		,		
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment		
Conclusion su	ımmary:			
Green Belt site	. Self contained b	etween existing hous	sing and airport runway. Development	would constitute rounding off
of settlement.	Site would need to	be accessed from a	new roundabout on Victoria Avenue.	
Site Capacity (	(dwellings units)	: 102	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Co	onclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Green		Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 441562 Area sq m: 4657.09 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 420335 Area Ha: 0.465709 HMCA: Aireborough

#### 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 - Outdoor amenity & open space

Neighbouring Use 3: Retail - Shops

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1613.50Distance to bus stop (metres)131.36Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID1269

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 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 Yes No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Former Kirland House residential care home. Existing building on site surrounded by gardens. Trees form the southern boundary. Site is flat, with access onto Queensway.

#### **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:	0.01	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
08/00196/LA	Addition of conservatory with access ramp to care home	14/01/2008	07/03/2008	Α	99.47
08/9/00458/MOD	4Addition of conservatory with access ramp to care home NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Installation of air conditioning unit	17/10/2008	24/12/2008	M01	99.47
12/00548/DEM	Determination for demolition of former care home	03/02/2012	30/03/2012	Α	99.47

### 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: 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 Conclus	sions	_		
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
lummary of Infra	astructure provider co	mments and of	ther planning requ	uirements
Leeds City Council	Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility commen				Rank (1-5)
Accessibility to public	transport. employment, health ar	nd education good.		5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Access possible from	Queensway, traffic calming may	need to be reconfigure	ed.	4
Local network comm	nent			Rank (1-5)
No concern for level of	f development possible.			4
Mitigation measure				Total scor
				13
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partia	I development:
Yes	No			
Network Rail:  Biodiversity	and I CC Foology Officers	Poundari	v Amendment	
Supported	gy and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	y Amendment	
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flo		Fundament A	manay Canatnainta	
Environment Agency	Comments:	Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Com	ments:	Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme
Combined and foul sev	vers in northern boundary	Esholt		
LCC Flood Risk Mana	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	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy Traveller Site	• Assessme	nt	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	1.10	,a, ze
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	1.10	0
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
-	tial area. Site was f	formerly in residential use as a	care home. Residential use therefore
considered acceptable and no Hi	ghways issues rais	ed.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 17	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential): 0
		ail Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Residential Conclusion:		assessed	Not assessed
Green	NOL	assesseu	1401 9262260

Site Name: Kirkland House, Queensway, Yeadon

Site Ref: 4019

#### Site Ref: 4020 Site Name: Hollins Lane/Hawstone Avenue, Guiseley

#### **Site Details**

441154 Area sq m: 30432.87 Northing: Guiseley and Rawdon Ward 418346 Easting: Area Ha: 3.043287 HMCA: Aireborough

#### 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): 1177.15 Distance to bus stop (metres) 195.77 Nearest Railway Station Guiseley Bus Stop ID 3062 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00

**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

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site to the rear of properties on Hawkstone Avenue, south of junction of Hawksworth Lane and Hollins Hill. Northern side of site is flat, southern area of site slopes upwards. There is no tree cover. Site is in agricultural use.

#### **UDP** Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.84	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 Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Site Ref: 4020 Site Name: Hollins Lane/Hawstone Avenue, Guiseley

Site Ref: 4020 Site Name: Hollins Lane/Hawstone Avenue, Guiseley

# 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 d	evelopment	?			
Would development result in isolated development	nent?				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	oundaries w	vith existin	g built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "rour	nd off" the se	ettlement	pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	isting barrie	r between	existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl					
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging					
Would development of the site lead to physica	I connection	of settlen	nents?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex development?	kisting barrie	er/boundar	y to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but there is no defensible boundar	У				
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachmen	nt			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and	d the exist	ing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countrysid	e?				
Does the site include local or national conserve	ation design	ated area	s?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerow	vs that are	protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?			<b>✓</b>	
Does the site contain buildings?	,	Are these	in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>L</u>				
The site does not perform an important role in	safeguardin	g the cou	ntryside from encroa	chment	
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic t	owns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation historical feature?	area, listed	building o	r other		
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	ter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:					
Development of the site would have no effect of	on the setting	g and spe	cial character of hist	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Green Belt site. Development would form an eboundary. However, development could set a				n the eastern	
Conformity with Core Strateg	ЭУ				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		, Smaller sett		0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:	•		22		,
Inner South Leeds:	0.0	00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.0		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

Site Ref: 4020 Site Name: Hollins Lane/Hawstone Avenue, Guiseley

HLAA Conclusion	ns			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
ummary of Infrast	ructure provider co	omments and ot	her planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Poor accessibility to public	transport and employment,	health and education g	ood accessibility.	3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Access onto Hollins Hill wo with Park Rd junction which	ould require widening to proven the bull of the bull of the signalised.	vide ghost island right t	urn due to proximity	4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Local capacity issues.				3
Mitigation measure	_			Total score
Widening of Hollins Lill for	ghost island			10
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
Yes with mitigation	No			
Highways Agency Comments Awaited Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Floodii	na			
Environment Agency Com		Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Commen	ts:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
		Esholt		
LCC Flood Risk Managem	ent:			
<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: 4020	Site Name:	Hollins Lane/Hawsto	one Avenue, Guiseley
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Desité Hanita na			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:	Sandaa		
West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service.		
Liigiisii Heritage.			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would avancies and	Vaa	No	Mouleo
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	110	CHRIGWII
·			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			-
Green Belt site. Development we	ould form an extension	on to the existing residential are	a on the eastern boundary.
However, development could set			ŕ
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 80	Floorspace sq m (Nor	n residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Amber	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 443004 Area sq m: 35718.66 Ward Guiseley and Rawdon Easting: 418431 Area Ha: 3.571866 HMCA: Aireborough

#### 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:

Other uses: Pub Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):899.20Distance to bus stop (metres)166.46Nearest Railway StationGuiseleyBus Stop ID6546

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** Yes No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No No

Public Rights of Way:

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Land to the west of Netherfield Road, bounded by railway line to the west and Ings Lane to the south. Open fields are beyond the northern boundary. Public house to the south west. Tree line provides screening along this boundary. There is little tree coverage on the remainder of the site. Site slopes down towards 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:	
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

# 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 ribbe	on development?			
Would development result in isolated deve	lopment?			
Is the site well connected to built up area (	2+ boundaries with ex	isting built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effectively "	round off" the settlem	ent pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a goo area and undeveloped land?	d existing barrier betw	een 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 of set	tlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a goodevelopment?	d existing barrier/bour	ndary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging of settlements				
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	n encroachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	reen the site and the e	existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the country	yside?			
Does the site include local or national cons	servation designated a	reas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	trees, hedgerows that	are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agr	cultural land?		$\checkmark$	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are the	ese in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclu	sion_			
The site does not perform an important role	e in safeguarding the	countryside from encro	achment	
Preserve the setting and special charac	ter of historic towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conserva historical feature?	tion area, listed buildir	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 his	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Green Belt site. Site is contained by existing settlement.	ng development & the	railway line and so rel	ates relatively well to the	
Conformity with Core Stra	tegy			
Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settl	ement	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00	Smaller se	ttlement	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 Conclusion	S				
Availability:	Suitability:		A	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	ucture provider con	nmen	ts and oth	ner planning re	equirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment					Rank (1-5)
The site is outside bus and ra accessibility reasonable	ail accessibility standards bu	it local c	entre and hea	lth/education	3
Access Comments					Rank (1-5)
No footway nearside - requir	ed to achieve access				3
Local network comment					Rank (1-5)
A65 congestion.					3
Mitigation measure					Total scor
footway and TM measures					9
Cump and 2	No. of the condition of the		-11	0-16-1-116-1	
Support? yes with mitigation	Need to combine wit	n otner	sites:	Suitability for pa	rtial development:
Highways Agency Network Rail : Biodiversity					
	d LCC Ecology Officer:		Boundary	Amendment	
Not supported (RED). No site consists mainly of low lying d Action Plan Priority Habitat Linecords of breeding and winte Conservation Concern - inclu Snipe. The railway line helps function along the western both	amp grassland (UK Biodiver owland Rush Pasture) and h ering Red and Amber list Bir ding Teal, Lapwing, Curlew, to provide a wildlife corridor	sity as ds of	excluded an RM/4043. Nof an area of new wet so west. Mitigate fencing allow unauthorise nesting wilc enhance th The boundare will be so well as the soundare for the soundare fo	of wet grassland with rapes in the excluded ation will be required ing the north boundar ad access that would affowl, and measures e adjacent/on-site are	d as per drawing ired to off-set the loss in the site by creating area to the north-to provide permanent by to reduce potential disturb ground agreed to protect and leas of wet grassland.
Natural England:			арргорпасе	Planting of a minimu	m 20 mene bullet.
<u>Education</u>					
Drainage/Water/Flooding	9.				
Environment Agency Comn	nents:	Env	ironment Age	ency Constraints:	

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

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

**Yorkshire Water Comments:** 

Site Ref: 4043	Site Name:	Ings Lane, Guiseley	
		Esholt	
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:			
Cypey Traveller Site	n Assassmen	4	
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessifier		
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:			
settlement. Sufficient frontage for	r access, would requ	ire footway on frontage and cros	elates relatively well to the existing sing points to footway opposite. 3026 first is considered preferable.
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 94	Floorspace sq m (Nor	residential):

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

**Retail Conclusion:** 

Not assessed

**Employment Conclusion:** 

Not assessed

**Residential Conclusion:** 

Amber

Site Ref: 4095 Site Name: Land to west of Knott Lane, Rawdon

#### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 438657
 Area sq m:
 19246.16
 Ward
 Horsforth

 Easting:
 422040
 Area Ha:
 1.924616
 HMCA:
 Aireborough

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 2: Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2429.17Distance to bus stop (metres)60.96Nearest Railway StationHorsforthBus Stop ID14185SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 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 Yes 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Land to the east of the A65, north of junction with Knott Lane and New York Lane. Site slopes down to industrial buildings to the west. There is no tree coverage on the site.

### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.95	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	
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)

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

Site Ref: 4095 Site Name: Land to west of Knott Lane, Rawdon

Site Ref: 4095 Site Name: Land to west of Knott Lane, Rawdon

# 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					
Would development result in isolated development	opment?				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2	+ boundaries	with existing	ng built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effectively "re	ound off" the	settlement	pattern?:	Yes	
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	existing barr	ier betweer	n 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 phys	ical connection	on of settler	nents?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?	l existing barr	rier/bounda	ry to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging of settlements					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	encroachme	ent			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	een the site a	nd the exist	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	<u>ion</u>				
The site does not perform an important role	in safeguard	ing the cou	ntryside from encroa	chment	
Preserve the setting and special charact	er of historic	towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservati historical feature?	on area, liste	d building c	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	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
The site is well contained by existing develo	opment and w	ould not co	onstitute sprawl if dev	/eloped.	
Conformity with Core Strat	egy				
Major Urban Area:	0.00		Major Settle	ment	1.00
Urban Extenstion Area:	0.00		Smaller sett		0.00
	0.00		Smaller sett	iement	0.00
Regeneration Priority Area:		2.00	Airo Vallov		0.00
Inner South Leeds: Leeds Bradford Corridor:		0.00 0.00	Aire Valley: West Leeds Gatew	av.	0.00
Ecous Diagnold Collidol.	·		Loods Oalew	~j·	

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: 4095 Site Name: Land to west of Knott Lane, Rawdon

HLAA Conclusion	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:	А	chievability:	
summary of Infras	tructure provider co	omments and oth	ner planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Good access to Public Tra	ansport - reasonable to other	r services.		4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Could be developed alon Lane to provide a 90 deg	g with 3331, the sites would ree approach to the A65.	need to jointly provide a ।	realignment of Knott	3
Local network commen	t			Rank (1-5)
A65 congestion issue.				3
Mitigation measure				Total score
				10
Support?	Need to combine v	with other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
yes with mitigation	3331			
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flood	ling			
Environment Agency Co		Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ment:			
<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	Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		·
	l		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?	(Text)		
Olto :	l		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
	l		
	l		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
	l		
Conclusion of Asses	omont		
Conclusion of Asses	Sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. Site is well conta	ined by existing develo	opment and would not consti	tute sprawl if developed. Could be
developed along with site 3331; t approach to the A65. Accessibility			of Knott Lane to provide a 90 degree
approach to the Aos. Accessibility	by public transport an	id to facilities is good.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	61	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail C	Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Green	Not ass	essed	Not assessed

Site Name: Land to west of Knott Lane, Rawdon

Site Ref: 4095

Telecom: