

## Leeds Local Development Framework



### Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan

## Regulation 25 'Alternative Options' Consultation Report April – June 2006

---

### 1. Introduction

This report summarises the responses to the consultation on the 'Alternative Options' for the Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan. The consultation took place between 10<sup>th</sup> April and the end of June 2006, consisting of:

1. The publication of an *Alternative Options* Consultation Paper in April 2006. The paper invited written comments based around a number of alternative land use and transport options for Aire Valley Leeds (AVL)<sup>1</sup>. A questionnaire was included in order to guide consultees to respond to the key issues and to indicate their preferences for the options presented. The document and questionnaire were published on the Council's website and a facility was available to complete the questionnaire on-line.
2. Three workshop events held at Cathedral Hall in Leeds City Centre in April 2006.
3. Attendance by officers at meetings such as local forums, partnership meetings and area committees within east and south Leeds which were held during the consultation period.

The deadline initially given for responses to the consultation was 18<sup>th</sup> May 2006, although in recognition of this being this an informal stage of the process it was extended to allow later responses, particularly those which arose from attendance at regular meetings which fell outside the initial six week consultation period.

#### Structure of Report

This report is set out in two sections:

Section 2 provides further details on the consultation events held and meetings attended at which the AAP *Alternative Options* were discussed. Where possible an attendance list has been provided.

Section 3 has two parts. The first is an analysis of the questionnaire responses. The second provides a schedule of the other comments received, including those made at the consultation events and meetings. This has been grouped by issue rather than

---

<sup>1</sup> The Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan: Alternative Options - April 2006 is available to download from the City Council's website at [www.leeds.gov.uk](http://www.leeds.gov.uk).

respondent/event allowing an easier comparison of responses to each issue to be made.

## 2. Consultation Events and Meetings

### **Richmond Hill Forum 10<sup>th</sup> April, 2006**

Format: This was a regular meeting of the forum which coincided with the start of the Alternative options consultation period. Richmond Hill is one of the communities surrounding AVL. The forum is attended by local councillors, members of the public and council officers. The Area Action Plan was one item on the agenda.

A 10 minute presentation was given, accompanied by large plans showing the alternative options and context for the plan. This was followed by a 20 minute question and answer session.<sup>2</sup>

### **Workshop 1: AVL Stakeholders Held: 11<sup>th</sup> April 2006, 2.00pm - 5.00pm**

Format: This workshop was aimed at Aire Valley Leeds landowners and other local and regional stakeholders, including statutory consultees. 21 individuals attended the workshops representing 16 organisations

The workshop started with an introduction to the Leeds Local Development Framework and the Area Action Plan process. This was followed by four 10-15 minutes Powerpoint presentations covering the following themes:

- The Aire Valley Leeds Regeneration Programme;
- The marketing of Aire Valley Leeds;
- The Alternative Options for the Area Action Plan; and
- Transport issues and options

This was followed by a facilitated discussion on the AAP Alternative Options involved all the participant and the presenters . The discussion was structured around the main options for the AAP: employment uses, alternative uses and transport. This provided the opportunity for participants to give their opinion on the options, raise important issues and asked questions of the presenters.

Attendance list:

Name	Organisation
Nigel Chambers	Atlas Property Consultants
Geoff Goodwill	Chair, Aire Valley Leeds Marketing Group
Mike Boar	DTZ

<sup>2</sup> The summary of the comments made at the event are included within the schedule of comments in Section 3 of this report. This applies to all events.

Name	Organisation
Rachel Swindells	Leeds Initiative
Ian Williams	Leeds Chamber of Commerce
Andy Haigh	Policy Manager (Planning), Yorkshire and Humber Assembly
John Wignall	Towngate PLC
Robin Gallagher	Towngate PLC
Judith Vokes	Turley Associates
Rachel Furnell	Walker Morris
Bhupinder Dev	White Young Green
Neil Pinner	Yorkshire Water, Land Property & Planning
Stephanie Walden	Yorkshire Water
Medina Inamdar	Corrocoat Ltd
S Swift	Environment Agency
P Medway	N Power/DTZ
A Haigh	Y&H Assembly
I Williams	Leeds Chamber
D Haskins	Metro
Louise Porter	Metro
B Aspinall	Montpellier Estates

**Workshop 2: AVL Local Communities**  
**Held: 11<sup>th</sup> April 2006, 6.00pm - 8.30pm**

Format: This workshop was aimed at individuals and organisations from the communities located close to Aire Valley Leeds. Invitations were sent out to community organisations and individuals on the Council's Local Development Framework database. 21 individuals attended the workshop.

The format replicated that used for Workshop 1 (see above).

Attendance list:

Name	Organisation
Michael Healey	Resident
Cathy Gurney	Sure Start Middleton
Sandie Jones	Neighbourhood Learning Project
Carrie Brain	Neighbourhood Learning Project
Darryll Jackson	
Gill Knowles	Hunslet Baptist Church
Helen Lindenmayer	Hunslet Baptist Church
Wilf Higginbottom	Hunslet Baptist Church
Edward Walker	Local resident
Geoff Goodwill	Chair, Aire Valley Leeds Marketing Group
David Richmond	South Leeds Area Management Team
Stephanie Burras	Business in the Community / Leeds Ahead
R. F. Howie	The Oulton Society
Terry Lee	London Container Company
John Crapper	(Civic Society) Oulton Society
David Horner	Re'New

Name	Organisation
Andy Gubbins	St. Philips
Eric Hammond	Noise Nuisance
Andy Goven	Richmond Community Hall
Rus Meetham	Groundwork
A Wilson	Leeds Youth Service

**Workshop 3: AVL Leeds City Council Officers**  
**Held: 13<sup>th</sup> April 2006, 2.00pm - 4.30pm**

Format: This workshop was primarily aimed at officers working for departments across Leeds City Council. There were, however, a few individuals present representing outside organisations who were unable to attend the stakeholder workshop. Their comments are set out in this report.

The format replicated that used for Workshop 1 (see above).

Attendance list (outside organisations):

Name	Organisation
Lester Hill	West Yorkshire Police (Architectural Liaison)
Gerry Gallagher	West Yorkshire Police (Architectural Liaison)
Joanne Gilkes	RSPB

**South District Housing Partnership**  
**8<sup>th</sup> June, 2006**

Format: The Partnership covers the 'south wedge' of Leeds district which includes the electoral wards of Beeston & Holbeck, City & Hunslet, Middleton Park, Ardsley & Robin Hood, Rothwell, Morley North and Morley South. Membership of the partnership comprises of housing organisations working in south Leeds, including the Leeds South Housing ALMO (Arms Length Management Organisation) and housing associations, and Leeds City Council officers.

A 10 minute presentation was given, accompanied by large plans showing the alternative options and context for the plan. This was followed by a 20 minute question and answer session.

The Partnership's comments were incorporated within Re'new's written comments to the consultation.

Attendance list:

Name	Organisation
Bob Howley (Chair)	Leeds South Homes, Board Member
Martyn Broadest	Connections Housing Association
Helen Correy	Leeds South Homes
Jennie Daly	Leeds South Homes
Simon Hale	Belle Isle Tenant Management Organisation

Name	Organisation
David Horner	Re'New
Huw Jones	Re'New
Mark Ireland	LCC Environmental Health, Neighbourhoods and Housing
Dave Richmond	LCC South Area Management
Matthew Walker	Leeds Federated Housing Association
Vicki Jagger	Leeds South Homes

### **Inner South Area Committee 26<sup>th</sup> June, 2006**

Format: This area committee, covering the electoral wards of Beeston & Holbeck, City & Hunslet and Middleton Park, is one of 10 across Leeds. The membership of each Area Committee comprises all Members who have been elected for wards within the area. The committees are attended by members of the public who are able to comment on proceedings and ask questions of Council officers presenting items. They are designed to act as a focal point for community involvement.

A 5 minute presentation was given, accompanied by a plan. This was followed by a 15 minute question and answer session.

### **Inner East and Outer East Area Committees**

The Inner East Area Committee includes the wards of: Gipton & Harehills, Killingbeck & Seacroft and Burmantofts & Richmond Hill.

The Outer East Area Committee includes the wards of: Garforth & Swillington, Kippax & Methley, Temple Newsam and Cross Gates & Whinmoor.

Format: The *Alternative Options* consultation paper was circulated to members of the respective committees asking for their comments at the request of the committees themselves rather than being presented in person.

### **Hunslet Gala 24<sup>th</sup> June, 2006**

Format: The City Council had a display at the Gala which related to the Area Action Plan and the wider Aire Valley Leeds regeneration programme. This informed people how they could find out more about the Alternative Options consultation.

### 3. Written Responses & Questionnaires

40 written responses were received to the *Alternative Options* consultation. 27 of the respondents completed the questionnaire which accompanied the *Alternative Options* paper and 20 respondents provided additional detailed comments.

A list of the respondents is set out below:

Respondent	Agent	Questionnaire	Comments
Metro			✓
EWS	Scott Wilson	✓	✓
Government Office Y&H			✓
Yorkshire Forward			✓
Highways Agency		✓	✓
Keyland	Jones Lang LaSalle	✓	✓
Environment Agency			✓
Montpellier Estates		✓	✓
Skelton Business Park	Framptons		✓
ISIS Waterside Regeneration	Turley Associates		✓
East Leeds Extension Consortium			✓
Network Rail			✓
Leeds HMO Lobby			✓
South Leeds PCT		✓	✓
Home Builders Federation			✓
English Heritage			✓
British Waterways			✓
AMEC Developments		✓	✓
Aire Valley Leeds Marketing Group		✓	✓
Re'new Partnership / South Leeds Housing Partnership		✓	✓
Yorkshire Water			✓
RWE Npower	Cass Associates	✓	
London Container Services		✓	
Commercial Development Projects		✓	
Corrocoat Ltd		✓	
RSPB		✓	
CPRE		✓	
Countryside Agency		✓	
Leeds Civic Trust		✓	
Sustrans		✓	
Ramblers Association		✓	
Cllr Gail Wardwick, Kippax Parish Council		✓	
Cllr W Morley, Kippax Parish Council		✓	
Leeds Initiative (Health)		✓	
Leeds Initiative		✓	
Scholes Community Forum		✓	
Mr S Thompson		✓	
Michael Healey		✓	
Edward Walker		✓	
Oulton Society		✓	

## Questionnaire Results

### Introduction

This section sets out the results from the questionnaire which accompanied the Alternative Options consultation document. Not all respondents answered every question hence the differing number of responses to each question. Some respondents to the consultation indicated their preference for certain options as part of their written submissions (without completing a questionnaire). Where a clear preference was indicated it has been included in the results below.

The results are based on a small sample but nevertheless represent something of a cross section of those individuals and organisations with an interest in the area, including:

- local residents
- local businesses
- landowners
- statutory consultees
- nearby parish councils; and
- local interest groups.

### Employment Uses

The questionnaire asked 8 questions about the approach the AAP should take to allocating employment land in AVL. Options were put forward in the consultation paper one for office uses (3 options) and for industrial / distribution uses (2 options).

Q1. Do you support the principle of reallocating employment land for other uses, where it is shown to be necessary to underpin the regeneration of AVL?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
25	23	2	0

Q2. Do you support the principle of reallocating employment land for other uses, where it is shown that sufficient land remains to meet the long-term needs of Leeds and the wider sub-region?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
26	24	1	1

There is general support for the principle of reallocating employment land for other uses in AVL to underpin the regeneration of the area, providing sufficient land is retained to meet the longer term needs of Leeds.

Q3. Do you support mixed use development which incorporates offices on the fringe of the City Centre?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
26	22	2	2

If yes, which locations are suitable?

Responses	Area 1	Area 2
16	13	11

Over 90% of respondents who gave a view supported the concept of mixed use development incorporating offices. Both Area 1 (The Armouries) and Area 2 (Hunslet Riverside) are considered to be a suitable location for this type of development by the majority of respondents to that part of the question, with Area 1 slightly favoured out of the two.

Q4. Do you consider there is a need/role for new out-of-centre business parks in AVL?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
26	13	8	5

If yes, which locations are suitable?

Responses	Area 4	Area 5	Area 7	Area 8
12	1	6	6	7

Q5. Do you consider there is a need/role for new out-of-centre offices on key frontages in AVL?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
26	12	10	4

If yes, which locations are suitable?

Responses	Area 3	Area 4	Other
12	7	8	1

There was a more mixed response to the need/role for out-of-centre offices in AVL although the majority of those who gave a view favoured the development of further out-of-centre business parks (62%) and offices on key frontages (55%)<sup>3</sup>.

Area 5 (Skelton Business Park), Area 7 (Leeds Valley Park) and Area 8 (Stourton North) are identified as suitable locations for a business park by a number of respondents. It should be noted that 40 hectares of Skelton Business Park (out of the total site area of 72 hectares) has recently been granted planning permission for a business park and an office development is currently under construction on the remaining land at Leeds Valley Park.

Area 3 (Skelton Moor Farm) and Area 4 (Bellwood) are identified by a number of respondents as a suitable locations to accommodate office development on key frontages. Skelton Moor Farm now has outline consent for mixed employment uses, including offices. One respondent felt that all key frontages were a suitable location for new offices.

<sup>3</sup> Excluding don't knows.

Q6. Which of the following areas should be allocated for industrial and distribution uses?

Responses	Area 3	Area 4	Area 6	Other
19	9	14	8	1

Area 4 (Bellwood) is identified as an appropriate site for an industrial/distribution allocation by the majority of respondents (74%). Area 3 (Skelton Moor Farm) and Area 6 (Haigh Park Road area) have less support with 47% and 42% indicating that they should be allocated for employment respectively. One respondent suggests that industrial/distribution should be located throughout the area.

Q7. Overall which option do you prefer for office use?

Responses	Opt O1	Opt O2	Opt O3	None
28	7	9	10	2

There is little consensus on the preferred options for office uses. 25% of respondents preferring Option O1, 32% Option O2 and 36% Option O3. Two respondents did not support any of the options, instead preferring to see office uses incorporated in mixed use developments throughout the area.

Q8. Overall which option do you prefer for industrial and distribution use?

Responses	Opt IW1	Opt IW2	Other
28	3	24	1

In terms of the approach for industrial and distribution uses, there is strong support for Option IW2 which advocates allocating sufficient land for industrial and warehousing uses to meet the longer term needs of Leeds and re-allocate remaining areas for other land uses.

### **Alternative Uses**

Q9. Do you support mixed use development on the fringe of the City Centre which incorporates housing?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
26	24	1	1

There is strong support for mixed use development incorporating housing on the fringe of the City Centre. This is consistent with the answers given to Question 3 (above) which asked about office uses within mixed use developments in the same location.

Q10. Do you consider there is a need for a new 'village' or other large-scale housing development in AVL?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
27	15	5	7

If yes which locations are suitable?

Responses	Area 3	Area 4	Area 4 & 6	Area 5
14	6	4	6	2

Of the 20 respondents who answered the question, 75% agreed that there was a need for a new village or other large scale housing development in AVL. A number of the 'don't knows' indicated that they did not have enough information to be able to answer the question.

In locational terms housing on Area 3 (Skelton Moor Farm) and a combination of Areas 4 (Bellwood) and 6 (Haigh Park Road area) was deemed appropriate by the greatest number of respondents. Area 5 (Skelton Moor Farm) is considered the least suitable.

Q11. Overall which housing option do you prefer?

Responses	Opt H1	Opt H2	Other	Neither
25	7	16	1	1

Option H2 is preferred by the majority of respondents (64%). This option advocates making a large housing allocation in AVL rather than just focusing development on City Centre fringe sites. One landowner commented that neither of the options were suitable preferring a mixed use approach for the major sites.

Q12. Which option do you prefer for leisure development?

Responses	Opt L1	Opt L2	Opt L3	Other
27	7	8	11	1

There is little consensus on the preferred option for leisure uses, although Option L3, which looks to identify a site or sites to accommodate major new leisure development in the wider AVL area, is the most favoured with 41% of respondents supporting it.

Q13. Which option do you prefer for recreational facilities?

Responses	Opt R1	Opt R2	Opt R3	Other
26	2	9	14	1

The recreational options which promoted greater access to and use of the river corridor for recreational purposes received the most support, particularly Option R3 which proposes the establishment of the riverside park along the waterfront. There is little support for the AAP taking an approach whereby it only safeguards existing access to and along the river corridor (Option R1).

Q14. Which option do you prefer for waste?

Responses	Opt W1	Opt W2	Other
25	13	11	1

There is little consensus on this issue. Comments were made by respondents in respect of the options being difficult to assess because there was no information about potential sites within or outside AVL and this would have influenced their choice.

### **Transport Questions**

Q15. Do you consider there is a role for managed transport and to restrict traffic levels as part of the development package?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
26	24	2	0

If yes, which measures would you support?

<b>Number of Responses</b>	24
Restrict access to/from motorways at peak times	4
Use of parking standards	12
Use of 'smarter choice' programmes to influence and inform travel choice	14
Introduction of charges for road use and/or workplace parking	5
Integrated planning of road and public transport capacity	21

92% of respondents feel there is a role for managed transport and to restrict traffic levels as part of a development package. Integrated planning of road and public transport capacity is by far the most popular managed transport measure being supported by 88% of those who answered yes to Q15. Use of 'smarter choice' programmes and parking standards received the support of at least half of respondents. Restricting access from the motorway at peak times and road user charges is much less popular being supported by only around a fifth of respondents.

Q16. Do you support the development of an integrated high quality public transport services for the area?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
26	25	1	0

If yes, how do you believe services should be introduced?

<b>Number of Responses</b>	20
Leave the market to respond as use grows with development	1
Provided as an integral part of developments to guarantee availability as soon as sites come into use	9
Pump primed by the development of a dedicated major public transport corridor(s) through the area as a whole	17

There is overwhelming support for the development of integrated high quality public transport services for the area (96%). 85% of respondents felt this should be pump primed through the development of a dedicated major public transport corridor, with around half supporting an approach of providing it as an integral part of development site as they come into use. There is little support for leaving it to the market to determine.

Q17. Do you support the provision of a new North-South road link, including a new river crossing?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
26	21	2	3

Q18. If yes to Q17, should the proposals provide dedicated priority for public transport?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
24	19	3	2

91% of those who responded (21 out of 23) support the provision of a new North-South road link in the area to include a new river crossing. The majority also feel this link should be prioritised for public transport.

Q19. Do you support the provision of a new/improved road link to the north into the EASEL area?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
26	21	3	2

Q20. If yes to Q19, should the proposals provide dedicated priority for public transport?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
23	20	2	1

There is also support (88%) for a new road link from the north of AVL into the EASEL (East and South East Leeds) regeneration area. Again, consistent with answers to Q18, the majority felt it should be prioritised for public transport

Q21. Do you support the development of a high quality pedestrian and cycle route network for the area?

Responses	Yes	No	Don't Know
26	24	2	0

This is overwhelming support for the development of a high quality pedestrian and cycle route network for the area.

Q22. Which option would you prefer for transport?

Responses	Opt T1	Opt T2	Opt T3	Other
29	2	1	24	2

Transport Option T3 (83%) is supported by the majority of respondents, with Options T1 and T2 gaining very little support. Option T3 promotes a planned programme to implement a balanced package of measures geared to support travel plans by providing a mix of public and private transport investments. Other transport options put forward by respondents include "sustainable transport options" and "sustainable transport to include public transport, walking and cycling". Neither of these suggestions appear inconsistent with Option T3.

## **Schedule of comments made in response to the Alternative Options consultation**

The following schedule includes a summary of all the comments made in response to the *Alternative Options* consultation whether these are written responses or comments made at consultation events and meetings. The comments are grouped together under the following themes:

### **1. OVERARCHING ISSUES**

- a) General approach / Conformity with other plans, policies and programmes
- b) Infrastructure / Remediation / Knostrop WWTW

### **2. LAND USES**

- a) General Employment issues
- b) Offices
- c) Industry / Distribution
- d) Housing
- e) Leisure
- f) Recreation
- g) Waste Management
- h) Retail

### **3. TRANSPORT**

### **4. AREA SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

- a) Area 1 (The Armouries)
- b) Area 2 (Hunslet Riverside)
- c) Area 5 (Skelton Business Park)
- d) Other locations

### **5. OTHER ISSUES**

- a) AAP boundary
- b) Environmental issues
- c) Health issues
- d) River corridor
- e) Urban design issues
- f) Marketing issues
- g) Surrounding communities
- h) Education issues

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
<b>1. OVERARCHING ISSUES</b>	
<b>1a. General approach / Conformity with other plans, policies and programmes</b>	
<p>Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have a sufficient range of alternatives been presented? Should more limited overall growth be considered or no growth of certain types of development.</li> <li>• RSS would not support the type and extent of some of the development envisaged. PO will need to conform generally with RSS.</li> <li>• Any plans for significant development of office, retail and leisure uses need to be considered against PPS6 &amp; PPG13 e.g O3, L3. If there is conflict could be a soundness issue.</li> <li>• Relationship with City Centre AAP in particular extent and type of growth and land uses should be considered.</li> <li>• Are all opportunity areas genuinely open to suggestion for a range of uses?</li> </ul>
<p>Keyland Developments Ltd (KDL) (Jones Lang Lasalle)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subsidiary of Kelda group (KG), the holding company of Yorkshire water (YW). KG own 182 ha of land in AVL, KDL own 46ha of that:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ensure activities do not impinge on the ability of YW to meet their ongoing statutory obligations – to provide water and sewerage services</li> <li>- influence development plans to ensure that environmental constraints and opportunities are taken into account and</li> <li>- optimise the value of surplus assets.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The consultation paper fails to grasp the real issues.</li> <li>• Regeneration should be consistent with the Government's Urban Renaissance and sustainable communities' agenda.</li> <li>• Concern that this document will be a pre-cursor to the Preferred Options which will not implement the Strategic Vision (2002) because it:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- fails to highlight and facilitate the unique opportunity</li> <li>- fails to take account and manage the impact of the significant environmental constraints, infrastructure and remediation costs</li> <li>- lacks the foundation of sound master planning – wide mix of uses</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The AAP must consider what land uses can be achieved to maximise regeneration benefits before land use patterns are defined by existing constraints.</li> <li>• To ensure the AAP is sound a masterplan and attributable costs need to be established via a study.</li> <li>• There has been lack of consultation with landowners and key stakeholders.</li> <li>• No indication of delivery or viable procurement.</li> <li>• KDL is concerned that there are insufficient public sector funds or resources to facilitate the master planning and deliver the objectives.</li> <li>• A masterplanning exercise needs to be undertaken to:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- address economic physical and social issues</li> <li>- introduce a wide range of uses including leisure and retail.</li> <li>- create 1 or 2 centres to support balanced regeneration</li> <li>- provide a sustainable transport package</li> <li>- address the impact of odours</li> <li>- introduce a phasing plan</li> <li>- establish costs</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The AAP fails the test of soundness – as it does not set out the evidence base to identify options and in accordance with paragraph:4.24, 4.9, 3.6 of PPS12.</li> <li>• KDL is committed to participate in the delivery of this unique opportunity for a planned, sustainable, mixed use dev and asks that LCC work with key landowners in the development of a masterplan for AVL that can inform the PO early next year.</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
Re'new & South District Housing Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent is it realistic to expect to achieve an uplift in land value to the extent that abnormal infrastructure costs can be delivered? Is there opportunity for public sector pump-priming for defined priority projects?</li> </ul>
ISIS (Turley Associates)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for City Council to make a clear statement on how the various land uses and infrastructure requirements can be developed along side each other.</li> <li>Need for Partnership Working.</li> </ul>
Montpellier Estates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RSS Policy LCR2 D relates to the AV as an economic development opportunity and EASEL as a housing regeneration opportunity. Does not believe that RSS envisages significant residential development in the AV.</li> </ul>
Skelton Business Park (Framptons)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AAP fails the test of soundness (PPS12 para 4.24), strategies, allocations and policies must be founded on a robust and credible evidence base. There are unrealistic expectations about the availability of infrastructure transportation and resources (PPS12 para 4.9).</li> <li>The Council has failed to deliver a regeneration programme for the Aire Valley over a number of years i.e. it has nor been able to issue planning permission in the AV for several years. There is no indication that the financial or personnel resources are available.</li> <li>AAP represents a series of separate land allocations whereas AV is of a scale where mixed use planning can be achieved - a master planner is required.</li> <li>There should be an emphasis on mixed use development on major sites including Skelton.</li> </ul>
Yorkshire Forward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RSS support for idea that AV is sub regionally significant employment regeneration terms.</li> </ul>
Richmond Hill Forum (10/4/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the links between the AAP and the Strategic Vision of 2002 which promised deliver jobs, public transport and environmental improvements?</li> </ul>
<b>1b. Infrastructure / Remediation / Knostrop WWTW</b>	
Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence required to support the scale of land likely to be needed for different types of development e.g. genuine need (ELR). Also needed to justify associated infrastructure required. If development required to fund infrastructure/remediation is not normally acceptable must justify. Is the step change justified if it requires a disproportionate amount of fund-generating development. Detailed evidence needed for remediation and KWWTP works.</li> </ul>
Keyland Developments Ltd (KDL) (Jones Lang Lasalle)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No expectations about the delivery of infrastructure etc i.e. evidence to support a new treatment plant.</li> <li>YW has indicated that its current investment programme will result in the removal and replacement of the filter beds (removing any risk of fly emergencies). However, odours (reduced) will still be a problem for <u>much</u> of the area – further mitigation (not removal of the filter beds) could be carried out if financed by developers from enhanced land values. A new treatment plant is not part of YW's current proposals.</li> <li>YW/KDL has not received evidence of remediation costs. Some work has been undertaken by YW/KDL which indicates that the costs referred to are unrealistic.</li> <li>Added value needs to be balanced against infrastructure costs.</li> </ul>
Home Builders Federation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inappropriate to identify sites when such significant infrastructure requirements are undetermined which may bring into question viability of development.</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
<p><b>Montpellier Estates</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The stated objectives of AVL is to secure new investment and jobs and to promote an access to employment networks to maximize opportunities for jobs and training and to support new and existing businesses.</li> <li>• Accept that the Works and former sludge lagoons represent a constraint. Remediation of the lagoons which are heavily contaminated would allow further development land to be realised.</li> <li>• Kelda is privately sector utility company-why would public sector or planning gain be diverted to benefit Kelda. If this is in the public interest who is scrutinising the costs on behalf of the council; what are the full costs and benefits of such investment. This should not be at the cost of loss of employment land-major leisure and residential use to fund this change is not sustainable. More effective use would be to spend on other major transport works. There is no need for higher value uses to be physically located in the AVL for the benefit to be recycled into Knostrop or any other projects.</li> <li>• If AVL is to accommodate the manufacturing and distribution uses why does KWWTW need to be moved or remediate to such an extent over and above the standard that Kelda are statutorily obliged to meet.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Skelton Business Park (Framptons)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The council estimate of £250 million for a new treatment plant and cleaning up of contaminated land associated with KWWTW. This must be based on a credible estimated of costs including source of calculations, basis for calculation, date, phasing and credible analysis that the land uses identified can support these costs and requirements. Costs might indicate the development to be unviable-Yorkshire Water have already indicated that the possibility of housing on or near the filter beds is very unlikely. Public and development industry can derive no confidence from this lack of evidence. In the absence of the availability of resources KWWTW is not realistic and should not be pursued further. The public interest is not well served by visions having little prospect of delivery. The council should put forward options that are realistically achievable and should not expect developers and investors to make commitments if viability of development is uncertain or at risk by planning constraints i.e. via the Highway Agency.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Yorkshire Water</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Works will be taking place at Knostrop WWTW between 2006 and 2010 to ensure compliance with the Freshwater Fisheries Directive (FFD) by 2010. The scheme will provide environmental benefits with respect to water quality within the River Aire and modern treatment technology will allow us to reduce the overall footprint of the works. This applies only to the High Level works.</li> <li>• Also undertaking a project designed to improve odour control at the site. This will install new plant in the High and Low Level sludge processing areas and on the storm tank mixers. The scheme mitigates existing odour levels but will not eliminate it.</li> <li>• Also completing restoration work to No. 1 lagoon.</li> <li>• History of odour complaints associated by WWTW. Most come from First Direct offices (1km away) and the car auction on Pontefract Lane.</li> <li>• May assist to take into account what YW believes to be the threshold for acceptable odour limits with regard to residential and similar (hotels, offices) development.</li> <li>• The odour concentration at the detection threshold is defined to be <math>1 \text{ ou}_E\text{m}^{-3}</math>. It is impossible to measure odour at this level. Research suggests that few complaints are received at exposures below <math>5 \text{ ou}_E\text{m}^{-3}</math>. Thames Water's Reading site was designed to achieve <math>5 \text{ ou}_E\text{m}^{-3}</math> at the nearest receptor. Suggest a threshold of <math>5 \text{ ou}_E\text{m}^{-3}</math> is utilised for residential development but may still generate a small number of complaints. Different thresholds may be suggested by other consultees.</li> <li>• Odour modelling undertaken by YW suggests that of the 8 Key Development Sites identified in the AAP, Areas 3 (Skelton Moor Farm) and 4 (Bellwood) would fall</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
	<p>entirely within the zone shown to have odour levels above 5 ou<sub>E</sub><sup>m-3</sup>. Area 5 (Skelton Business Park) would be significantly affected whilst Area 6 (Haigh Park Road) would be partially impacted. Modelling was based on a post odour control scenario.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommended that land use decisions within the AAP should be based on odour modelling that takes into account changes in the layout of the WWTW. This would be in accordance with PPS23.</li> <li>• Strongly support a sequential approach to infrastructure provision to allow release of sites for development. This will maximise the opportunity to ensure that adequate water and sewerage infrastructure is in place, prior to commencement or occupation of the development.</li> <li>• A sequential approach will allow YW to align development with its 5 year investment plans. Would expect any shortfall in funding to be met by the developer via a legal agreement.</li> <li>• Knostrop processes currently go beyond what is required by statute rather than meeting minimum requirement as stated in the AAP consultation document.</li> <li>• Correct that major and expensive works would be needed to mitigate malodour, we are unsure how the figure of £100m quoted in the AAP has been calculated.</li> <li>• A figure of £250m is quoted here with respect to overcoming infrastructure shortcomings and the presence of the WWTW. Not clear how this figure has been derived.</li> <li>• AAP expresses the desire that the filter beds are replaced with new enclosed plant. There appears to be a misunderstanding that the filter beds are the primary source of odour when it is the sludge processing operation that causes most malodour. Likely that a proportion of the filter bed area will be released within the next 5 years. However, a section will have new plant built on it as part of the FDD scheme, whilst we wish to retain a further area for "future proofing".</li> <li>• Knostrop No 1 lagoon is currently being restored to mitigate levels of contamination. There are currently no plans to release it from YW operational land for redevelopment. If this situation changes further remediation would be required for built development.</li> </ul>
<p>AVL Workshop 1 (11/4/2006)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be careful not to underestimate the costs involved at Knostrop WWTW. 4,000 homes will also need waste services.</li> </ul>
<p>AVL Workshop 2 (11/4/2006)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can higher land values in one area be used to pay for infrastructure improvements elsewhere in the area?</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. LAND USES</b></p>	
<p><b>2a. General Employment issues</b></p>	
<p>Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationship with YF Cluster Development strategy needs to be explained.</li> </ul>
<p>British Waterways</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AVL should remain predominantly an employment area.</li> <li>• Heavy industry in areas with good access to the motorway and B1 in waterside locations – perhaps target technology/knowledge based industries – where the waterside location provides an enhanced working environment.</li> </ul>
<p>Re'new &amp; South District Housing Partnership</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the commitment to particular business clusters as proposed within the City Growth Area – for instance, certain high-tech clusters could offer a cross between office/lab/light manufacturing which could potentially be good for the image of AVL and compatible with a range of other uses including residential?</li> </ul>
<p>Yorkshire Forward</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSS support for idea that AV is sub regionally significant employment regeneration</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
	<p>terms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must be match between employment and skills and economic regeneration for the local community.</li> </ul>
<p>Montpellier Estates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area has been focus of employment/economic development strategies. The ELLR will create certainty and allow developers / landowners to plan for employment uses.</li> <li>• Yorkshire Forward consider AVL as an employment location.</li> <li>• AVL website say it's the mostly significant area for new investment and employment for 29k new jobs in 10-15years as the economic heart of Leeds.</li> <li>• There is unsatisfied demand from Leeds employers for industrial property requirements. AV can stem loss of manufacturing and distribution allowing businesses to relocate particularly from city centre locations.</li> <li>• Whilst B1, B2, B8 needs will vary over time there is still need to provide employment land within Leeds to meet market led demands.</li> <li>• Concern is expressed that developers will hold back land on the off chance that housing or higher values are on offer from options document. This will delay implementation of schemes and hinder development of AVL for employment uses. Changing the land use mix significantly away from B1, B2, B8 to residential/leisure dilutes the offer/brand of the AVL as an employment location.</li> <li>• Leeds Growth Area and RES are based on business clusters which require good land supply. Support work of Leeds and YF to identify and nurture business clusters and land to be made available for businesses to expand. An example is the Advanced Manufacturing Park at Waverley Rotherham. It does not need to be restrictive as Rotherham but at least hold the line in relation to B1, B2, B8 if clusters in Leeds area to develop. This will ensure the Council and Yorkshire forwards approach to cluster growth policy can be delivered within the broad parameters of B1, B2, and B8.</li> <li>• There is a fine balance between the rigidity of a narrow industry sector and policy capitulating to higher value land uses. Policy should allow the flexibility for developers to deliver premises required by the occupier market (B1, B2, and B3) this is the best for long term growth.</li> <li>• Advancing other uses i.e. housing and leisure will undermine the cluster growth aims; create uncertainty with landowners/developers who will not develop today but tomorrow in the chance of higher land values in the future; the Council by advancing these options is contributing to the hindering effect.</li> <li>• Support for 'Business as usual' scenario. This does not mean this is a secondary approach there are exciting and challenging times under the business as usual scenario.</li> <li>• There is scope to provide high quality high value development along the new road without remediation of Knostrop-there is scope under existing B1, B2, B8 to provide office and mixed use development closer to the City Centre; high quality business parks removed from Knostrop with general manufacturing distribution closer to Knostrop.</li> </ul>
<p>The Oulton Society</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is essential to provide suitable jobs and skills for local people – this would also reduce transport difficulties.</li> </ul>
<p>RWE Npower (Cass Associates)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocations in the adopted UDP will inevitably influence the AAP. Some allocated sites progress has been made on planning and implementing employment uses. This needs to be recognised. On other sites employment use is neither practical nor likely – these might be considered for other uses.</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
AVL Workshop 1 (11/4/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market will determine demand for employment uses. Need to allow local firms to grow <u>and</u> provide an opportunity for inward investment</li> <li>• Should allocate land for all B-uses rather than differentiating sites for offices (more flexible)</li> <li>• Need to look at the capacity for existing businesses to expand and what capacity is brought forward by the following schemes and illustrate this:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leeds Valley Park</li> <li>- ELLR</li> <li>- Bridge Crossing</li> <li>- Other infrastructure</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Need to consider what types of business we want? Is it sheds or should we be exploiting links to universities and encouraging higher value uses?</li> <li>• Need to share the recommendations of the Leeds City Growth Strategy – growth held back by premises constraints particularly freehold.</li> <li>• Although there is an oversupply of employment land – is it of the right type?</li> <li>• RSS – The region has far too much employment, some of it in the wrong place. Guidance to local authorities is that there may be a need to reorganise their portfolios.</li> </ul>
AVL Workshop 2 (11/4/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the Knostrop issue moving the AAP away from considering the most appropriate uses?</li> <li>• Where do existing employees in Aire Valley come from? There is no guarantee that employers will give jobs to local people. Are we doing enough in this respect?</li> </ul>
Inner South Area Committee (26/6/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to options which would result in a loss of employment land.</li> </ul>
<b>2b. Offices</b>	
Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionable that office development would make public transport more viable without complementary measure to discourage or restrict car use.</li> </ul>
Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option O1 is the most desirable as it assists in creating linked trips. Office development viable within walking distance of central bus station.</li> <li>• Office development in fringe locations and on public transport routes preferred to out of centre locations. However, public transport access to office development can be more viable than industry e.g. office working hours rather than shifts and greater employment densities.</li> </ul>
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Office development within the city centre and its fringe (O1 and O2) would increase the risk of flooding. All the O3 sites have potential flooding constraints except Leeds Valley Park.</li> </ul>
English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option O1 – There are a number of listed buildings in the Fearn's Island area. There is a need to ensure that proposals, particularly those proposing tall buildings – will not have an adverse effect upon these historic assets.</li> <li>• Option O3 – Have significant reservations about the impact which development of office buildings at certain locations with Skelton Moor Farm, Bellwood and the Skelton Business Park upon the Registered Historic Park and Garden at Temple Newsam and on the views from its principal building.</li> </ul>
EWS (Scott Wilson)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within Hunslet East site the western end has the greatest potential for office use as it would have a frontage onto South Accommodation Road and could screen industrial uses behind.</li> <li>• Option O3 is supported. If mixed use areas and communities are to be developed</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
	<p>then residents in the AVL area will need a variety of employment opportunities readily available to them, without having to travel into the city centre.</p>
<p><b>Metro</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Office development within walking distance of railway station should also include along key public transport alignments.</li> <li>• Out of centre should only be allowed in the vicinity of key transport links</li> </ul>
<p><b>Network Rail</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest it somewhat bizarre that the development of J45 for out of town offices can even be contemplated when so much brownfield land still lies available, throughout the city. Motorways are a means of transport between cities not to act as a focus for development themselves. Development at J45 would only feed the congestion problem. The City centre should be maintained as the focus office development at the hub of extensive local passenger train services and bus network. (Question 7 Option O1)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aire Valley Leeds Marketing Group</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although all the locations listed are suitable, not all of them should be allocated for office use. Too many office locations in AVL would be inappropriate. Choice is good, but the market can only take so much. If too many locations were earmarked for these uses, it would dilute the attraction of the individual sites. The consequent risks and uncertainties could well prove to be a deterrent to implementation, particularly in view of the high infrastructure costs to be incurred 'up front' in opening up the sites.</li> <li>• The range of uses in some of these locations may change as a consequence of (i) PPS6 (ii) consultation process (iii) the City Council's HMA and ELR (iv) market forces e.g. housing and leisure uses may need to be considered. Reference should be made to existing office consent and the fact that Leeds Valley Park is already part developed.</li> <li>• Should exclude Option O1, as it is important for AVL to have a range of office locations. These sites will be within easy walking distance of other modes of public transport and close to where people live in and around AVL.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Yorkshire Forward</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• O1 - Should be in sustainable locations accessible to residents by sustainable modes of transport to support regeneration/renaissance and reduce travel particularly by car. Sites should be accessible from the City Centre in line with PPS6 to support vitality of City Centre and renaissance</li> <li>• O2 - Key consideration should be to provide full range of office and business use. It might be an option 2 if part of mixed used development but only in supporting locations in city centre and only if well served by public transport to surrounding communities</li> <li>• O3 - It is acknowledged that a separate market exists for out of centre offices; in providing a buffer to housing uses and in supporting viability of public transport.</li> <li>• However out of centre demand may be being met elsewhere and evidence for the O3 approach would be needed. May increase use of private car, increase congestion, worsening air quality and reduction in benefits to local community as people will commute from elsewhere.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Yorkshire Water</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadly support Option O3. Have concerns regarding location of B1 uses in relation to proximity of the WWTW, particularly Areas 3 and 4. The options appraisal suggests this disadvantage could be overcome by provision of a new treatment plant and that office development would provide a higher value use which could help pay for new infrastructure. The Council must demonstrate that sufficient value could be released to pay for the works required to eliminate the impacts of the WWTW.</li> </ul>
<p><b>AVL Workshop 1 (11/4/2006)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leeds Valley Park and Skelton Business Park provide an opportunity to create</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
	<p>something different in the market including a landscaped, high quality environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are two different markets for office (out of centre and City Centre).</li> <li>• Offices located close to the motorway give rise to traffic generation issues.</li> </ul>
<p>AVL Workshop 2 (11/4/2006)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skills Audit – what did it reveal in terms of employment aspirations?</li> </ul>
<p><b>2c. Industry / Distribution</b></p>	
<p>Highways Agency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option IW1 would allow for a large area of industry which could benefit from businesses clustered together resulting in fewer HGV trips. Needs to be carefully planned for public transport.</li> <li>• Option IW2 lends itself well to the notion of creating sustainable mixed communities. Balance and location of other uses needs to be carefully considered.</li> </ul>
<p>EWS (Scott Wilson)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Hunslet East site supports three general industrial uses, all of which are industrial (B2) uses.</li> <li>• Option IW2 is the most appropriate approach given that residential development has been approved at Hunslet Mills. Reallocation of remaining sites in the wider area for alternative uses would provide more amenable living conditions and support the aspirations of PPS1.</li> <li>• Need to maintain a range of site sizes and types across the whole of Leeds rather than focusing on one area of the city. Expanding businesses in other areas of the city may not wish to relocate to the other side of the city for workforce reasons.</li> </ul>
<p>Metro</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IW2 favoured as it enable a greater land use mix.</li> </ul>
<p>Aire Valley Leeds Marketing Group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B2/B8 planning consents for parts of Bellwood and Skelton Grange will need to be reconciled with other potential uses under consideration</li> <li>• Part of the Haigh Park Road area may also be suitable</li> </ul>
<p>Yorkshire Forward</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefit of AV is the provision of large sites not found elsewhere in the region and close proximity to the motorways</li> <li>• Need in AV to get away from traditional industries including provision of wider range of office and business use</li> <li>• However proposal needs to be satisfied that a plan is required for long term needs particularly if manufacturing clusters are not to be compromised.</li> </ul>
<p>Leeds Civic Trust</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept infrastructure has to be funded but it is not appropriate to lose some of the last appropriate sites in the City. Would not want to see significant reallocation.</li> </ul>
<p>Yorkshire Water</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Option IW2. Land that is most affected by the presence of the WWTW is generally suited to B2 &amp; B8 uses (although would have concerns about food processing in these areas)</li> </ul>
<p>AVL Workshop 2 (11/4/2006)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the land values of hi-tech business parks compared to other uses?</li> <li>• What happens to traditional industrial uses such as container depots? They have got to go somewhere and Leeds is one of the busiest parts of the country for container transport</li> <li>• Industry / Distribution may be better for local residents in terms of accessing employment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2d. Housing</b></p>	
<p>Government Office for Yorkshire and the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would housing be viable in all areas put forward bearing in mind competing sites and remediation and new infrastructure requirements</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
Humber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing will need to be addressed</li> <li>• Balance between housing and employment on the fringe of the City Centre needs careful consideration</li> <li>• Has consideration been given to provision of land for gypsies and travellers</li> </ul>
Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option H1 is more sustainable in its proximity to a wide range of employment.</li> <li>• Option H2 A and B would require new community and social infrastructure. Impact of HGV traffic during construction needs to be taken into account – therefore cautious.</li> <li>• Option H2 C would not be acceptable in terms of sustainability and impact of the strategic highway network. Mixed use scheme could be more acceptable than just offices because the number of vehicle trips would be lower.</li> </ul>
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Centre has a high risk of flooding. Increase more vulnerable uses such as residential into these areas will increase the risk. Need to consider the biodiversity implications of development in the Armouries and Hunslet Riverside area (Areas 1 &amp; 2).</li> <li>• The following environmental constraints identified:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Skelton Moor Farm – watercourses on site, native crayfish – requires large set back zones</li> <li>- Bellwood / Haigh Park Road – Large proportion of site at high risk of flooding – represents worst site only to be considered if sequentially preferable sites exhausted; very high conservation value along river side; former landfill site; No1 lagoon currently being capped to reduce pollutants (would not be stable enough to support housing under current scheme)</li> <li>- Skelton Business Park – Adjacent to area of high flood risk (south west of site)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Options H2A and H2C could both impact upon the setting of Temple Newsam. Any residential development of this area should include the requirement for the creation of a landscaped buffer along the park's boundary.</li> </ul>
East Leeds Extension Consortium (Dacre Son & Hartley)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally supportive of development of the fringe of the city centre that incorporates housing development</li> <li>• Have concerns that the Council is using an AAP to introduce the concept of new settlements that have not been adopted in the UDP Review and have not been considered and emerged from a wider LDF Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal. Does not conform with the sequence for allocating major housing sites as part of the LDF process.</li> </ul>
British Waterways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some waterside areas suitable for high quality, high density housing.</li> </ul>
Metro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing supported as it may encourage people to live and work in AVL. Need to link such areas with employment opportunities – developer contributions should fund public transport infrastructure.</li> <li>• Skelton Business Park is the least desirable location, being separated by the M1 from the rest of AVL and its proximity to the motorway could result in high levels of road based commuting into the city.</li> </ul>
Network Rail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support H1 (Question 11) – providing it reflects the UDP Review inspector's recommendation.</li> </ul>
Aire Valley Leeds Marketing Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst such development should integrate with its surroundings, it should also become a destination in its own right. It would need to be of sufficient size to become</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
	<p>a sustainable community, capable of supporting public transport, schools and other facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be that only part of the Haigh Park Road area is suitable.</li> <li>• Skelton Moor Farm is not an appropriate location for large-scale housing, and that the size and location of the site represents an early opportunity to provide employment generating development to coincide with completion of the ELLR.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Re'new &amp; South District Housing Partnership</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South District Housing Partnership supports affordable housing in the area, whilst also recognizing the need to attract developers who can contribute to infrastructure costs. Affordable housing could offer a mix of rental, sub-market sale and shared equity models.</li> <li>• There should be scope within AVL for new housing, a new village in the area proposed would link well with the emerging M62 housing market between South-East Leeds and North Wakefield (Castleford/Pontefract etc).</li> <li>• The proposal for housing on the site close to Halton Moor would provide greater connectivity for Halton Moor and provide the opportunity for a mixed tenure 'housing ladder' approach to be put in place providing 'pathways' from social rented housing through intermediate shared equity/sub-market rented housing to full market housing for sale.</li> <li>• However, the potential housing developments identified are planned for a long time into the future and are highly dependent on action being taken on the sewage treatment works. Accordingly it is hard to fully respond as so much could happen in housing market terms between now and when development would be likely to take place. It may be prudent to keep those proposals under review.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Home Builders Federation</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally supportive of housing on the fringe of Leeds City Centre.</li> <li>• Concern about any alternative sites which refer to a 'village' without robust evidence to support such a commitment.</li> <li>• Not appropriate to limit housing to the 2 options without further information.</li> <li>• Would have concerns about new housing allocations being advanced ahead of existing commitments and allocations.</li> <li>• Would have concerns about new allocations being promoted in advance of a Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal which will identify and test strategic options.</li> <li>• HMA must be done to provide robust evidence base to support locations of new development. HBF need to be involved from the start.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Yorkshire Forward</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for wider range of uses to provide for mixed balanced, communities attracting inward investment to fund infrastructure costs.</li> <li>• Scale of housing provision needs to be carefully balanced for maximum opportunity for local people but does not impact negatively on areas suffering from low demand.</li> <li>• Balance to be struck between employment and residential so that long term employment use is not lost to residential.</li> <li>• Locational choices should be governed by sustainable modes of transport i.e. cycling, walking and accessibility to City Centre services.</li> <li>• A quality location can be provided by the city centre waterfront area improving the visibility and viability of the area.</li> <li>• New residential development needs to be supported by local facilities and services to ensure quality of life and reduce the need to travel. However any new retail/leisure facilities must be of an appropriate scale which will not undermine role of the city centre.</li> <li>• Housing should not be located adjacent to the motorway network - such locations will encourage commuters, congestion and impact on air quality.</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
Leeds HMO Lobby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AAP should consider whether student housing developments are a suitable land use in line with the UDP Review Policy H15A and whether they should be specifically provided. Policy H15A supports development sites in five criteria concerned with transport, connections, viability, intergration, regeneration and impact on local housing stock.</li> <li>• Support a mix and balanced community of students and advance the Option H2 for new student accommodation and specifically:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Area 1: The Armouries as this already functions as a popular choice for the development of student accommodation.</li> <li>2. Area 2: Hunslet Riverside - UDP proposed alteration 15/014 indicates that the Strategic Housing allocation will take into account the opportunity for student housing development. Part of Cross Green/East End has been identified as having advantages as a location (Unipol Student Homes, Jan 2006).</li> <li>3. Areas 4&amp;6 Proposed new village in the Aire Valley. Would support student housing on the grounds of mix, sustainability and in terms of the market needs of the 2 HEI's in Leeds. In terms of housing types the student market is changing with older students, students for overseas, some with families. Area 4 &amp; 6 are therefore supported.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
Montpellier Estates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AVL HMA indicated that housing was viable in the AVL, could deliver higher values close the funding gap and could be done without adversely impacting on surrounding housing markets. Would question all parts of this conclusion.</li> <li>• Viability here would only be about phasing, infrastructure and providing of community facilities.</li> <li>• Question whether housing could deliver values to pay for a new Knostrop plant and remediation-needs more analysis it should not be at the expense of loss of employment land.</li> <li>• In respect of EASEL, a competing major residential scheme must have an impact on the delivery of EASEL both in terms of market prices and resources.</li> </ul>
Skelton Business Park (Framptons)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new village is not realistic in the context of AV forming a major urban extension to Leeds. There is no sound reason why 4000 dwellings form a threshold. The AVL HMA report Nov 2005 has suggested 2500 to justify a reasonable level of local services. A sustainable pattern of development can be achieved with less numbers with leisure and employment uses.</li> <li>• The new village concept should be abandoned in favour of substantial residential uses within major mixed use schemes throughout the AV.</li> </ul>
Yorkshire Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on recent modelling, it appears that all of Area 3 (Skelton Moor Farm) would be subject to unacceptable odour levels.</li> <li>• YW would object to any proposals for residential development within the areas of 4 and 6 shown in the AAP.</li> <li>• Further modelling would be required, but based on existing data, it is possible that a small proportion of Area 5 could be allocated for housing.</li> </ul>
AVL Workshop 1 (11/4/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a contradiction between introducing new housing and the Aire Valley's employment role?</li> <li>• How do the housing options fit with the Regional Spatial Strategy?</li> <li>• Housing types – Is family housing deliverable in the City Centre and can Aire Valley fill the gap?</li> <li>• Are housing pressures pushing out City Centre offices?</li> <li>• What is the impact of retail facilities in land use terms. For example if a new housing</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
	<p>village were to provide a neighbourhood centre would it increase the overall land take to more than 80 hectares?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the impact of the proposals on health and inequalities e.g. access to services, ageing population?</li> </ul>
AVL Workshop 2 (11/4/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to build affordable housing for local residents (70% of houses)</li> </ul>
Inner South Area Committee (26/6/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to more housing development in South Leeds to replace proposals at Thorp Arch and the East Leeds Extension.</li> </ul>
<b>2e. Leisure</b>	
Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out-of-centre major leisure is questionable in terms of PPS6/PPG13 and has an implication for car journeys.</li> </ul>
Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relaxed about principle of leisure uses provided they are commensurate with planning policies and are aimed at meeting the needs of local communities.</li> </ul>
EWS (Scott Wilson)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognised that a mixed use area with cinemas, restaurants, bars and cafes could be developed in the AVL area. Option L2 is preferred over Option L3 as a means of developing mixed use communities rather than sterile areas of single use.</li> </ul>
British Waterways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target Thwaite Mills.</li> </ul>
Metro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• L1 and L2 will require adequate provision of PT routes.</li> <li>• L3 is not supported – such levels of trips better located in the city centre/fringe.</li> </ul>
Leeds HMO Lobby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Option L1 focus new leisure development in locations within or edge of the City centre - there may be potential for leisure activities on the fringe of the city centre including Aire Valley. This would also increase demand for leisure services but also provide a labour force.</li> </ul>
Montpellier Estates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New major leisure schemes including new arena/conference /exhibition facilities and/or casino are contrary to PPS6 as they are main town centre uses. These facilities can best be met by major development in the City Centre. Research has shown that a regional casino could displace 35% of the night time economy of a city such as Sheffield.</li> <li>• The PMP report on Leeds Concert hall, Arena &amp; Music Facilities Feasibility Study has indicated that the potential for this would be greater in an inner city site and as such major leisure development should be struck out of the alternative options.</li> <li>• Reasons for advancing higher values for major leisure to pay for treatment works and remediation may be a step change but in the wrong direction if it undermines the vitality of the city centre.</li> <li>• Keeping out of town options for major leisure is creating uncertainty undermining development of city centre projects; and opening the council to procurement difficulties and judicial review and should be dropped from the alternative options.</li> </ul>
Skelton Business Park (Framptons)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leisure uses on a regional or sub regional scale should be considered.</li> </ul>
Leeds Civic Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AVL is not an appropriate location for destination leisure due to reliance on car access and limited support facilities. Also competition with Xscape.</li> </ul>
<b>2f. Recreation</b>	
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REC1, 2 &amp; 3 not mutually exclusive. Strong support for creation of a new park along</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
	<p>waterfront. Would create biodiversity benefits and reduce flood risk. Creation of a linear park, paths and cycle lanes may impinge upon wildlife refuge area and would need to be done with substantial biodiversity advice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to encourage more angling.</li> <li>• Immersion sports are mentioned but the River Aire is not a designated bathing water. Suggest further information is sought on whether waters would be suitable for leisure pursuits mentioned.</li> </ul>
English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the proposal to provide better linkages between the existing cultural and recreational assets of the area.</li> </ul>
EWS (Scott Wilson)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Hunslet East site is in a key location, including a significant stretch of waterfront. There is opportunity to formalise access along the site boundary.</li> <li>• Opportunity to develop the river corridor as an attraction in its own right and as part of a strategic green corridor for movement of people, flora and fauna, and goods into and out of the city centre.</li> </ul>
Metro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreation proposals supported providing they do not generate excessive trips.</li> </ul>
Ramblers' Association, Leeds Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Waterfront Biodiversity SPD need to be taken into into account, to ensure there is no conflict between the two documents, particularly in relation to access versus habitat protection. Wish to protect access but recognise that safeguarding habitats may be necessary. In such case would wish to see alternative access points and/or crossing of the river/canal.</li> </ul>
The Oulton Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High quality landscaping throughout the development is just as essential as the type of numbers of businesses created.</li> </ul>
Leeds Civic Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to build upon existing parks and recreation areas such as Twaite Mills – limited cash for maintenance of existing so unwise to build much more.</li> </ul>
Michael Healey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports a walking/cycling route from the Royal Armouries past Skelton Lake.</li> </ul>
Yorkshire Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the recreational use of the water corridor e.g. for rowing or angling.</li> <li>• Concerns with regard to Option REC3 as the proximity of the works could cause serious loss of amenity to casual recreational users of a park. YW would not object if the park is located upstream of the WWTW.</li> </ul>
AVL Workshop 2 (11/4/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need linkages to the riverside from Hunslet.</li> </ul>
<b>2g. Waste Management</b>	
Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Without identifying areas in W1 it may be difficult for stakeholders to compare. Important to resolve SEP issues asap.</li> </ul>
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aire Valley would be ideal for a Sustainable Waste Park given links to the motorway network. Actual location would be dependent on other development.</li> </ul>
EWS (Scott Wilson)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concept of a Sustainable Energy Park is supported and the AVL area would be wholly suitable location. With consideration the SEP could be located within an industrial area away from high quality employment and residential areas.</li> <li>• The Hunslet East site could potentially support the SEP as the location for a waste transfer station. The site would be well suited to supporting the transfer of waste were</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
	to be brought in by rail.
Metro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option W1 is supported.</li> <li>Option W2 – currently uncertain until detailed analysis is carried out which will show whether the increased levels of HGV's can be accommodated.</li> </ul>
Re'new & South District Housing Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could certain treatment methods for Knostrop waste also provide fuel for the proposed Sustainable Energy Park? If so the arguments for location in AVL may include local linkage economies and may also assist with resolution of the waste treatment works problem.</li> </ul>
Montpellier Estates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEP should be seized open in the AVL. This could locate alongside Knostrop and has the potential to turn a constraint into an opportunity.</li> </ul>
Yorkshire Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If it is decided to locate a SEP in AVL there is an obvious synergy between this type of facility and the WWTW which already includes an incinerator and sludge treatment facilities.</li> </ul>
<b>2h. Retail</b>	
AMEC Developments Ltd (White Young Green)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is retail not considered in the alternative options paper similar to the approach taken for leisure and recreation uses. Support the provision of small scale retail facilities as part of larger development in the wider AVL area as well as major new retail development to attract national occupiers and further investment.</li> </ul>
Skelton Business Park (Framptons)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major retail should be considered in the context of new centres to provide a focus for retail and leisure development.</li> </ul>
<b>3. TRANSPORT</b>	
Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of public transport infrastructure and other measures to encourage its use should be paramount. Options need to address:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>should development be limited to what existing/improved network can accommodate</li> <li>sustainable modes access and modal share they should achieve</li> <li>need for demand management</li> </ul> </li> <li>Option T3 would appear to be the most effective.</li> </ul>
Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consequence of Option T1 would be a lack of coherence in developing transport solutions.</li> <li>Option T2 – there is space available to widen M1 to four lanes between Junction 44 and 46.</li> <li>Planned programme for the implementation of a balanced package of measure (T3) is the obvious choice. AVL must have strong public transport and development must be in the most favourable locations in order for single car trips to be discouraged.</li> <li>Direct access to AVL from local communities to the EASEL area will be welcomed.</li> <li>Would expect issues directly relating to future development of the M1 to be included in the AAP. Two omissions – M1 widening and network management measures</li> <li>No reference made to possibility of a Park &amp; Ride facility other than at Stourton.</li> </ul>
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any river crossing would require formal prior consent. Welcome further detailed involvement with the feasibility of the proposed bridge.</li> </ul>
British Waterways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good transport access is key.</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Canal for freight.</li> <li>• Maximise use of towpaths for cycling and pedestrians.</li> </ul>
Metro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public transport should play a key role in shaping land use patterns</li> <li>• Public transport alignments must be optimised</li> <li>• Sustainable patterns of development – from the outset – which will require up-front pump priming of public transport infrastructure.</li> <li>• Incremental investment as development sites are brought forward will not be sufficient.</li> <li>• Recently commissioned a study into public transport alignments through and to AVL</li> <li>• Land use strategy should focus high trip generators along the alignment of new public transport routes or areas which are already accessible.</li> <li>• Consider the role of P&amp;R in ensuring two-way flow and increasing viability.</li> <li>• AAP should include disincentives for car use – demand management.</li> <li>• A key objective must be to lock in the capacity benefits of ELLR and other highway infrastructure, for trips associated with living and working in the area as opposed to through trips.</li> <li>• Doubt is expressed whether travel plans and High Occupancy Vehicle lanes will be sufficient to achieve the above aim without further demand management.</li> <li>• Option T1 - Land use patterns should not dictate public transport routes. To encourage more sustainable travel habits it is important that a core public transport network is in place from the outset – developer contributions will be necessary to pump prime services.</li> <li>• Option T2 – this approach will increase reliance of the car. Does not fit with local, regional or national transport objectives – which seek to actively manage demand.</li> <li>• Option T3 – represents the most balanced approach</li> <li>• Allowing a public transport network to be developed in a structured manner and enable the shaping of land use patterns around public transport alignments.</li> <li>• Demand management aspects should be pursued – The Transport Innovation Fund may assist in pump priming.</li> </ul>
Network Rail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new station east of Neville Hill must be a long term ambition – due to existing capacity constraints, however they do support T3 (Question 22) as a strategic view.</li> </ul>
Re'new & South District Housing Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following decision not to proceed with Supertram, are there still issues to be addressed in relation to management of traffic from the M1/M62 to reduce city centre congestion e.g. should AVL still offer a significant Park and Ride site?</li> <li>• Location of AVL next to M1 and M62 means employment opportunities could attract commuters. If employment opportunities are to offer benefit to disadvantaged residents in adjoining areas then improved public transport linkages and a new river crossing will be required</li> </ul>
ISIS (Turley Associates)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already in discussions with Metro about extending public transport provision</li> <li>• Need to ensure car is not the main option for journey to work</li> </ul>
Yorkshire Forward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Option T3.</li> <li>• Support ELLR.</li> <li>• Support a wider transport network connecting to the wider communities to enable wider benefits of regeneration; encourage sustainable transport and reduce car use by a planned programme of public transport improvements.</li> </ul>
Montpellier Estates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rather than provide a new residential village it would be better to provide better</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
	<p>transport links to adjacent residential communities. Option 3 would provide a mix of public and private transport investments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land should not be reallocated in the light of benefits to development arising out of the development of the ELLR.</li> </ul>
Skelton Business Park (Framptons)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The AAP lacks a vision of High Quality Public Transport to replace former aspirations for Supertram.</li> </ul>
The Oulton Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crucial when the motorway link roads are opened that Pontefract Lane is closed south of the motorway. Left open it would only increase the high levels of traffic using this road and the A642 to Garforth and Oulton/Rothwell.</li> </ul>
Leeds Civic Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More stress should be put on public transport.</li> </ul>
CPRE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crucial that when Junction 45 is complete there is no connection to Pontefract Lane, south of the M1. If Area 5 goes ahead, there must be links from Area 5 to Pontefract Lane, Bullerthorpe Lane or A642.</li> </ul>
Yorkshire Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option T3 would appear to be the most sustainable option.</li> <li>• The bridge on Skelton Grange road is heavily used by traffic accessing the WWTW. Design of a replacement bridge would have to take this into account.</li> </ul>
AVL Workshop 1 (11/4/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the timing for new infrastructure to provide across the river to Haigh Park Road? What feasibility work has been carried out on the bridge crossing (costings, connection to the ELLR etc).</li> <li>• What work is being done with towns to the south, such as Wakefield, where many Aire Valley employees come from</li> <li>• Health impact – need to give people choices of transport to get to jobs.</li> <li>• Demand restraint measures must be linked to better public transport.</li> <li>• ELLR cannot be allowed to just fill up with commuter traffic.</li> </ul>
AVL Workshop 2 (11/4/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access along the riverside and links to communities are important.</li> <li>• Need to consider use of the railway line and a building new station</li> <li>• What about Park &amp; Ride at Stourton North?</li> </ul>
Inner South Area Committee (26/6/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questioned the new stations proposed in the consultation document.</li> </ul>
<b>4. AREA SPECIFIC COMMENTS</b>	
<b>4a. Area 1 (The Armouries)</b>	
British Waterways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarence Dock (BW site) is being developed as a new city destination (residential, offices, waterside bars/restaurants, hotel and casino)</li> </ul>
<b>4b. Area 2 (Hunslet Riverside)</b>	
EWS (Scott Wilson)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Southern part of Hunslet East support Hanson Aggregates which has expressed a desire to expand its operations on the site. Also interest from Lafarge aggregates to locate on the site. Aspirations will limit the location of any housing development.</li> <li>• Suggested that any housing use on the site should be located at the western edge of the site, away from the WWTW and on a river frontage. Such a location would be opposite Hunslet Mills and would provide a pleasant outlook. The site has been remediated to industrial tolerances but not to sensitive end uses such as housing. Option 1 is supported.</li> <li>• Development scenarios for Hunslet East (EWS) site           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Scenario 1</i> – assumes a 'do nothing' approach and would consolidate existing</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
	<p>and other industrial uses on the site. The existing waterside landscape area could be incorporated into a waterside route with associated footbridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Scenario 2</i> – Proposes a housing use at the north western end of the site. This would create a residential 'cluster' incorporating the Hunslet Mill site on the opposite side of the river. The remainder of the site would continue to support industrial uses. Other details as Scenario 1.</li> <li>- <i>Scenario 3</i> – Proposes a gateway housing site on the north western part of the site and on an area of land adjacent to South Accommodation Road which currently supports light industrial uses. Land is not under EWS control. Other details as Scenario 1.</li> <li>- <i>Scenario 4</i> – Proposed a research and development use at the north western end of the site. Remainder as Scenario 2</li> </ul>
British Waterways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ISIS (BW site) has submitted an outline application for residential uses – with links to the city centre and new employment opportunities.</li> </ul>
Network Rail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough emphasis has been placed on the rail freight potential and existing uses on the EWS/Network Rail site on Hunslet Riverside.</li> </ul>
Re'new & South District Housing Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As the city centre gradually expands, Hunslet Mills and Hunslet Riverside offers perhaps a unique opportunity on the river/canal corridor for a 'Hunslet Urban Village' mixed use development encompassing land on both banks:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- concert hall or conference/arena space with residential, offices, cafes, bars, galleries, etc</li> <li>- marina encouraging activity on the water as well as on the banks (cf the canal basins in Birmingham where active uses, access and high quality public realm spaces have encouraged a mixed use quarter and a sense of security)</li> <li>- annual Canal/ Boating Festival event to put Leeds and the AVL on the leisure boating map</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
ISIS (Turley Associates)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning application for residential on Yarn Street will:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- will lead regeneration of AVL</li> <li>- deliver high quality residential</li> <li>- benefit from existing public transport provision</li> <li>- benefit in complementing employment opportunities, services and facilities</li> <li>- add to mix of city centre uses</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>4c. Area 5 (Skelton Business Park)</b>	
Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionable whether Skelton Business Park (Area 5) is PPG3 compliant. Relatively isolated and unlikely to support attractive public transport and community facilities.</li> </ul>
Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBP (Site 5) is a site where there is potential for more office development. Creating mixed use here could address the tidal flow effect of single land uses. Proposed improvements to M1 are virtually the maximum that can be achieved without extensive re-modelling. Therefore intensification of office use could require extensive and expensive infrastructure works.</li> </ul>
Re'new & South District Housing Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on the eastern section of Skelton Business Park site (offices or residential) would probably be visible from Temple Newsam – is the open outlook from Temple Newsam part of any planned landscape/vista the further interruption of which could negatively impact its interpretation/conservation?</li> <li>• What will be the long term future (and what timescale?) for the landfill operation south of the Skelton Business Park site – landscaping and return to farmland or park?</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
Skelton Business Park (Framptons)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skelton Key Development Opportunity Site 5, should be designated for mixed uses including residential as it is not constrained upon major infrastructure works at Knostrop</li> <li>• It can include major leisure and retail within a new centre together with new business opportunities.</li> <li>• Skelton can provide a terminus for High Quality Public Transport linked to Park and Ride at Junction 45</li> </ul>
<b>4d. Other locations</b>	
British Waterways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knostrop/Thwaite Mill (BW site)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To be promoted for waterside office/business use and improvements to waterway users</li> <li>- To develop the Mills to better interpret the museum as a visitor destination and gateway to the canal.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Stourton (BW site)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Long term aspirations for water freight terminal – water/road interchange.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Re'new	<p>Thwaite Mills should have potential as a focus for expanded leisure/educational activity along the river/canal corridor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- improved access from Thwaite Gate/Pontefract Road?</li> <li>- specialised craft or heritage village/ workshops/ studios/ leisure activities/ park/ sculpture trail/ etc?</li> </ul>
<b>5. OTHER ISSUES</b>	
<b>5a. AAP boundary</b>	
Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overlap between boundaries of AVL and CC AAPs. To have an area included in more than one AAP could be confusing.</li> </ul>
<b>5b. Environmental issues</b>	
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas of AVL are at a high risk of flooding</li> <li>• Specific measure must be taken if development is to go ahead in these areas</li> <li>• New flood modelling information and a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will allow more strategic decisions to be made to manage flood risk</li> <li>• Options developed should take into account the sequential test and the vulnerability of the use</li> <li>• Significant constraints exist due to contaminated land and landfill sites. This must be dealt with in a systematic manner in line with PPG23</li> <li>• There is a threat to water quality within this area from increased development and this must be address by any future document and schemes</li> <li>• Wyke Beck offers important opportunitites for environmental and amenity enhancement</li> <li>• The biodiversity value of the area needs to be recognised and balanced with the recreational needs</li> </ul>
Re'new & South District Housing Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the additional implications of the flood risk area?</li> <li>• The M1 though AVL is an elevated stretch therefore noise transmission to adjacent development sites may be a problem. Opportunities to incorporate noise barriers and landscaping should be explored.</li> </ul>
AVL Workshop 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a new 1,000 hectare nature reserve being created just the east of the AVL</li> </ul>

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
(13/11/06)	area which includes Skelton Lake at its western end.
<b>5c. Health issues</b>	
South Leeds Primary Care Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for PO to;               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- decrease negative health impacts</li> <li>- ensure green transport is included</li> <li>- target jobs at local deprived communities - not necessarily a new village</li> <li>- take on board any implications for increasing health service provision</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>5d. River corridor</b>	
British Waterways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage holistic and sustainable approach to the protection of waterways from inappropriate development – as well as unlocking the economic, environmental and social benefits offered by such waterways.</li> <li>• The Aire &amp; Calder navigation will provide the opportunity to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- create attractive mixed use waterfront development</li> <li>- with a strong sense of place, with active edges to the waterspace</li> <li>- improve access to and use of the waterway</li> <li>- provide a sustainable transport route and improve access for peds/cycles and public transport within and from adjoining areas</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Encourage waterway corridor study.</li> </ul>
Re'new & South District Housing Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What proposals are there to promote leisure activity on the canal and realise recreational potential, as well as to develop the banks – safe moorings/marina requirements, navigation strategy?</li> </ul>
<b>5e. Urban design issues</b>	
British Waterways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality and sense of place are critical in establishing Leeds Window containing high profile occupiers.</li> </ul>
AVL Workshop 3 (13/11/06)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety and security in residential development are important to make the area an attractive place to live. 'Secure by design' principles should be adopted.</li> </ul>
<b>5f. Marketing issues</b>	
AVL Workshop 1 (11/4/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will the introduction of alternative uses (to employment) influence the marketing of the Aire Valley?</li> </ul>
<b>5g. Surrounding communities</b>	
AVL Workshop 2 (11/4/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a mixed picture in terms of education. A local school has a built environment specialism.</li> <li>• The social impact is very important - access from East Leeds is vital.</li> <li>• Need to remember people who live in the area at present and how the plans will affect them.</li> <li>• There is a need for more than new roads and industry. In the past there have been no benefits for the local community e.g. leisure facilities, a village green, children's play facilities etc.</li> </ul>
Inner South Area Committee (26/6/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What consultation events have taken place in Middleton?</li> </ul>
<b>5h. Education issues</b>	
AVL Workshop 2 (11/4/2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be a requirement for new schools which need paying for.</li> </ul>

## 4. Next Steps

The consultation on *Alternative Options* draws to a close the informal stage of consultation on the Area Action Plan issues and options. The comments reported here will now be considered in the preparation of a preferred options report. The preferred options themselves will be subject to a 6 weeks period of formal public participation. This will feed into the preparation of a draft Area Action Plan which will be accompanied by a consultation statement detailing the consultation methods used, the results of the consultation and how it has influenced the preparation of the draft plan.

## 5. Contact Details

If you would like any further information on this report please telephone Paul Bingham on (0113) 2478203 or Richard Askham on 2478184 or e-mail us at: [ldf@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@leeds.gov.uk)

Consultation documents relating to the Aire Valley Leeds AAP are available for viewing or downloading at [www.leeds.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.leeds.gov.uk/ldf)