

## Site Assessment

### Becca Hall, Aberford

Site Plan ref: n/a

SHLAA ref: 5319

#### Site Details

Easting	441339	Northing	438810	Site area ha	296.49	SP7	Other
HMCA	Outer North East			Ward	Harewood		

#### Site Characteristics

Site type	Greenfield
-----------	------------

##### On-site land uses

Agriculture
Managed Forest

##### Neighbouring land uses

Agriculture
Managed Forest

Other land uses - None

Topography	Undulating	Landscape	Significant Tree Cover
Boundaries	Partially well-defined	Road front	Yes

##### Description

Large collection of agricultural fields located to the west of Becca Hall. The village of Potterton lies to the west of the site with the freestanding settlements of Barwick in Elmet and Aberford to the south-west and south-east respectively. The site and surroundings contains areas of extensive woodland blocks and belts. The site has a frontage onto the A64 which is a key radial route into Leeds. Several historical features are contained within and directly adjacent to the site including Becca Banks scheduled monument, Potterton Hall, Becca Hall, and Potterton Medieval village.

#### Spatial relationships

##### UDP Designations

N32 Greenbelt	100.00	% overlap
N34 PAS	0.00	
RL1 Rural Land	0.00	
N1 Greenspace	0.00	
N1A Allotments	0.00	
N5 Open Space	0.00	
N6 Playing Pitch	0.00	
N8 Urban Green Corridor	0.00	
CC Shopping Quarter	0.00	
UDP City Centre	0.00	
S2S6 Town Centre	0.00	
Proposed Local Centre	0.00	
Sch. Ancient Mon.	0.00	

##### Core Strategy

Main Urban Area	0.00	% overlap
Major Settlement	0.00	
Minor Settlement	0.00	
Overlaps Urban Extension	<input type="checkbox"/>	

##### Regeneration Areas

Inner South RA	0.00	% overlap
LB Corridor RA	0.00	
EASEL RA	0.00	
Aire Valley RA	0.00	
West Leeds Gateway	0.00	

##### Other Spatial Relationships

LCC ownership %	0.00
Nearest train station	Garforth
Nearest train station distance (m)	5234.53
Nearest bus stop	10202
Nearest bus stop distance (m)	1392.01

##### Agricultural classification

Grade	Percent
Grade 2	80.53
Grade 3	15.45
Non-agricultural	4.02

## Site Assessment

Becca Hall, Aberford

Site Plan ref: n/a

SHLAA ref: 5319

Overlaps SSSI	<input type="checkbox"/>	Overlaps Public Right of Way	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps SEGI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Overlaps SFRA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNA	<input type="checkbox"/>	Overlaps EA Flood Zone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps LNR	<input type="checkbox"/>	Overlaps HSE Major Hazard	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Conservation Area	<input type="checkbox"/>	Overlaps HSE Gas Pipeline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Listed Building	<input type="checkbox"/>	Overlaps Pot. Contamination	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps N37 SLA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overlaps Strat. Employment buffer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Overlaps Minerals Safeguarded 100m	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Greenbelt Assessment

### 1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?	No
Would development result in an isolated development?	Yes
Is the site well connected to the built up area?	No
Would development round off the settlement?	No
Is there a good existing barrier between the existing urban area and the undeveloped land?	No

Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion | High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

### 2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

Would development lead to physical connection of settlements?	No
Do features provide boundaries to contain the development?	No

Coalescence Conclusion | No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

### 3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Strong defensible boundary between site and urban area	No
Does the site provide access to the countryside	Yes
Does the site include local/national nature conservation areas?	Yes
Areas of protected/unprotected woodland/trees/hedgerows?	Yes
Site includes Grade 1, Grade 2 or Grade 3a agricultural land?	Yes
Does the site contain buildings	Yes
Are these buildings used for agricultural purposes?	Yes

Encroachment Conclusion | Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment

### 4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Site within/adjacent to conservation area/listed building/historical features?	Yes
Can development preserve this character?	No

Character Conclusion | Significant effect on the setting and special character of historic features

### Overall Conclusion from assessment against all 4 purposes of green belt and essential characteristics of openness and permanence

Development of the site would create a significant incursion within the Green Belt and the site currently performs an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The site does not contain strong, logical boundaries and as such the new settlement would not have robust defensible boundaries which would help to contain development. Access to the countryside is also available via PROW networks across significant parts of the site. The site and its immediate surroundings contain several important historical features including Becca Banks, Potterton medieval village and the historic settlements of Barwick in Elmet and Aberford. The scale and location of the site would have a significant effect on the setting and special character of these historic features. In particular the impact Becca banks schedule monument would be difficult to mitigate and the medieval village of Potterton would be surrounded and subsumed by the new settlement. Whilst no merging of settlements will occur the site would significantly reduce the Green Belt gap with the neighbouring settlement of Barwick in Elmet. Given the scale of the proposed new development and the lack of a substantial strong boundary it is considered that this gap would be insufficient and harm would occur. Consequently, overall the site is considered to have an unacceptable impact on the openness and permanence of the Green Belt.

## Summary of infrastructure provider comments

## Site Assessment

### Becca Hall, Aberford

Site Plan ref: n/a

SHLAA ref: 5319

#### LCC Highways Comments

##### Public transport accessibility comments

The site fails all accessibility criteria. However a development of this size will effectively be a village in its own right and should provide and sustain public transport provision and local services, which should be provided as part of the development.

Rank (1-5)

1

##### Access comments

Access could be achieved by way of a new junction onto A64 York Road. A development of this scale will require a number of access points. There are concerns that other than the A64 there is limited site frontage/connectivity to other adopted highway. There is limited site frontage to Potterton Lane

4

##### Local network comments

Spare capacity in the local network but significant impact on the local and strategic highway network likely

4

##### Mitigation measures

none identified to be assessed through TA

Total score

9

##### Highways site support

Yes with significant mitigation

##### Contingent on other sites

Full site needs developing to maximise potential to provide public transport and local services

#### Highways England

Impact	Major Impact	Network Status	Likely to require significant physical mitigation
--------	--------------	----------------	---

The proposal is understood to be for 3,000 homes plus ancillary land uses by the end of the Plan period in 2028 with the potential for later expansion to 4,000 or 5,000 homes. Highways England has commented separately on the 3,000 homes proposal. Development of the full site to maximise capacity would have a very much greater adverse traffic impact on the strategic road network. Committed RIS schemes: M621 junctions 1-7 improvements - scheme intended to start in the current roads period (2015/16-2019/20). M1 J39-J42 Smart Motorway scheme completed. M1/M62 Lofthouse Interchange - scheme to be developed in the current roads period with the objective of commencing construction in the period 2020/21-2024/25. M1 junction 45 improvement - anticipated construction start 2017. M62 junction 25 - construction of the M62 J20-J25 Smart Motorway is expected to start by 2020/21. M62/M606 Chain Bar construction to commence 2015/16-2019/20. Interim traffic improvements to M62 junction 26 gyratory under construction. M1 junction 45 - developer scheme to allow the East Leeds Orbital Route (ELOR) to connect into the gyratory at the junction. M621 junction 7: Developer funded capacity enhancement schemes – implementation dates to be determined. Highways England West Yorkshire Infrastructure Study (WYIS) shows that additional mitigation will be needed. The following locations identified in the WYIS to require additional mitigation are relevant: M1 junction 47, M1 junction 46 - substantial improvements to the operation of the gyratory. M1 junctions 45 and 46 - additional mainline capacity. M1 junction 44 - southbound offslip and northbound onslip. M621 junction 7 - M621 J7 outbound from Leeds. A1(M) junction 44. Additional capacity enhancement may be needed at some locations but some of the sections of the strategic road network impacted are beyond the boundary of the WYIS area.

#### Network Rail

#### Yorkshire Water

Treatment Works

#### Environment Agency

Constraints	Approx 98% of the site is located within FZ1. The Southern tip of the site is located adjacent to Cock Beck and any building should be located at least 9m away from the centreline of the beck.
-------------	--

Majority of the site is located within FZ1. The southern boundary is along Cock beck which is a Main river. Any works within 8m of the 'top of the bank' of a Main River will require a 'Flood Risk Activity Environmental Permit' from the Environment Agency prior to works commencing. A tertiary river which is an Ordinary Watercourse runs through the site

Site is also located on a principal aquifer. SPZ3 is just beyond northern boundary. We request that you consult Yorkshire Water on the proposed site allocations in relation capacity issues with the sewer network.

#### LCC

Ecology support	Not Supported
-----------------	---------------

Not supported (Red). This will result in the loss of the western end of Becca Banks LWS, a semi-natural ancient woodland. The development of the

## Site Assessment

### Becca Hall, Aberford

Site Plan ref: n/a

SHLAA ref: 5319

site has wider implications for other neighbouring sites from increased levels of air pollution and disturbance including Bramham Park, Saw Wood and Wendel Hill Bank. Increase in people pressure likely to be a problem. The Leeds Habitat Network runs up the Cock Beck and tributary streams including adjacent grassland and woodland - it also includes woodland and parkland within the proposed allocation. All habitat from the LHN would need to be removed from the development area and increased levels of connectivity between woodland blocks. Otter, badger, great crested newt, and bats roost in Becca Hall Farm and Becca Hall. May be other great crested newt issues in the ponds at Potterton - surveys would be required to understand this.

#### Education comments

#### Flood Risk

#### Utilities

##### Gas

##### Electric

##### Fire and Rescue

##### Telecoms

#### Other

##### Heritage England

##### Natural England

## Conclusions

#### Submission Draft Plan Allocation

Not allocated for housing

#### Submission Draft Plan Allocation Conclusion

The site is of significant scale and forms a potential location for a new settlement with a capacity for up to 4000 dwellings (3000 within the plan period). The development of the site is considered to have an unacceptable impact on several significant heritage assets as well as the surrounding wider historic environment which includes the character of the hamlet of Potterton. The site is situated within a special landscape area and contains some of the highest quality accessible landscape in Leeds. The proposed site is readily visible from key viewpoints from surrounding roads, public footpaths and nearby settlements and would have a significant adverse impact on this sensitive landscape setting. Furthermore, the site is a significant incursion into the Green Belt and would have a substantial impact on Green Belt principles. This impact would be further exacerbated by the future expansion areas which have been requested to be considered for removal from the Green Belt. The site is consequently not considered to form the most appropriate location for a new settlement development when considered against reasonable alternatives.