

# Site Allocations Plan

Sustainability Appraisal Report – Non Technical Summary

Leeds Local Development Framework



Issues and Options for the Plan

June 2013

If you do not speak English and need help in understanding this document, please phone: (0113) 247 8092 and state the name of your language. We will then put you on hold while we contact an interpreter. This is a free service and we can assist with 100+ languages.

We can also provide this document in audio or Braille on request.

**(Bengali):-**

যদি আপনি ইংরেজীতে কথা বলতে না পারেন এবং এই দলিলটি বুঝতে পারার জন্য সাহায্যের দরকার হয়, তাহলে দয়া করে 0113 247 8092 এই নম্বরে ফোন করে আপনার ভাষাটির নাম বলুন। আমরা তখন আপনাকে লাইনে থাকতে বলে কোন দোভাষীর (ইন্টারপ্রিটার) সাথে যোগাযোগ করব।

**(Chinese):-**

凡不懂英語又須協助解釋這份資料者，請致電 0113 247 8092 並說明本身所需語言的名稱。當我們聯絡傳譯員時，請勿掛斷電話。

**(Hindi):-**

यदि आप इंग्लिश नहीं बोलते हैं और इस दस्तावेज़ को समझने में आपको मदद की ज़रूरत है, तो कृपया 0113 247 8092 पर फ़ोन करें और अपनी भाषा का नाम बताएँ। तब हम आपको होल्ड पर रखेंगे (आपको फ़ोन पर कुछ देर के लिए इंतज़ार करना होगा) और उस दौरान हम किसी इंटरप्रिटर (दुभाषिए) से संपर्क करेंगे।

**(Punjabi):-**

ਅਗਰ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਅੰਗਰੇਜ਼ੀ ਨਹੀਂ ਬੋਲਦੇ ਅਤੇ ਇਹ ਲੇਖ ਪੱਤਰ ਸਮਝਣ ਲਈ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਸਹਾਇਤਾ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ, ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰ ਕੇ 0113 247 8092 ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਅਤੇ ਅਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਦਾ ਨਾਮ ਦੱਸੋ. ਅਸੀਂ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ 'ਤੇ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਲਈ ਕਹਾਂ ਗੇ, ਜਦ ਤਕ ਅਸੀਂ ਦੁਭਾਸ਼ੀਏ (Interpreter) ਨਾਲ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਬਣਾਵਾਂ ਗੇ.

**(Urdu):-**

اگر آپ انگریزی نہیں بولتے ہیں اور آپ کو یہ دستاویز سمجھنے کیلئے مدد کی ضرورت ہے تو براہ مہربانی اس نمبر 0113 247 8092 پر فون کریں اور ہمیں اپنی زبان کا نام بتائیں۔ اس کے بعد ہم آپ کو لائن پر ہی انتظار کرنے کیلئے کہیں گے اور خود تہ جمان (انٹرپرائٹر) سے رابطہ کریں گے۔

**This publication can also be made available in Braille or audio cassette.**

**Please call 0113 247 8092.**

## **1.1 Introduction**

Leeds City Council is preparing the Leeds Site Allocations Plan which will identify land for housing, employment, retail and greenspace for the period to 2028. This will help to deliver the Core Strategy policies, ensuring that sufficient land is available in appropriate locations to meet the targets set out in the Core Strategy.

The first stage of the Site Allocations Plan is the Issues and Options which sets out initial ideas or options for the Site Allocations Plan. This is the first consultation stage in the preparation of the plan.

## **1.2 What is Sustainability Appraisal?**

An integral part of preparing the Site Allocations Plan is the Sustainability Appraisal, which assesses the social, environment and economic impact of the Plan. Alongside this is the requirement to carry out a Strategic Environmental Assessment which is set out in the SEA Directive. The requirements of the Directive have been incorporated into the Sustainability Appraisal.

## **1.3 Methodology**

The first stage of the Sustainability Appraisal was the review of plans, policies and programmes relevant to the scope of the Site Allocations Plan. Information referred to as baseline evidence was also collated to develop an understanding of the existing social, environmental and economic characteristics of the Leeds district. As part of this process, the Sustainability Appraisal Framework was reviewed to ensure that it could be used to assess the Site Allocations Plan. The SA Framework is explained in more detail in section 1.4 below. A Scoping Report was then prepared and subject to consultation with the SA Consultees (English Heritage, Environment Agency and Natural England) and revised to reflect the comments received.

The sites which are being considered by the Site Allocations Plan have been appraised against the Sustainability Objectives identified in the SA Framework using the approach set out in the Scoping Report. This assessment has informed the development of the Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options.

## **1.4 Key Sustainability Issues**

By looking at existing evidence for the Leeds district, the table below identifies the key social, environmental and economic issues that could be affected by or potentially addressed by the Site Allocations Plan:

<b>Social</b>	1. Provide housing provision for all
	2. Improve health and well-being and reduce health inequalities
	3. Improve access and provision of services including access to sustainable means of transport
<b>Environmental</b>	4. Prioritise development on brownfield sites in accessible locations in preference to greenfield sites
	5. Improve access to, increase the quantity and improve the quality of local greenspace
	6. Address the increased likelihood of flooding
	7. Reduce greenhouse emissions to address climate change
	8. Reduce the number of car journeys into and around the city, particularly into the City Centre
	9. Protection of biodiversity and the natural environment
	10. Preserve and enhance the historic environment
<b>Economic</b>	11. Encourage sustainable economic growth, providing new opportunities for economic development
	12. Improve the vitality and viability of the City Centre, town and local centres.

## 1.5 Sustainability Objectives

The Sustainability Appraisal Framework provides a way in which sustainability effects can be described, analysed and compared. It comprises 22 objectives, decision-making criteria and indicators which can be used to assist in the assessment of significant effects. The SA objectives are listed below:

Economic Objectives	
SA1	Maintain or improve good quality employment opportunities and reduce the disparities in the Leeds' labour market.
SA2	Maintain or improve the conditions which have enabled business success, economic growth and investment.
Social Objectives	
SA3	Increase participation in education and life-long learning and reduce the disparity in participation and qualifications achieved across Leeds.
SA4	Improve conditions and services that engender good health and reduce disparities in health across Leeds.
SA5	Reduce overall rates of crime, and reduce the disparities in crime rates across Leeds.
SA6	Maintain and improve culture, leisure and recreational activities that are available to all.
SA7	Improve the overall quality of housing and reduce the disparity in housing markets across Leeds.
SA8	Increase social inclusion and active community participation.
SA9	Increase community cohesion.
Environmental Objectives	

SA10	Increase the quantity, quality and accessibility of greenspace.
SA11	Minimise the pressure on greenfield land by efficient land use patterns that make good use of derelict and previously used sites and promote balanced development, provided that it is not of high environmental value (defined as ecological value)
SA12	Maintain and enhance, restore or add to biodiversity or geological conservation interests.
SA13	Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and thereby help to tackle climate change.
SA14	Improve Leeds' ability to manage extreme weather conditions including flood risk and climate change.
SA15	Provide a transport network which maximises access, whilst minimising detrimental impacts.
SA16	Increase the proportion of local needs that are met locally.
SA17	Reduce the growth in waste generated and landfilled.
SA18	Reduce pollution levels.
SA19	Maintain and enhance landscape quality.
SA20	Maintain and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the built environment.
SA21	Preserve and enhance the historic environment.
SA22	Make efficient use of energy and natural resources and promote sustainable design.

## 1.6 Option Selection

The role of the Site Allocations Plan is to identify sufficient land to deliver the spatial development strategy set out in the Core Strategy. Spatial Policy 1 of the Core Strategy identifies the location of development (including new housing, employment land and retail development). In relation to housing, Spatial Policy 6 identifies the housing land requirement and allocation of housing land, and Spatial Policy 7 gives the distribution across the 11 Housing Market Characteristic Area established by the Core Strategy. The preparation of the SAP and the options presented in the Issues and Options document have therefore been guided by the development parameters set by these and other relevant Core Strategy Policies.

## 1.7 Evaluation of Effects

Each site has been assessed against the 22 SA objectives. In order to achieve a consistency of approach a scoring framework was established (detailed in Table 3 of the SA Report), setting out a recommended score for sites reflecting how well the site performed against each SA objective. The scores range from a major positive effect (++) , minor positive (+), neutral (O), minor negative (-) to major negative (--). Sites with an uncertain effect are scored ?. Not all SA objectives have a full range of scores from ++ to --, this was dependant on the detailed information available to enable 5 different scores to be devised.

Table 1 summarises the results of the assessment of sites against the 22 SA objectives under the three SA themes (economic, social and environmental).

## **1.8 Monitoring**

The social, environmental and economic effects of the Site Allocations Plan are required to be monitored to identify any significant effects and enable mitigation to be taken. The Core Strategy has established a monitoring framework which will also be used to assess the effects of the Site Allocations Plan.

**TABLE 1 - SUMMARY OF SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL RESULTS**

**Retail Sites**

<b>Economic (SA1-SA2)</b>	<b>Social (SA3-SA9)</b>	<b>Environmental (SA10-SA22)</b>
<p>Implementation of the sites will create jobs and investment which is seen as a positive outcome against the objective. Sites which are currently vacant or cleared have significant positive impacts. Sites currently in use for employment have scored neutral.</p>	<p>SA objectives 3,4, 5, 7 &amp; 9 are not considered applicable to retail sites. Some sites will have positive impact where there is scope for commercial leisure development which would be an acceptable town centre use on all the expansion sites. Due to scale and location not all the sites offer this potential and will have a neutral impact. None of the sites identified would result in a loss of facilities for the activities referenced within the objective.</p>	<p>SA objective 17 is not considered applicable to retail expansion sites. Only one expansion site indicates a significant negative environmental impact due to being green field, although it is geographically well located for other objectives. This site's green field status creates a number of negative impacts across the environmental objectives. The other sites which involve recycling of previously developed land have positive or significant positive impacts against SA11 and SA22. All expansion sites, due to their location close to the existing centre score positively for SA15, 16 and 18 due to their potential to reduce car journeys, provide facilities locally, ease congestion, reduce pollution and access by public transport.</p>

## Housing Sites

<b>Aireborough</b>		
<b>Economic Objectives (SA1-SA2)</b>	<b>Social Objectives (SA3-SA9)</b>	<b>Environmental Objectives (SA10-22)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 of the sites are existing employment sites (2 fall within an unimplemented employment allocation) and scored negatively due to loss of their existing employment use. The sites within the employment allocation have been proposed for de-allocation through the employment land review.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area is generally considered to be accessible in terms of access to public transport and education and health facilities, although there are a number of sites where access to both education and health is not within the accessibility standard, however the majority of sites score positively or neutral. The scoring methodology does not account for available capacity of existing facilities to accommodate future growth. This needs to be considered and addressed as part of the site allocation process for all Housing Market Characteristic Areas (SA3 &amp; SA4).</li> <li>One site (3028) score significant negative against SA6 where an existing recreational facility would be lost.</li> <li>All sites are given the same score for Crime (SA5), housing (SA7) and community participation (SA8).</li> <li>6 sites score negatively against SA9, given the site size is considered to have a potential effect on community cohesion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The majority of sites score well in terms of greenspace accessibility, 5 sites are assessed as poor in terms of the Core Strategy Policy G3 standards and 2 sites are existing greenspace sites which score significant negative (SA10).</li> <li>There are only 7 brownfield sites, one part brownfield and greenfield and the remaining 34 sites are greenfield creating a significant negative effect (SA11).</li> <li>The ecological impact is significant negative for 8 sites, the remainder have a neutral effect or where impact is identified this can be mitigated (SA12)</li> <li>The impact on greenhouse gases, transport and local needs is largely affected by highways and accessibility, which varies significantly for different locations. 2 sites (1194 and 3033) are scored significantly negative for accessibility and highways (SA13, SA15 and SA16) and two others (2163B and 3031) are scored significant negative on accessibility (SA13 &amp; SA16).</li> <li>None of the sites are scored negatively on flood risk, reflecting the geographical location of Aireborough, which is located within an area of generally low flood risk (SA14).</li> <li>One site (1113) is identified as a waste site</li> </ul>



		<p>(SA17).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two sites (1104 and 1308) have significant negative scores on reducing pollution levels (SA18)</li> <li>• Overall the impact on landscape is scored neutral with the exception of 4 sites where loss of existing woodland is assessed to be negative. None of the sites are located within a Special Landscape Area (SA19)</li> <li>• The effect on local distinctiveness is considered to be neutral overall, however 7 sites are scored negatively where the site size is assessed to be out of scale with the settlement (SA20)</li> <li>• The effect upon the historic environment is assessed to be neutral. Only one site has a potential effect on listed buildings (SA21)</li> <li>• 7 sites perform positively where located in the Area of Search for Wind. Many of the sites are agricultural land and are scored significant negative to reflect the agricultural grade of the land (SA22)</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<b>City Centre</b>		
<b>Economic Objectives (SA1-SA2)</b>	<b>Social Objectives (SA3-SA9)</b>	<b>Environmental Objectives (SA10-22)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Half of the sites are in existing employment use resulting in a negative effect on SA1 and SA2. The remainder are neutral.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites score positively in terms of access to education and health (SA3 &amp; SA4)</li> <li>• All sites are given the same score for Crime (SA5), housing (SA7), community participation (SA8) and community cohesion (SA9).</li> <li>• All sites have a significant positive effect on SA6 given their location within the City Centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The effect on SA10 is generally negative or significant negative, reflecting the deficit of greenspace provision in the City Centre.</li> <li>• All of the sites are brownfield scoring a positive effect. 8 sites are derelict brownfield scoring a significant positive effect.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA12, although for a number of the sites the effect is unknown at this stage pending an ecological assessment.</li> <li>• For the majority of sites, the effect on SA13, SA15 and SA16 is positive or significant positive reflecting the accessible location of the City Centre.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a significantly positive, positive or neutral effect on flood risk. 10 sites have a negative effect on SA14.</li> <li>• All sites have a neutral effect on SA17.</li> <li>• Whilst the majority of sites score neutral against SA18, 19 sites score negative or significant negative.</li> <li>• All sites have a neutral effect on SA19.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA20. 11 are derelict brownfield sites where development has a significant positive effect.</li> <li>• A significant number of sites include listed buildings where retention and enhancement is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>

		<p>The effect would depend on the detailed design stage (SA21). Most of the remaining sites have a neutral effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All sites have a neutral effect on SA22.</li></ul>
--	--	---

<b>East</b>		
<b>Economic Objectives (SA1-SA2)</b>	<b>Social Objectives (SA3-SA9)</b>	<b>Environmental Objectives (SA10-22)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 of the sites are existing employment sites and are scored negative due to loss of their existing employment use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites have a negative score against SA3 and SA4 reflecting the accessibility of the sites.</li> <li>• All sites are given the same score for Crime (SA5) and housing (SA7).</li> <li>• Half of the sites have a negative score against SA6. Remainder are neutral or positive.</li> <li>• 12 sites have a negative effect on SA8. Four sites score neutral and 3 sites score positive.</li> <li>• The effect on SA9 is split between neutral and negative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The effect on SA10 varies from significant positive to significant negative.</li> <li>• The majority of sites are greenfield or part greenfield scoring significant negative or negative against SA11. 5 sites are brownfield scoring positive or significant positive.</li> <li>• 8 sites score neutral against SA12, 4 sites are negative where ecological concern can be mitigated against. 9 sites are significant negative where ecological concerns cannot be.</li> <li>• The impact on greenhouse gases, transport and local needs is largely affected by highways and accessibility, which varies significantly for different locations (SA13, SA15 &amp; SA16). 7 sites are positive or significantly positive. 11 sites are negative or significantly negative.</li> <li>• The overall effect on SA14 is positive or significant positive. One site has significant negative effect on flood risk.</li> <li>• The effect on SA17 is neutral overall. One site is scored negative.</li> <li>• The impact on SA18 is split between neutral and negative or significant negative.</li> <li>• The overall impact on landscape is neutral, however 4 sites are negative and 1 site significant negative.</li> <li>• The effect on SA20 is neutral overall,</li> </ul>

		<p>however 3 sites are large sites out of scale with the existing settlement scoring a negative impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The effect on SA21 is neutral, except one site scoring negative.</li><li>• A large number of sites are greenfield agricultural land which have a negative or significant negative score to reflect the agricultural grade of the land. One site is scored positive, the remaining sites are scored neutral against SA22.</li></ul>
--	--	--

<b>Inner</b>		
<b>Economic Objectives (SA1-SA2)</b>	<b>Social Objectives (SA3-SA9)</b>	<b>Environmental Objectives (SA10-22)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA1 and SA2, a significant number of sites are in existing employment use and have a negative effect.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overall effect on SA3 and SA4 is positive, reflecting the accessible location of the inner area.</li> <li>All sites are given the same score for crime (SA5) and housing (SA7).</li> <li>The majority of sites have a positive effect on SA6, reflecting the accessibility of the sites to existing cultural and leisure facilities.</li> <li>The accessible location of the inner area in relation to the City Centre is reflected in the positive effect on SA8 for a large number of the sites. The remaining sites have a neutral effect.</li> <li>The effect on SA9 is neutral, except for one site with a negative impact due to being out of scale with the existing settlement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The access to greenspace varies significantly across the inner area from significant positive to significant negative (SA10).</li> <li>The effect on SA11 is positive or significant positive for the majority of sites being brownfield. The remainder are negative or significant negative being greenfield or part greenfield.</li> <li>The overall effect on SA12 is neutral or negative where there are no ecological concerns or could be mitigated. 7 sites are significant negative where ecological concerns cannot be mitigated.</li> <li>Reflecting the accessible location of the inner area, the majority of sites have a positive or significant positive effect upon SA13, SA15 and SA16.</li> <li>The majority of sites have a positive or significant positive effect on SA14. 9 sites are negative and 1 site has a significant negative effect on flood risk.</li> <li>The overall effect on SA17 is neutral, however 14 sites have a negative score.</li> <li>The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA18, however 24 sites have a negative or significant negative effect.</li> <li>The overall effect on landscape (SA19) is neutral, however 13 sites have a negative impact on 1 site significant negative.</li> <li>The effect on SA20 is neutral with the</li> </ul>

		<p>exception of one large site out of scale with the settlement scoring negative and two derelict brownfield sites having a positive effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA21. 2 sites are positive, 2 sites are negative and 2 sites where the effect on a listed building depends on detailed design consideration (O?).</li> <li>• The effect on SA22 is positive, except for 3 sites with a negative or significant negative effect.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<b>North</b>		
<b>Economic Objectives (SA1-SA2)</b>	<b>Social Objectives (SA3-SA9)</b>	<b>Environmental Objectives (SA10-22)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 of the sites are existing employment sites and are scored negative due to loss of their existing employment use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of the sites score positive in terms of access to education and health facilities, although 8 sites are scored negatively where one or both is outside the accessibility zone (SA3 &amp; SA4).</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral impact on SA6 with 16 having a positive impact where located in or near an existing centre</li> <li>• The majority of sites score neutrally against SA9, although 3 had a significant negative impact where the site is significantly out of scale with the existing settlement.</li> <li>• All sites are given the same score for Crime (SA5), housing (SA7) and community participation (SA8).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites are positive or neutral on access to greenspace (SA10). 19 sites have a significant positive score and 11 are significant negative.</li> <li>• The majority of sites are greenfield or part greenfield which score significant negative or negative (SA11).</li> <li>• A significant number of the sites raise ecological concerns creating significant negative scores (SA12)</li> <li>• The impact on greenhouse gases, transport and local needs is largely affected by highways and accessibility, which varies significantly for different locations (SA13, SA15 &amp; SA16). A number of sites have a significant positive impact, but equally a number also have a significant negative impact.</li> <li>• The majority of sites do not affect a flood risk zone having a positive impact on SA14. 5 sites have a significantly negative impact.</li> <li>• All sites had a neutral effect on SA17, with the exception of site 1016.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA18, although 5 have a significantly negative effect.</li> <li>• The landscape impact (SA19) is neutral for the majority of sites, however 8 sites lie within a Special Landscape Area (significant negative) and 10 sites would lead to the loss of existing woodland</li> </ul>



		<p>(negative).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall the effect on local distinctiveness is considered to be neutral, however positive impact is identified for 5 sites. A negative impact is identified for 6 sites (SA20).</li> <li>• The effect on the historic environment is assessed to be neutral for most sites, however 11 sites could potentially have a negative effect on a listed building or conservation area (SA21).</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA22. 28 sites are negative or significant negative reflecting the agricultural grade of the land.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<b>Outer North East</b>		
<b>Economic Objectives (SA1-SA2)</b>	<b>Social Objectives (SA3-SA9)</b>	<b>Environmental Objectives (SA10-22)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 of the sites are existing employment use sites and score negative. The remaining sites have a neutral effect upon SA1 &amp; SA2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites score positively or neutrally in terms of access to education and health facilities, although 5 sites have a negative impact for both education and health as they fall outside the accessibility zones (SA3 &amp; SA4).</li> <li>• All sites are given the same neutral score for crime (SA5) and housing (SA7).</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA6. 9 sites have a positive effect where located in or near an existing centre. One site (3310) scores a double negative due to the loss of an existing greenspace.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA8, with the exception of site 1094 which could potentially have a positive effect where the large site could potentially provide new facilities.</li> <li>• The overall effect on SAS9 is neutral, however 3 sites (1055, 1094 and 1271) are considered to be significantly out of scale with the existing settlement, scoring significant negative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sites perform relatively poorly against SA10. Half of the sites have a negative or significant negative effect on access to greenspace. Only 7 sites are positive.</li> <li>• The majority of sites are greenfield, having a negative effect on SA11. 9 sites are brownfield with a positive or significant positive score.</li> <li>• For SA12, whilst the majority have a neutral effect, 19 sites have a negative score requiring mitigation against ecological effect and 7 have a significant negative score where ecological concerns cannot be mitigated.</li> <li>• The impact on greenhouse gases, transport and local needs is largely affected by highways and accessibility, which varies significantly for different locations (SA13, SA15 &amp; SA16). None of the sites have a positive effect on all 3 objectives. 3 sites have a significant negative effect and a number have mixed negative and neutral effect on the objectives.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a positive effect on SA14. 3 sites have a significant negative effect on flood risk.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA17. Two sites have a negative effect.</li> <li>• The overall effect on SA18 is neutral, however 16 sites have a negative effect.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall effect on landscape quality (SA19) is neutral. However 14 sites have a significantly negative effect due to their location within a Special Landscape Area.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA20. 7 sites are greenfield sites considered out of character with the existing settlement having a negative effect.</li> <li>• Most sites have a neutral effect on SA21, although 7 sites could detract from the character of a listed building or conservation area, scoring negative.</li> <li>• A large number of the sites within Outer North East are located within the Area of Search for Wind Energy which scores positive for SA22. The remaining sites score double negative if agricultural land outside the search area or neutral for non agricultural land.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<b>Outer North West</b>		
<b>Economic Objectives (SA1-SA2)</b>	<b>Social Objectives (SA3-SA9)</b>	<b>Environmental Objectives (SA10-22)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 of the sites are existing employment sites (1 is an unimplemented employment allocation) and scored negatively due to loss of their existing employment use. Site 313 and 320 are located within and on the edge of Otley Town Centre so could accommodate a mix of uses including employment and residential.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites score positive or neutrally in terms of access to education and health facilities, although 8 sites have a negative impact for both education and health as they fall outside the accessibility zones (SA3 &amp; SA4).</li> <li>• 2 sites are scored were significant negative in terms of SA6. The majority of sites are considered to have a neutral effect.</li> <li>• 2 sites perform significant negative against SA9 where considered to be significantly out of scale with the settlement scale.</li> <li>• All sites are given the same neutral score for crime (SA5), housing (SA7) and community participation (SA8).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites are positive or neutral on access to greenspace (SA10). 4 are significant positive to reflect the access to different types of greenspace and 1 site is significant negative where the site is an existing greenspace</li> <li>• 7 sites score positive for being brownfield, 3 are part greenfield and brownfield, the remaining majority (20 sites) are greenfield sites (SA11).</li> <li>• The ecological impact is significant negative for 9 sites, the remainder have a neutral effect or where impact is identified this could be mitigated (SA12)</li> <li>• The impact on greenhouse gases, transport and local needs is largely affected by highways and accessibility, which varies significantly for different locations (SA13, SA15 &amp; SA16). 3 sites are significant negative on accessibility (SA13 &amp; SA16). The remainder perform a mix of positive, neutral and negative scores.</li> <li>• The majority of sites score neutrally against flood risk, however 3 sites in Otley and Pool-in-Wharfedale score negatively to reflect their Zone 2 (greenfield) and Zone 3 (greenfield and brownfield) status (SA14).</li> <li>• All sites are neutral in terms of waste (SA17).</li> <li>• The majority of sites are neutral for SA18. 3 perform negatively.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall impact on landscape is scored neutral, except 4 sites within Special Landscape Areas (significantly negative) and 2 sites where the loss of woodland is assessed to be negative (SA19)</li> <li>• Positive impact on local distinctiveness is identified for 3 brownfield sites within Otley. 5 sites are scored negatively where the site size is assessed to be out of scale with the settlement (SA20).</li> <li>• Positive impact on the historic environment is identified for 3 brownfield sites within Otley. The remaining sites are assessed to be neutral. Site 2130 is assessed to be neutral, however this is dependent on an acceptable scheme designed to mitigate any effects upon Adel St John the Baptist Church (SA21).</li> <li>• 6 have a positive impact on SA22 where located in the Area of Search for Wind Energy. Many of the sites are agricultural land and are scored negative or significant negative to reflect the agricultural grade of the land.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<b>Outer South</b>		
<b>Economic Objectives (SA1-SA2)</b>	<b>Social Objectives (SA3-SA9)</b>	<b>Environmental Objectives (SA10-22)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 of the sites are in existing employment use and score negatively. The remaining impact is neutral.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to existing schools and health facilities is mixed, with a number of sites scoring negatively for at least one of these facilities (SA3 &amp; SA4).</li> <li>• The majority of sites are neutral in terms of SA6. 10 score positive given access to existing facilities and 4 are negative.</li> <li>• 11 sites score negative against SA9, given the site size is considered to have a potential effect on community cohesion. One site is significantly out of scale with the settlement scale scoring significant negative.</li> <li>• All sites are given the same score for Crime (SA5), housing (SA7) and community participation (SA8).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites have a positive impact on SA10. 7 have a significant positive impact and 1 has a significant negative impact where an existing greenspace would be lost.</li> <li>• 4 sites scored positive for being brownfield sites, the remainder are greenfield (SA11) scoring significant negative.</li> <li>• The ecological impact is significant negative for 4 sites, the remainder have a neutral effect or where impact is identified this can be mitigated (SA12) this scores negative.</li> <li>• The impact on greenhouse gases, transport and local needs is largely affected by highways and accessibility, which varies significantly for different locations (SA13, SA15 &amp; SA16). The majority of sites score neutral or positive on accessibility and highways. 1 site is significant positive and 3 sites significant negative for accessibility (SA13 &amp; SA16).</li> <li>• A negative or significant negative impact on flood risk is identified for 9 sites (SA14).</li> <li>• All sites have a neutral impact on waste (SA17)</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral impact on SA18. 5 sites have a positive impact due to being contaminated.</li> <li>• The overall impact on landscape is scored neutral, except 2 where the loss of</li> </ul>

		<p>woodland is assessed to be negative (SA19).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The effect upon local distinctiveness is generally assessed to be neutral, however there are a number of sites where the site size has been assessed to be out of scale with the existing settlement (SA20).</li> <li>• The effect upon the historic environment is assessed to be neutral for all sites (SA21).</li> <li>• 7 sites lie within the Area of Search for Wind Energy so perform positively against SA22. Many of the sites are agricultural land and are scored significant negative to reflect the agricultural grade of the land.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<b>Outer South East</b>		
<b>Economic Objectives (SA1-SA2)</b>	<b>Social Objectives (SA3-SA9)</b>	<b>Environmental Objectives (SA10-22)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 sites are existing employment sites all scoring negative. The majority of sites have a neutral impact on SA1 &amp; SA2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA3 and SA4, meaning that part of the site lies within the accessibility zone. 19 sites score negative for both objectives due to the sites lying outside the accessibility zone.</li> <li>• All sites are given the same score for Crime (SA5) and housing (SA7).</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA6. 13 sites have positive impact due to being located in or near a centre, but 16 score negative due to a relatively inaccessible location. One site contains an existing protected playing pitch scoring double negative.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA8, although a number have a negative score due to poor accessibility to existing services.</li> <li>• The overall effect on SA9 neutral, however 5 sites have a negative effect due to their scale and one site is significant negative where considered significantly out of scale with the settlement scale.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites have a positive effect on SA10 and 5 have a significant positive effect. 10 sites have a negative or significant negative effect.</li> <li>• The overall effect on SA11 is significant negative given the number of greenfield sites. 4 sites are brownfield scoring positive or significant positive.</li> <li>• The ecological impact is significant negative for 17 sites, the remainder have a neutral effect or where impact is identified this could be mitigated (SA12)</li> <li>• The impact on greenhouse gases, transport and local needs is largely affected by highways and accessibility, which varies significantly for different locations (SA13, SA15 &amp; SA16). The majority of sites score neutral or positive (3 significant positive) on accessibility and highways. 4 sites are negative on all 3 objectives and 3 sites significant negative for accessibility (SA13 &amp; SA16).</li> <li>• The overall effect on SA14 is positive, with a number of sites scoring significant positive. One site scored significant negative on flood risk.</li> <li>• The effect on SA17 is neutral.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA18, however 10 score negative and 5 significant negative.</li> <li>• The overall impact on landscape (SA19) is</li> </ul>



		<p>neutral, except one site scoring negative and one scoring significant negative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA20, with 6 sites scored negative where out of scale with the existing settlement.</li> <li>• The effect upon the historic environment is assessed to be neutral for all sites (SA21).</li> <li>• Most sites have a negative or significant negative impact on SA22 reflecting the agricultural grade of the land. A number of these sites also lie within the Area of Search for Wind Energy scoring positive.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

<b>Outer South West</b>		
<b>Economic Objectives (SA1-SA2)</b>	<b>Social Objectives (SA3-SA9)</b>	<b>Environmental Objectives (SA10-22)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 29 sites are existing employment sites, of which 4 score significant negative. The majority of sites have a neutral impact on SA1 &amp; SA2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites have a positive or neutral effect on SA3 and SA4. However 15 sites have a negative score for both objectives.</li> <li>• All sites are given the same score for Crime (SA5) and housing (SA7).</li> <li>• Most sites have a neutral effect on SA6, however there are a significant number with relatively poor access to leisure facilities having a negative score. 3 sites have a significant negative score given the loss of an existing greenspace site.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA8, although a number have a negative score due to poor accessibility to existing services.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA9, however a number are scored negative where considered to be out of scale with the settlement pattern. 3 sites are scored significant negative where considered to be significantly out of scale with the settlement pattern.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The access to greenspace (SA10) is mixed. 4 sites have a significant positive score and 7 sites have a significant negative score.</li> <li>• The majority of sites are greenfield sites scoring significant negative, however a significant number are brownfield (SA11).</li> <li>• Overall the effect on SA12 is neutral, however a significant number have ecological issues scoring negative or significant negative.</li> <li>• The impact on greenhouse gases, transport and local needs is largely affected by highways and accessibility, which varies significantly for different locations (SA13, SA15 &amp; SA16). Compared to other HMCAs the scoring is relatively positive, however there are a significant number with a negative or significantly negative impact on the three objectives.</li> <li>• The overall effect on SA14 is positive. 2 sites have a significant negative effect on flood risk.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA17, however 22 sites have a negative effect.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA18. There is a negative impact from a number of sites including 8 sites with a significant negative impact where a number of pollution sources are identified.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have neutral effect on</li> </ul>

		<p>SA19. A number would create a negative impact due to loss of woodland and 4 sites lie within a Special Landscape Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall effect on SA20 is neutral. 5 sites have a positive effect and 12 sites have a negative effect.</li> <li>• The effect on SA21 is neutral overall. 3 sites could detract from the character of an existing listed building or conservation area.</li> <li>• Most sites have a significant negative impact on SA22 reflecting the agricultural grade of the land. A number of these sites also lie within the Area of Search for Wind Energy and it is considered that housing development could have a negative impact on this given the limited land available in south Leeds.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<b>Outer West</b>		
<b>Economic Objectives (SA1-SA2)</b>	<b>Social Objectives (SA3-SA9)</b>	<b>Environmental Objectives (SA10-22)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 14 of the sites are in existing employment use and score negatively. The remaining impact is neutral.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites have a positive effect on one or both of the SA3 and SA4 objectives, demonstrating the accessibility to existing schools and health facilities is generally good. 4 sites fall out the accessibility zone for both education and health facilities.</li> <li>• All sites are given the same score for Crime (SA5) and housing (SA7).</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA6. 3 sites have a significant negative effect to reflect the loss of the existing greenspace facility.</li> <li>• For SA8, whilst most sites have a neutral effect, 5 sites are negative due to having poor access to existing services.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA9, 2 sites are considered to be significantly out of scale with the existing settlement scoring negative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites have good accessibility to existing greenspace with 5 sites having a significant positive score for SA10. 2 sites are existing greenspace having a significant negative score.</li> <li>• Most of the sites are greenfield scoring significant negative for SA11, however there are 19 brownfield sites of which 10 are derelict brownfield scoring significantly positive.</li> <li>• Overall the effect on SA12 is neutral, however there are a significant number of sites scoring negative or significant negative on ecology grounds.</li> <li>• The impact on greenhouse gases, transport and local needs is largely affected by highways and accessibility, which varies significantly for different locations (SA13, SA15 &amp; SA16). Most sites have a positive or neutral effect, however 8 sites have a significant negative score for accessibility (SA13 &amp; SA16).</li> <li>• The majority of sites had a neutral effect on SA17, however 7 sites have a negative effect.</li> <li>• The majority of sites have a neutral effect on SA18, however one site is significant negative and one site negative.</li> <li>• The overall effect on landscape (SA19) is neutral, however 8 sites fall within a Special Landscape Area (significantly negative) and 11 sites would lead to loss of existing</li> </ul>

		<p>woodland (negative).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of sites have neutral effect on SA20. 5 brownfield sites would have a positive and 4 large greenfield sites have a negative effect.</li> <li>• The effect on the historic environment (SA21) is neutral overall, although there are 7 sites having a potentially negative effect on a listed building or conservation area.</li> <li>• A large number of sites are greenfield agricultural land which have a significant negative score to reflect the agricultural grade of the land. The remaining sites are scored neutral against SA22.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

## Employment Sites

<b>Economic Objectives (SA1-SA2)</b>	<b>Social Objectives (SA3-SA9)</b>	<b>Environmental Objectives (SA10-22)</b>
<p>Implementation of the sites will create jobs and investment which is seen as a positive outcome against the objective. Sites which are currently vacant or cleared have significant positive impacts. Sites currently in use for employment have scored neutral. Sites within the city centre and town centres have significant positive impacts to help recognise Spatial Policy SP8 for new office development.</p>	<p>SA objectives 3,4, 5 &amp; 7 are not considered applicable to employment sites. Some sites may have a positive impact where there is scope for commercial leisure development which would be an acceptable town centre use, but since the exact nature of future development is unknown and as none of the sites identified would result in a loss of facilities ALL sites have scored neutral. Employment sites, depending on their scale and nature can potentially offer opportunities to increase community cohesion in respect to the workers and the knock-on trade/leisure time spent in the immediate surroundings. This is likely to have most positive impact in the city centre and town and local centre locations. However as the scale and nature of employment is unknown at this stage ALL sites have been considered as neutral.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SA10 is not considered directly applicable to employment sites.</li> <li>• The majority of proposed employment sites will have a positive impact through the reuse of brownfield land (SA11)The 25 sites that are greenfield/part greenfield have scored negatively. The sites with green field status also create a number of negative impacts across the environmental objectives. There are 9 sites that score negatively towards SA19 as they contain woodland/trees that may be lost. Other greenfield sites score negatively against SA22 as they fall within Grade 3 and in one instance grade 2 agricultural land.</li> <li>• In addition there are 6 sites that score negatively against SA22 as they fall in an area of “restricted water available for licensing” – though clearly this will depend on the type of employment use that locates in these areas.</li> <li>• In relation to SA objectives SA13, 15 and 16 it could be assumed that the sites that score positively against the SA economic objectives of SA1 &amp; 2 will be able to fulfil the provision of providing for local jobs, depending on the nature and scale for the employer. As to how far each employment site will be able to support local suppliers and services is unknown. Therefore the employment sites have been assessed to look at their local impact in regard to their potential to access</li> </ul>

		<p>the site by public transport, reducing car journeys, ease congestion &amp; reduce pollution. However at the time of scoring, not all the employment sites had accessibility data available to assess SA 13, 15 and 16 and therefore there are still a number of sites with question marks that will need to be completed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are 9 employment sites that are designated as waste sites in the Natural Resources &amp; Waste DPD and therefore score negatively against SA17, however, the use of these sites for recycling, recovering and processing waste are still an important element of the overall economic growth portfolio across the district and therefore in balance should be neutral when weighed up against the economic SA objectives.</li> <li>• At the time of scoring there are still a number of sites that were missing Ecology comments (SA12). These will need to be completed.</li> </ul>
--	--	--



## Contact Details

**Write to:** Local Development Framework  
Leeds City Council  
Thoresby House, Level 3  
2 Rossington Street  
LEEDS LS2 8HD

**Telephone:** 0113 247 78092

**Email:** [ldf@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@leeds.gov.uk)

**Web:** [www.leeds.gov.uk/siteallocations](http://www.leeds.gov.uk/siteallocations)

# Site Allocations Plan

Leeds Local Development Framework

## Issues and Options for the Plan

June 2013