

Site Ref: 12

Site Name: Adjacent To Ivy House, Off Larkfield Drive, Rawdon

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Vacant and derelict - Vacant land
Existing Use 2:	Residential - Dwellings
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 2:	Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	
Site State:	Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	3315.39	Distance to bus stop (metres)	141.95
Nearest Railway Station	Horsforth	Bus Stop ID	9719
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 12

Site Name: Adjacent To Ivy House, Off Larkfield Drive,
Rawdon

Planning History

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

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

Site Ref: 12

Site Name: Adjacent To Ivy House, Off Larkfield Drive, Rawdon

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 12

Site Name: Adjacent To Ivy House, Off Larkfield Drive, Rawdon

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Good access to Public Transport, Education and Local Health facilities.

Rank (1-5)

4

Access Comments

New access road requires retaining structures due to levels.

Rank (1-5)

3

Local network comment

Existing residential estate with some on-street parking issues.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Traffic Management measures?

Total score

10

Support?

Yes - with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Various sewers towards western boundary of site

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 12

Site Name: Adjacent To Ivy House, Off Larkfield Drive, Rawdon

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Access would require removal of existing dwelling. There is a Tree Preservation Order over the site, however, the site has only limited tree cover and this could be considered in detailed design.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

6

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

Site Ref: 180

Site Name: Brookfield Nursing Home, Swaine Hill Terrace, Yeadon

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Residential - Residential institution
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility
 Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1605.76	Distance to bus stop (metres)	194.17
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	12345
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Flat site set within Nunroyd Park, surrounded by N1 greenspace. There is an existing building on site which would suit conversion. There is limited tree cover on site.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0.01	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.01	Other?:	<input type="text"/>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 180

Site Name: Brookfield Nursing Home, Swaine Hill
Terrace, Yeadon

Planning History

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

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

Site Ref: 180

Site Name: Brookfield Nursing Home, Swaine Hill Terrace, Yeadon

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 180

Site Name: Brookfield Nursing Home, Swaine Hill Terrace, Yeadon

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Medium term (6-10 y) Suitability: Yes Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Good access to bus services, no access to rail

Rank (1-5)

4

Access Comments

The adopted highway would have to be extended from the current end of Swaine Hill Terrace, across the full extent of the site frontage onto the existing access track (Public Right Of Way). The public right of way may require improvements.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

Good connection to Kirk Lane and Queensway via Public Footpath

Rank (1-5)

4

Mitigation measure

Extend adopted highway and improve PROW.

Total score

12

Support?

Yes - with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Private water supply serves site from the south

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 180

Site Name: Brookfield Nursing Home, Swaine Hill Terrace, Yeadon

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Set within Nunroyd Park the site is surrounded by green space (designated as N1 on the existing Unitary Development Plan). The building is a positive building set within the conservation area and should be retained if possible. Conversion of the existing building would be the best use for the site, this would not require allocation. Adopted highway would need extending but acceptable in highway terms.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

7

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 1103

Site Name: Harry Ramsdens off Bradford Road, Guiseley

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Vacant and derelict - Vacant land
Existing Use 2:	
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 2:	
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	
Site State:	Mixed

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Significant Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	801.84	Distance to bus stop (metres)	134.25
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	1771
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.04	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Planning History

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

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

H28/195/74/	Addition of hard surfaced play area, with retaining wall, to childrens fun and adventure park.	20/08/1974	18/11/1974	A	11.96
H28/165/91/	2 shop units with 2 bedroom managers/caretakers flat over and covered way, to side of amusement arcade.	13/08/1991	21/10/1991	A	13.14
06/02484/FU	Amendment to condition No. 7 (Extractor system to adjacent restaurants) of application No. 28/264/01/FU, Change of Use of building to 4 flats and erection of 3 storey building containing 6 flats	19/04/2006	28/09/2007	A	14.73
28/272/05/OT	Outline application to layout access road erect 18 flats and 5 houses and layout car park to adjacent restaurant	07/11/2005	06/02/2006	R	59.09
H28/235/88/	1 static internally illuminated individual letter sign, size 7.5m x 2.5m, height above ground 5.5m (underside) and 1 internal	01/09/1988	27/10/1988	A	70.20
28/262/01/FU	Detached 5 bedroom house with detached block of 2 garages and workshop	10/12/2001	30/10/2002	A	14.60
11/04269/FU	6 houses with garages and new access, parking and landscaping	10/10/2011	02/12/2011	W	27.17
12/00771/FU	Single storey front extension and alterations to create new entrance lobby and take away area to front	17/02/2012	10/04/2012	A	24.82
H28/274/90/	Alterations including new shop front, to form toilets, and souvenir shop to part of restaurant.	31/12/1990	25/02/1991	A	87.13
H28/179/90/	Laying out of car parks with 42 car parking spaces, picnic area, and play area, to vacant site.	26/07/1990	12/11/1990	A	11.44
H28/276/88/	Alterations to shop and stone frontage to form two shops.	20/10/1988	28/02/1989	A	11.41
13/00553/FU	Variation of condition 18 of planning approval 11/02169/FU (extend Monday to Saturday openings from 20:00 hours to 21:00 hours)	01/02/2013	18/03/2013	W	66.86

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 1103

Site Name: Harry Ramsdens off Bradford Road, Guiseley

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: Yes Physical Achievability: Short term (0-5yrs)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

The site meets all accessibility standards

Rank (1-5)

4

Access Comments

Access would be through the approved housing layout - some amendments may be required to footway provision.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

The small scale of development would not impact on the local network.

Rank (1-5)

5

Mitigation measure

Total score

13

Support?

Yes

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported - but White-clawed Crayfish recorded nearby

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 1103

Site Name: Harry Ramsdens off Bradford Road, Guiseley

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Planning permission implemented but not complete. Site boundary amended to delete retail element from site. Site considered suitable for residential development, and has extant permission.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

4

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 1104

Site Name: Greenside Farm, Yeadon, LS19

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm
 Existing Use 2: Agriculture
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Wholesale distribution
 Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings
 Other uses:
 Site State: Mixed

Site Detail

Topography:	Undulating	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2435.70	Distance to bus stop (metres)	218.36
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	5982
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 1104

Site Name: Greenside Farm, Yeadon, LS19

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Development of site 1104 in isolation would constitute urban sprawl, but development along with sites 2162 and 3033 would be contained by development on 3 sides.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 1104

Site Name: Greenside Farm, Yeadon, LS19

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Good access to Public Transport, Education and Local Health facilities.

Rank (1-5)

4

Access Comments

Site has an existing acceptable access point onto Warm Lane but footway provision along Warm Lane is substandard.

Rank (1-5)

3

Local network comment

Local congestion issues. Warm Lane is already traffic calmed (speed cushions).

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

Widen footway along site frontage

Total score

9

Support?

Yes - with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Combined and surface water sewers along southern boundary

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 1104

Site Name: Greenside Farm, Yeadon, LS19

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Existing city farm on site. Development of site 1104 in isolation would constitute urban sprawl, but development along with sites 2162 and 3033 would be contained by development on 3 sides. Highways consider that the site can be suitably accessed.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

58

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 1113

Site Name: Land at Silverdale Avenue, Guiseley

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	808.91	Distance to bus stop (metres)	284.08
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	8389
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 3
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	97.66	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 1113

Site Name: Land at Silverdale Avenue, Guiseley

Planning History

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

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 1113

Site Name: Land at Silverdale Avenue, Guiseley

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Within 800m of railway station. 50% of site accessible to buses. 50% of site within acceptable distance to employment and town centre. Accessible to education and healthcare.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access Comments

Access possible from Silverdale Ave or extension to Silverdale Mount, both 'traditional estate roads', pedestrian access possible on to Coach Road with improvement.

Rank (1-5)

5

Local network comment

Silverdale Ave, existing on street parking to houses towards Park Road problematic, this is the shortest route out, Coach Rd is narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road so not to be encouraged. Capacity issues at Park Road / A65 Gyratory.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Traffic calming may help but won't provide the full solution.

Total score

11

Support?

yes - with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 1113

Site Name: Land at Silverdale Avenue, Guiseley

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Loss of allotments would need to be considered through the greenspace review. (See Greenspace section page 23 question G8).

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

71

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 1148

Site Name: Land off Thorpe Lane / Bradford Road
Guiseley

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Residential
 Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1101.42	Distance to bus stop (metres)	358.93
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	1771
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 4
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	23.91	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large area of Green Belt land north west of Guiseley used for agriculture. Site is bounded to the east by Bradford Road, and to the southeast by Thorpe Lane. Site is bounded on all other sides by further agricultural land. Site slopes down from Thorpe Lane and has limited tree cover, which predominantly runs along field boundaries. Thorpe Lane has a significant tree line.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	4.70		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Planning History

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

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

Site Ref: 1148

Site Name: Land off Thorpe Lane / Bradford Road
Guiseley

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

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

Site Ref: 1148

**Site Name: Land off Thorpe Lane / Bradford Road
Guiseley**

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

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

Site Ref: 1148

Site Name: Land off Thorpe Lane / Bradford Road
Guiseley

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have marginal effect on the setting & special character of historic features, which

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Development of the site would result in a breach of Thorpe Lane, an important boundary preventing sprawl towards Bradford. The Green Belt is necessary to prevent coalescence between settlements of Guiseley and Menston.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 1148

Site Name: Land off Thorpe Lane / Bradford Road Guiseley

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Only approximately 50% of the site is within Public Transport accessibility standards, only approximately 30% of the site is within accessibility to other services, no footways on Thorpe Lane.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Access could be created on Thorpe Lane but no footways on Thorpe Lane at moment and trees will need to be removed. Preferred access off Guiseley Drive with signals on Bradford Road but Guiseley Drive appears to be private for High Royds development, access onto Bradford Road not suitable.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

Local congestion issues on A65.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Possible signals on Bradford Road from private Guiseley Drive, extend adopted highway on Guiseley Drive, access improvements onto Thorpe Lane, footway required on Thorpe Lane, footway needs to be wider on Bradford Road, pedestrian/cycle access onto Bradford Road directly, bus service to divert into site if possible, junction capacity improvements along A65 likely

Total score

9

Support?

yes - with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). No designated sites but Mire Beck flows through the site which is an important wildlife corridor together with the adjacent grassland for breeding Curlew. White-clawed Crayfish, Bullhead, Brown Trout to consider.

Boundary Amendment

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/1148. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitat are addressed i.e. protecting and enhancing the wildlife corridor function of the Mire Beck, and pond towards southern boundary.

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Large surface water sewer in north eastern corner of site

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

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

Site Ref: 1148

Site Name: Land off Thorpe Lane / Bradford Road
Guiseley

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Development of the site would result in a breach of Thorpe Lane, an important boundary preventing sprawl towards Bradford. The Green Belt is necessary to prevent coalescence between settlements of Guiseley and Menston. The site is attractive and a designated Special Landscape Area. Part of the site is also N6 greenspace in the current UDP (see question G9, page 24). Development would require footway improvements on Thorpe Lane and access through High Royds site.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

539

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 1180A

Site Name: Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
Existing Use 2:
Existing Use 3:
Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 3:
Other uses:
Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Undulating	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1003.72	Distance to bus stop (metres)	471.04
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	8389
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 3
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 1180A

Site Name: Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Site A (the northern section) relates well to the urban area when considered with 1311A and 2163A.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 1180A

Site Name: Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

The site is outside bus and rail accessibility standards but accessible for health and education.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Access could be created onto Coach Road with provision of footway on frontage.

Rank (1-5)

5

Local network comment

Route through Silverdale estate not suitable for large increase in traffic because of existing on street parking to houses on Silverdale Ave towards Park Road which prevents two way free flow of traffic. As an alternative route out, Coach Rd is unadopted, narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road which can't be addressed with this site. Capacity issues at Park Road / A65 Gyratory.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Traffic calming throughout the Silverdale Avenue would help to meet street design guide requirements for a 25mph design speed but won't provide the full solution as the on street parking near Park Road will remain.

Total score

8

Support?

Yes - with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Yes

Suitability for partial development:

Would prefer further reduction in size

Highways Agency

No objection

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported - no objections

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

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

Site Ref: 1180A

Site Name: Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development due to Highways concerns and the fact that development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. A comprehensive development along with sites 1311A & 2163A would be appropriate. Site A (the northern section) has a road frontage and relates well to the urban area, when considered with 1311A and 2163A. This smaller site (ie site A) will put less pressure on the road network. Traffic calming in Silverdale Estate would be required.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 37 **Floorspace sq m (Non residential):** 0

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 1180B

Site Name: Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2:	
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Undulating	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1062.80	Distance to bus stop (metres)	519.61
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	8389
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 3
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.87	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<input type="text"/>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 1180B

Site Name: Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development due to the fact that development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 1180B

Site Name: Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

This part of the site (Site B) does not meet any of the accessibility standards.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Adequate access can be provided through site A.

Rank (1-5)

3

Local network comment

The route through the Siverdale estate is not appropriate for this level of development.

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

Total score

7

Support?

No

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

No objection

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Support - no objections

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 1180B

Site Name: Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development due to Highways concerns and the fact that development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. The quality of the road network would prevent a large development (both A and B) in this area.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 72 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 1194

Site Name: Land at Thorpe Lane - Hawksworth Lane, Guiseley LS20

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2:	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 3:	Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility
Other uses:	Woodland
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1713.63	Distance to bus stop (metres)	1068.30
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	3062
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 4
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.92	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 1194

Site Name: Land at Thorpe Lane - Hawksworth Lane,
Guiseley LS20

Planning History

Site Ref: 1194

Site Name: Land at Thorpe Lane - Hawsworth Lane, Guiseley LS20

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and acts a strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban sprawl.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 1194

Site Name: Land at Thorpe Lane - Hawksworth Lane, Guiseley LS20

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

No access to Public Transport.

Rank (1-5)

1

Access Comments

Access possible onto Thorpe Lane and Hawksworth Lane.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

Local congestion issues.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Unknown at this stage?

Total score

8

Support?

No

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 1194

Site Name: Land at Thorpe Lane - Hawksworth Lane, Guiseley LS20

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and acts a strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban sprawl.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

58

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 1199

Site Name: Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge.
LS16

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Transport tracks & ways
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1222.96	Distance to bus stop (metres)	438.07
Nearest Railway Station	Horsforth	Bus Stop ID	5639
SFRA Flood Zone:	1.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	1.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	12.97	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	87.03	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 1199

Site Name: Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge.
LS16

Planning History

Site Ref: 1199

Site Name: Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge. LS16

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up area

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Majority of site PAS. Only 12% in green belt (western section).

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.04	Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 1199

Site Name: Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge. LS16

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Portion of site accessible for education and public transport but distant from local services.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Access via Moseley Wood Rise, limit capacity to 200. Requires secondary link.

Rank (1-5)

3

Local network comment

Local congestion issues

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Unknown at this stage

Total score

8

Support?

yes

Need to combine with other sites:

no

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

F/B at LEH1 5 miles 396 yds to be made equality compliant (ramps)? Horsforth station improvements general asset protection issues

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). No site-based designations but contains the Moseley Beck, semi-improved grassland areas and adjacent rank and wet grassland that forms a wildlife corridor function. Great Crested Newts to consider.

Boundary Amendment

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/1199. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats and Great Crested Newts are addressed i.e. minimum 20 metres buffer adjacent to Moseley Beck protected and enhanced, habitat enhancement to link beck to the woodland to the north-east, pond creation near beck for Great Crested Newts.

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

The vast majority of this site is in flood zone 1 (low risk). A consultant (URS) has recently modelled this section of Moseley Beck to confirm the extent of flood zone 3 (non-development area).

Environment Agency Constraints:

FZ3 beck running through site

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

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

Site Ref: 1199

Site Name: Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge.
LS16

Various large sewers cross the whole site north/south east/west

Knothrop High Level

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

200

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Red

Employment Conclusion:

Red

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

Site Ref: 1221

Site Name: Gill Lane, Yeadon LS19

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2063.68	Distance to bus stop (metres)	150.57
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	1686
SFRA Flood Zone:	1.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 1221

Site Name: Gill Lane, Yeadon LS19

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Yes
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Well contained site with strong connections to the urban area. Site performs well against the purposes of Green Belt.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Good access to Public Transport, Education and Local Health facilities.

Rank (1-5)

4

Access Comments

Vehicle access onto Gill Lane not possible due to limited site frontage. Vehicular access would have to be via A65 only and dependant upon level of development may require two access points.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

Local congestion issues on A65.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Unknown at this stage?

Total score

11

Support?

Yes- with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

This site lies in flood zone 1 on the EA Flood Map (low risk). However, any site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must investigate the small unnamed watercourse as a source of flood risk. The development layout plan must be amended accordingly.

Environment Agency Constraints:

no constraints but drain running through

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Mains and surface water sewer within north and eastern boundaries

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

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

Site Ref: 1221

Site Name: Gill Lane, Yeadon LS19

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Well contained site with strong connections to the urban area. Site does perform well against the purposes of Green Belt. Access onto A65, limited frontage onto Gill Lane.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

155

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

Site Ref: 1255A

Site Name: Land at Shaw Lane, Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2:	Forestry - Unmanaged Forest
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Poorly defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1472.01	Distance to bus stop (metres)	304.07
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	173
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 4
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 1255A

Site Name: Land at Shaw Lane, Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
28/11/93/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	28/01/1993	20/04/1993	R	99.53

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

Site Ref: 1255A

Site Name: Land at Shaw Lane, Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Development of site A would constitute urban sprawl.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 1255A

Site Name: Land at Shaw Lane, Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

This part of the site is poorly served by Public Transport and other services.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Shaw Lane has a very poor junction alignment with Queensway and Banksfield Mount is not suitable as a single point of access to serve in excess of 400 dwellings (for site as whole). Banksfield Mount has existing on-street parking around the point of connection to the site.

Rank (1-5)

2

Local network comment

Traffic management issues on Queensway. On-street parking within existing development on the approach to the site via Banksfield Mount.

Rank (1-5)

1

Mitigation measure

None that would overcome site deficiencies.

Total score

5

Support?

No

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

No objection

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the adjacent Deipkier Local Nature Area. Provide a suitable buffer zone to the north-east.

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 1255A

Site Name: Land at Shaw Lane, Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

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

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 1255B

Site Name: Land at Shaw Lane, Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
Existing Use 2:
Existing Use 3:
Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 3:
Other uses:
Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1458.31	Distance to bus stop (metres)	136.63
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	173
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 4
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	98.47	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 1255B

Site Name: Land at Shaw Lane, Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
28/11/93/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	28/01/1993	20/04/1993	R	98.35

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

Site Ref: 1255B

Site Name: Land at Shaw Lane, Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Partial
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site which after splitting, site B relates well to the existing settlement.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 1255B

Site Name: Land at Shaw Lane, Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Only 65% of this site is within acceptable access to Public Transport and only approx 55% of site is within acceptable distance to School and Health facilities.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access Comments

Shaw Lane has a very poor junction alignment with Queensway and is not acceptable for vehicular access to the site. Other access options include Banksfield Mount, Coppice Wood Close and Howson Close all of which have existing on-street parking issues which could be resolved by Traffic Regulation Order or the provision of off-street parking spaces for existing residents. Site could be connected in part to adjacent site 3029A depending on overall number of dwellings.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

Traffic management issues on Queensway. On-street parking issues.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Traffic calming on Queensway and provision of TRO's and off-street parking for existing residents.

Total score

10

Support?

Yes - with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Yes

Suitability for partial development:

Yes

Highways Agency

No objection

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the adjacent Deipkier Local Nature Area. Provide a suitable buffer zone to the north-east.

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

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

Site Ref: 1255B

Site Name: Land at Shaw Lane, Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

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

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 1256

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

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Undulating	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	987.26	Distance to bus stop (metres)	300.64
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	2187
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 4
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 1256

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

Planning History

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

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have marginal effect on the setting & special character of historic features, which

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. The site is not well connected to the urban area, and would not constitute rounding off of the settlement. As such development would represent urban sprawl.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 1256

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

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Only 50% of the site is accessible to Public Transport, Health and education facilities.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Only limited frontage to Carlton Lane, which has inadequate carriageway width and no footways. Very substandard existing access at corner of Carlton Lane/Moor Lane - poor visibility onto Moor Lane.

Rank (1-5)

2

Local network comment

Local network poor i.e. Carlton Lane and Moor Lane.

Rank (1-5)

1

Mitigation measure

None that would overcome site deficiencies.

Total score

5

Support?

No

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but a semi-improved grassland area in the north-east which should be excluded from the site.

Boundary Amendment

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/1256. Mitigation will still be required to ensure adjacent habitats are protected and enhanced, and hedgerows and water courses are protected and enhanced.

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

This site lies in flood zone 1 on the EA Flood Map (low risk). However, any site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must investigate the small unnamed watercourse as a source of flood risk. The development layout plan must be amended accordingly.

Environment Agency Constraints:

beck running through

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Various sewers and mains in western and southern boundaries

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

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

Site Ref: 1256

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

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site is not well connected to the urban area, and would not constitute rounding off of the settlement. As such development would represent urban sprawl. The site has access constraints.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

289

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 1308

Site Name: land to the Rear of and including Naylor
Jennings Mill Off Green Lane , Yeadon

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale
Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
Existing Use 3: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land
Neighbouring Use 1: Office
Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 3:
Other uses:
Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2628.03	Distance to bus stop (metres)	285.85
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	11710
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

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

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 1308

Site Name: land to the Rear of and including Naylor
Jennings Mill Off Green Lane , Yeadon

Planning History

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

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

Site Ref: 1308

Site Name: land to the Rear of and including Naylor Jennings Mill Off Green Lane , Yeadon

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 1308

Site Name: land to the Rear of and including Naylor Jennings Mill Off Green Lane , Yeadon

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs)

Suitability: Yes

Achievability: Short term (0-5yrs)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Public Transport not in line with accessibility standards (contary to Metro info), 50% of site accessible to employment and town centres, site accessible to education and healthcare.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access Comments

Narrow footway, stone boundary wall and mature trees may mean achieving visibility is impossible without removal. Pedestrian linkage to Henconner Lane needs improving.

Rank (1-5)

3

Local network comment

Local congestion issues on A65 + Green Lane Harrogate Road junction a problem. Footways on Green Lane narrow and intermittent.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

To create vehicular access and improve pedestrian linkages.

Total score

9

Support?

Yes - with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance open water features. Bats and Great Crested Newts to consider, Great Crested Newts recorded on-site.

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Various culverted watercourses and surface water sewers with outfalls near to ponds. Water mains and sewers in southern road frontage

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 1308

Site Name: land to the Rear of and including Naylor Jennings Mill Off Green Lane , Yeadon

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Brownfield site in urban area. There are some restraints on site (large ponds and trees) but these could be mitigated against and would not prevent the site coming forward.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

126

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 1311A

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

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3: Industry and business - Wholesale distribution
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1066.53	Distance to bus stop (metres)	476.94
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	8394
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	94.35	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 1311A

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

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two. Site A relates well to the urban area when considered with 1180A and 2163A.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

Site Ref: 1311A

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

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

The site is outside bus and rail accessibility standards but accessible to health and education, but not town centre/employment.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Access could be created onto Coach Road with provision of footway on frontage.

Rank (1-5)

5

Local network comment

Route through Silverdale estate not suitable for large increase in traffic because of existing on street parking to houses on Silverdale Ave towards Park Road which prevents two way free flow of traffic. As an alternative route out, Coach Rd is unadopted, narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road which can't be addressed with this site. Capacity issues at Park Road / A65 Gyratory.

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

Traffic calming throughout the Silverdale Avenue would help to meet street design guide requirements for a 25mph design speed but won't provide the full solution as the on street parking near Park Road will remain.

Total score

9

Support?

Yes - with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Yes

Suitability for partial development:

Would prefer further reduction in size

Highways Agency

No objection

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported - no objections

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Surface water sewer in northern boundary

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

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

Site Ref: 1311A

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

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 2163A would be appropriate. Site A (the northern section) has a road frontage and relates well to the urban area, when considered with 1180A and 2163A. This smaller site (ie site A) will put less pressure on the road network. Traffic calming in Silverdale Estate would be required.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 38 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 1311B

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

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Storage
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1158.19	Distance to bus stop (metres)	568.68
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	8394
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<input type="text"/>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 1311B

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

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Development of the site would extend further into the green belt and not relate well to the existing settlement pattern.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 1311B

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

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

The site is outside bus and rail accessibility standards but accessible to health and education, but not town centre/employment.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Access could be created onto Coach Road with provision of footway on frontage alternatively could be developed with 2163 with access onto widened Old Hollings Hill

Rank (1-5)

5

Local network comment

Route through Silverdale estate not suitable for large increase in traffic. Silverdale Ave, existing on street parking to houses towards Park Road problematic, as an alternative route out, Coach Rd is narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road which can't be addressed with this site. Capacity issues at Park Road / A65 Gyratory.

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

Total score

9

Support?

No

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

No objection

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported - no objections

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 1311B

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

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development. Development of site B would extend further into the green belt and not relate well to the existing settlement pattern.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

38

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

0

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Employment Conclusion:

Site Ref: 2038

Site Name: Low Mills, Guiseley

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale
 Existing Use 2: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Transport tracks & ways
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Undulating	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1328.48	Distance to bus stop (metres)	479.40
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	3957
SFRA Flood Zone:	1.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	1.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.01	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes
-------------------------------------	-----	---	-----

<i>Site</i>	<i>Site Type</i>
Milners Road (Aireborough Mini Skips)	General Waste Management Sites
Machells Reclamation, Guiseley	Other (Waste) Specialist Misc - Loose Ends

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

Site Ref: 2038

Site Name: Low Mills, Guiseley

Stone Masons Milners Road, Yeadon	Other (Waste) Specialist Misc - Building Materials
Milners Road Yeadon (SBT)	General Waste Management Sites
Milners Road Guiseley (Tarmac)	Asphalt and Concrete Plants

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

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
H28/42/80/	Detached warehouse unit, with office, and kitchen to mills .	30/01/1980	17/03/1980	A	18.80
H28/392/75/1	Renewal of permission for single storey warehouse unit, with loading platform, ancillary office, reception,	17/09/1980	03/11/1980	A	15.64
H28/206/74/	Alterations, to form two new showrooms with toilet and single storey extension to form counter sales area, two store	05/08/1974	18/11/1974	A	15.11
H28/7/84/	Alterations and extension, to form customer service area, staff room, office and toilet , with offices over, to w	11/01/1984	20/02/1984	A	21.21
H28/146/85/	Change of use of first floor store rooms to builders merchants, ancillary offices and with 3 car parking spaces.	09/08/1985	05/09/1985	ND	13.20
H28/132/81/	Alterations, to form toilet, and extensions, to form enlarged showroom and enlarged store, to side and, store, to	31/03/1981	05/05/1981	A	13.13
H28/449/80/	Alterations, to form toilets, and extensions, to form store room, to rear, and sales area office and enlarged storage ar	27/11/1980	12/01/1981	R	15.14
H28/392/75/	Single storey warehouse unit, with loading platform, ancillary office, reception, lobby, rest room and toilets to	29/07/1975	29/09/1975	A	15.14

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Medium term (6-10 y) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

90% of the site is outside bus accessibility standards and all of the site is outside rail accessibility standards. 60% of site meets requirements for health and education, but only 10% town centre/employment.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Ghyll Royd functions as an industrial road and is not conducive to pedestrian movement from a residential development. Milner Road is narrow with discontinuous footways and not capable of improvement.

Rank (1-5)

1

Local network comment

Ghyll Royd and Milners Road are the only two means of access, both are unsuitable particularly for pedestrians. Local congestion on A65.

Rank (1-5)

1

Mitigation measure

None

Total score

4

Support?

No, unless significant mitigation.

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Drainage (beck under railway) capacity. Also general asset protection issues

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance Engine Fields Local Nature Area (LNA). An appropriate corridor is needed to exclude any overlap with the LNA and provide a buffer.

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

A significant proportion of the northern area of this site is classified as flood zone 3 on the EA flood map (high flood risk). A sequential approach to the development layout should direct development to the flood zone 1 area.

Environment Agency Constraints:

FZ3 large proportion of site

Yorkshire Water Comments:

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

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

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

Site Ref: 2038

Site Name: Low Mills, Guiseley

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

This is a brownfield site currently allocated for employment use in the existing UDP. The site would require significant works to enable residential development. The site dips into a valley through the centre which may limit the potential capacity. However, the site is not in the green belt and is well contained. Highways have raised concerns regarding access and accessibility of the site; Milners Road and Ghyll Road both lack good footway provision, Milner Road would need land from the Council's waste site for widening.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

144

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 2118

Site Name: Haw Lane, Yeadon

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Other
Existing Use 2:	
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 2:	Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	Site is a Village Green
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	No Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2087.78	Distance to bus stop (metres)	262.11
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	12022
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	100.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 2118

Site Name: Haw Lane, Yeadon

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Protected Area of Search site, not Green Belt

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 2118

Site Name: Haw Lane, Yeadon

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Accessible to Public Transport, most of the site meets accessibility standards for local services, schools and healthcare.

Rank (1-5)

4

Access Comments

Vehicle access onto Haw Lane OK with Manual For Streets standards.

Rank (1-5)

5

Local network comment

Local congestion issues on A65.

Rank (1-5)

4

Mitigation measure

None

Total score

13

Support?

yes

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 2118

Site Name: Haw Lane, Yeadon

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

The site is a Protected Area of Search (PAS) site in the existing UDP, but has since received designation as a Village Green and so is not considered suitable for development.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

60

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 2119

Site Name: Canada Road, Rawdon

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	No Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	3105.76	Distance to bus stop (metres)	82.33
Nearest Railway Station	Horsforth	Bus Stop ID	5530
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	100.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 2119

Site Name: Canada Road, Rawdon

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Protected Area of Search (PAS) site, not Green Belt.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 2119

Site Name: Canada Road, Rawdon

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Good access to Public Transport, Education and Local Health facilities.

Rank (1-5)

4

Access Comments

Site is located close to a brow and as such an acceptable access does not appear to be possible.

Rank (1-5)

2

Local network comment

None

Rank (1-5)

1

Mitigation measure

None that would overcome site deficiencies.

Total score

5

Support?

No

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Water mains in southern road frontage

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 2119

Site Name: Canada Road, Rawdon

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

The site is a Protected Area of Search (PAS) site in the existing UDP. Whilst the site is considered to be well related to the urban area, Highways object to development of the site due to poor visibility of site access.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

34

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 2160

Site Name: Ling Bob, Scotland Lane, Horsforth

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	Residential - Dwellings
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2:	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	Airport
Site State:	Mixed

Site Detail

Topography:	Undulating	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1086.37	Distance to bus stop (metres)	535.76
Nearest Railway Station	Horsforth	Bus Stop ID	6740
SFRA Flood Zone:	1.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	1.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 4
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	Yes	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.57	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.12		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 2160

Site Name: Ling Bob, Scotland Lane, Horsforth

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up area

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?: Potentially

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have marginal effect on the setting & special character of historic features, which

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Listed buildings on site - impact on these would need to be considered. Large site that relates poorly to settlement. Development would set a precedent for further sprawl.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.43	Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Medium term (6-10 y) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Accessibility to Public Transport not in line with Core Strategy standards for majority of site.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Highway frontage but adequate access can not be achieved for level of development proposed.

Rank (1-5)

1

Local network comment

Local congestion issues.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Unknown at this stage.

Total score

6

Support?

no

Need to combine with other sites:

no

Suitability for partial development:

no

Highways Agency

Network Rail :

F/B at LEH1 5 miles 396 yds to be made equality compliant (ramps)? Horsforth station improvements general asset protection issues

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). Includes Sims Pond Site of Ecological and Geological Importance (SEGI), species-rich grasslands alongside the railway and Moseley Beck, and woodland along a beck in the north of the site.

Boundary Amendment

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/2160. Mitigation will still be required to ensure impacts on Great Crested Newts are addressed and hedgerows and some semi-improved grassland areas within the site are retained as parts of the public open space.

Natural England:

Education

Should this come to fruition, particularly in conjunction with site ref. 1199, we would request land from part of the development for new school provision. Part of this site is within the Horsforth primary planning area.

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Apart from a very narrow section of flood zone 3 adjacent to the railway line, this site lies in flood zone 1 on the EA Flood Map (low risk). However, any site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must investigate the small unnamed watercourses as a source of flood risk. The development layout plan must be amended accordingly.

Environment Agency Constraints:

FZ3 along railway no other constraints

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

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

Site Ref: 2160

Site Name: Ling Bob, Scotland Lane, Horsforth

Water main crosses the southern part of the site

Knothrop High Level

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The capacity and site area has been split - 27.6ha, 724 capacity in Aireborough, 45.33ha, 1189 capacity in North Leeds. Development of such a large site would represent unrestricted urban sprawl and Highways objections include local congestion that would arise if developed.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

1913

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 2161

Site Name: West of Westfield Mount, Yeadon

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Forestry - Unmanaged Forest
Existing Use 2:	Other
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 2:	Industry and business - Wholesale distribution
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	SSSI on west part of site
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Significant Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1523.68	Distance to bus stop (metres)	449.41
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	10299
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 4
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	62.14	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<input type="text"/>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes
-------------------------------------	-----	---	-----

<i>Site</i>	<i>Site Type</i>
Stone Masons Milners Road, Yeadon	Other (Waste) Specialist Misc - Building Materials
Milners Road Yeadon (SBT)	General Waste Management Sites

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

Site Ref: 2161

Site Name: West of Westfield Mount, Yeadon

Milners Road Guiseley (Tarmac)	Asphalt and Concrete Plants
--------------------------------	-----------------------------

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

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

The western part of the site is Green Belt. The development of this site alone would represent an isolated development unrelated to the existing settlement unless linked with adjacent site 2038. The site is also a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

Site Ref: 2161

Site Name: West of Westfield Mount, Yeadon

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Medium term (6-10 y) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Poor accessibility to all services.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Requires adopted highway and private road to be converted, poor bend further up road.

Rank (1-5)

3

Local network comment

Local congestion issues.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

highway works, signal improvements

Total score

8

Support?

no

Need to combine with other sites:

no

Suitability for partial development:

yes

Highways Agency

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). Yeadon Brickworks and Railway Cutting Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) covers most of this site, and the remainder is a mixture of lowland mixed deciduous woodland, a UK Biodiversity Priority Habitat and some grassland which is of unknown quality.

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

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

Site Ref: 2161

Site Name: West of Westfield Mount, Yeadon

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

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

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 83 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

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

Site Ref: 2161

Site Name: West of Westfield Mount, Yeadon

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

Site Ref: 2162

Site Name: North of Warm Lane, Yeadon

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3: Agriculture
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Undulating	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2320.25	Distance to bus stop (metres)	293.27
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	5982
SFRA Flood Zone:	1.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	1.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 3
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site to the north of Warm Lane, bounded to the north by Gill Lane. To the west of the site beyond a heavily treed area, is an established residential area. To the east there is more sporadic spread of mixed uses. The site has road frontages with both Gill Lane and Warm Lane. Site is generally flat although there is a more undulating profile on the western boundary of the site. Tree coverage is concentrated to the northern limits of the site, with a small number of trees in the centre of the site.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 2162

Site Name: North of Warm Lane, Yeadon

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
H28/511/79/	Change of use of farm building s to 2 flats.	30/07/1979	16/10/1979	A	10.95

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Development of site 2162 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, but development along with sites 1104 and 3033 would be contained by development on 3 sides.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	0.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

Site Ref: 2162

Site Name: North of Warm Lane, Yeadon

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Not all of the site is within accessibility standard to Public Transport, accessible to employment /Town Centres

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Gill Lane has no footways along the majority of its length including along site frontage, it also has substandard forward visibility at points along its length and is not considered to be suitable to serve additional development. Access from Warm Lane may also be difficult due to the road alignment and potential conflict with existing access points. If linked with adjacent sites 1104 and 3033 suitable access could be achieved.

Rank (1-5)

2

Local network comment

Local congestion issues. Warm Lane is already traffic calmed (speed cushions).

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

None that would overcome site deficiencies.

Total score

6

Support?

Yes with mitigation, if linked with adjacent sites

Need to combine with other sites:

1104 and 3033

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildlife corridor function of Yeadon Gill towards north of the site - by providing a 20 metre buffer from the water course.

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Culverted watercourse to north of site

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

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

Site Ref: 2162

Site Name: North of Warm Lane, Yeadon

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Development of site 2162 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, but development along with sites 1104 and 3033 would be contained by development on 3 sides. Highways consider that the site can be suitably accessed.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

72

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 2163A

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

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2:	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	896.26	Distance to bus stop (metres)	353.96
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	8389
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 3
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.96	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 2163A

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

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
H28/308/89/	Outline application to erect residential development to agricultural site. (site area 2.14ha)	24/10/1989	22/01/1990	R	64.40
H28/173/74/	Outline application to erect one detached house with private driveway, to detached house	25/07/1974	09/12/1974	A	99.53

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Partial
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Site A (the northern section) has a road frontage and relates well to the urban area, when considered with 1180A and 1311A.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Site A is just outside Public Transport accessibility distances and meets other requirements.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access Comments

Access could be created onto Old Hollings Hill with significant widening with the loss of a stone boundary wall and mature trees. Coach Road frontage is onto the narrow section of Coach Road and doesn't have sufficient frontage to the west to improve the full substandard length, alternative route through Silverdale estate not suitable for large increase in traffic. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 1311A would be appropriate.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

Old Hollings Hill would require significant widening with the loss of a stone boundary wall and mature trees. Silverdale Ave, existing on street parking to houses towards Park Road problematic, as an alternative route out, Coach Rd is narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road which can't be fully addressed with this site. Capacity issues at Park Road / A65 Gyratory. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 1311A would be appropriate.

Rank (1-5)

4

Mitigation measure

Old Hollings Hill would require significant widening with the loss of a stone boundary wall and mature trees. Traffic calming in Silverdale estate may help but won't provide the full solution. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 1311A would be appropriate.

Total score

11

Support?

Yes with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

1180A & 1311A

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

No objection

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported with mitigation.

Boundary Amendment

Mitigation is required to ensure impacts on adjacent habitats (potential Leeds Habitat Network) are addressed.

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Water mains in east of site

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

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

Site Ref: 2163A

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

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 1311A would be appropriate. Site A (the northern section) has a road frontage and relates well to the urban area, when considered with 1180A and 1311A. This smaller site (ie site A) will put less pressure on the road network. Traffic calming in Silverdale Estate would be required.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 76 **Floorspace sq m (Non residential):** 0

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 2163B

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

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Existing Use 3: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1078.25	Distance to bus stop (metres)	504.83
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	4411
SFRA Flood Zone:	1.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	1.00	Agricultural Land Class:	
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	64.75	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 2163B

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

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
H28/173/74/	Outline application to erect one detached house with private driveway, to detached house	25/07/1974	09/12/1974	A	27.21

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have marginal effect on the setting & special character of historic features, which

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Development of Site B would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Suitability: Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

The site is outside bus accessibility standards and only a small proportion of the site falls within 800m of a train station. Only the edges of the site meet accessibility standards for health and education.

Rank (1-5)

1

Access Comments

Access could be created onto Old Hollings Hill with significant widening with the loss of a stone boundary wall and mature trees. Coach Road frontage is onto the narrow section of Coach Road and doesn't have sufficient frontage to the west to improve the full substandard length, alternative route through Silverdale estate not suitable for large increase in traffic.

Rank (1-5)

3

Local network comment

Old Hollings Hill would require significant widening with the loss of a stone boundary wall and mature trees. Silverdale Ave, existing on street parking to houses towards Park Road problematic, as an alternative route out, Coach Rd is narrow poorly surfaced road with no footways for a distance between Silverdale Mount and Park Road which can't be fully addressed with this site. Capacity issues at Park Road / A65 Gyratory.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Total score

7

Support?

No

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

No objection

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but includes areas of woodland, a beck, pond and species-rich grassland (potentially part of the Leeds Habitat Network).

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Surface water sewers adjacent to pond in north west of site

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Site Ref: 2163B

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

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development due to Highways concerns and the fact that development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. The quality of the road network would prevent a large development (both A and B) in this area.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 76 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 3026

Site Name: Land between Mire Beck and Ings Lane

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 2:	Community Services - Education
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	Open Countryside
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	839.06	Distance to bus stop (metres)	158.66
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	11896
SFRA Flood Zone:	1.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	1.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 3b
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

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

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 3026

Site Name: Land between Mire Beck and Ings Lane

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Yes
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Site is well contained. Development would round off the settlement.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Suitability: Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Via Ings Lane no bus service but 1km to rail station and within town centre walk.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Access from Ings Lane achievable with mitigation. No access to A65 which would resolve bus service and improve accessibility in general.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

Local congestion issues on A65.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Unknown at this stage?

Total score

9

Support?

Yes - with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

General asset protection issues

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the Mire Beck wildlife corridor - retaining a minimum 20 metre buffer from the beck. Otter, White-clawed Crayfish and feeding bats to consider.

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

This site lies in flood zone 1 on the EA Flood Map (low risk). However, any site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must investigate Mire Beck as a source of flood risk because the development site abuts the watercourse. The development layout plan must be amended accordingly.

Environment Agency Constraints:

FZ3/2 de minimis

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Large surface water sewer adjacent to railway track at east

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Burley Menston

LCC Flood Risk Management:

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

Site Ref: 3026

Site Name: Land between Mire Beck and Ings Lane

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Site is well contained. Development would round off the settlement. Highways concerns about local road congestion, mitigation measures would be required.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

535

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Retail Conclusion:

Employment Conclusion:

Amber

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

Site Ref: 3028

Site Name: Kelcliffe Mount/West View, Kelcliffe Lane,
Guiseley, LS20 9DE

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
Existing Use 3:	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 1	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2:	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	
Site State:	Mixed

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	581.57	Distance to bus stop (metres)	437.02
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	4836
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 4
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.75	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<input type="text"/>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 3028

Site Name: Kelcliffe Mount/West View, Kelcliffe Lane,
Guiseley, LS20 9DE

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
H28/621/77/	Laying out of enlarged car parking area to works.	10/11/1977	16/01/1978	A	23.25
H28/543/79/	Replacement, 3, 814 litres liquid oxygen storage tank to works.	10/08/1979	05/11/1979	A	23.34
H28/779/79/	Addition of porch, to rear of semi-detached house.	12/11/1979	04/12/1979	A	13.51
H28/106/75/	Demolition of stable, alterations and change of use of outbuildings, comprising stable, stores, garage, w.c. and barn,	10/03/1975	09/06/1977	R	13.51
H28/578/75/	Re-siting of petrol pump, to works premises.	04/11/1975	01/12/1975	A	23.25
H28/132/75/	Change of use of farm outbuildings to residential accommodation.	25/03/1975	09/06/1977	R	13.51
H28/267/76/	Laying out of access road to link 2 existing car parks to work premises.	28/04/1976	05/07/1976	A	23.25
H28/621/79/	One 68, 190 litres and one 45, 460 litres oil storage tanks, to works.	14/09/1979	05/11/1979	A	23.25
H28/407/76/	Application to erect one detached house to vacant house. (site area 0.285 ha. (0.7 acre)).	24/06/1976	16/08/1976	R	13.51
H28/720/76/	Laying out of turning and vehicular loading area, to works premises.	25/11/1976	04/01/1977	A	23.25
H28/774/79/	Demolition of existing office unit and loading bay, laying out of enlarged access, and alterations, including	08/11/1979	17/12/1979	A	23.38
H28/112/77/	Laying out of golf practice area, to vacant site. (site area 2.27ha (5.61 acres)).	04/03/1977	18/04/1977	A	14.67
H28/216/90/	Retrospective change of use of land and outbuildings including school and off site highway improvements.	21/09/1990	13/06/1991	A	27.96
H28/560/78/	Outline application to lay out access and erection of residential development to vacant site. (site area 3.85ha (9.	31/08/1978	16/10/1978	R	20.30

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

Site Ref: 3028

Site Name: Kelcliffe Mount/West View, Kelcliffe Lane, Guiseley, LS20 9DE

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Visible location above the urban area. Development would constitute urban sprawl, unrelated to the existing settlement pattern.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 3028

Site Name: Kelcliffe Mount/West View, Kelcliffe Lane, Guiseley, LS20 9DE

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Not accessible to public transport. Half site is within accessibility standards to services.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Landlocked, not clear why extra field to Moor Lane not included.

Rank (1-5)

1

Local network comment

Local congestion issues on A65.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Unknown at this stage?

Total score

6

Support?

No due to access, mitigation if access possible.

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Large abandoned water mains through the centre of the site

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 3028

Site Name: Kelcliffe Mount/West View, Kelcliffe Lane, Guiseley, LS20 9DE

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Visible location above the urban area. Development would constitute urban sprawl, unrelated to the existing settlement pattern. Highways issues regarding access.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

396

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 3029

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

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	932.75	Distance to bus stop (metres)	196.07
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	7412
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.86	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 3029

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

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Partial
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. The site is well connected to the urban area but does perform a role in safeguarding the countryside from further sprawl.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 3029

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

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

The majority of the site is within walking distance of access to bus services. The Railway Station is a bit further afield.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access Comments

Potential for direct access to Queensway subject to satisfying junction spacing and visibility requirements. Pedestrian link to Shaw Lane Gardens is possible. Also could be linked in part to site 1255B depending on overall number of dwellings.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

Traffic Managemnt issues on Queensway.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Traffic caliming on Queensway

Total score

10

Support?

Yes - with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Yes

Suitability for partial development:

Yes

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Combined sewers and water mains in north and western boundary of the site

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 3029

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

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site has been redrawn to exclude the residential properties along Wills Gill. The site is well connected to the urban area but does perform a role in safeguarding the countryside from further sprawl.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 133 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 3030

Site Name: Yeadon Banks, Haw Lane, Yeadon, LS19 7

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Vacant and derelict - Vacant land
Existing Use 2:	
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 2:	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	Village Green
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	No Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2029.95	Distance to bus stop (metres)	259.60
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	12022
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.99	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 3030

Site Name: Yeadon Banks, Haw Lane, Yeadon, LS19 7

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
H28/4/75/	Outline application to erect a pprox. 30 detached and 25 pairs of semi-detached houses, with garages to vacant sit	07/01/1976	09/06/1977	R	58.96
H28/820/78/	Outline application erect deta ched bungalow with attac hed garage to vacant site. (site area	18/12/1978	19/03/1979	R	59.39

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Part of the site also falls within the designated Village Green. Development of the site in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern and constitute urban sprawl.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 3030

Site Name: Yeadon Banks, Haw Lane, Yeadon, LS19 7

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: No

Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

60% of site meets Public Transport accessibility standards, 40% of site meets accessibility standards to local facilities, education and healthcare

Rank (1-5)

3

Access Comments

Direct access from Haw Lane possible on 'country lane' section. Haw Lane will need to be widened with footways along site frontage, footways extended south.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

Local congestion issues on A65.

Rank (1-5)

4

Mitigation measure

Haw Lane widening and footways, improve footpath link to Bankfield Cres

Total score

11

Support?

yes - with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

better if combined with 2118

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 3030

Site Name: Yeadon Banks, Haw Lane, Yeadon, LS19 7

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Part of the site also falls within the designated Village Green. Development of the site in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern and constitute urban sprawl.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

101

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 3031

Site Name: Ghyll Mount, Yeadon, LS19 7GA

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Mixed

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1804.79	Distance to bus stop (metres)	306.98
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	10299
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 3
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.35	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<input type="text"/>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 3031

Site Name: Ghyll Mount, Yeadon, LS19 7GA

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
H28/259/90/	Alterations and extension to form dining room and conservatory, to side of semi-detached house.	03/12/1990	09/01/1991	A	53.48
H28/689/77/	Amendment to previous application involving resiting of 2 detached link dwellings, to vacant site (previous application)	23/12/1977	06/02/1978	A	56.11

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site, not particularly well related to the existing settlement pattern. Highways objections.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 3031

Site Name: Ghyll Mount, Yeadon, LS19 7GA

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Poor access to Public Transport and Health facilities. Close to local Primary and Secondary Schools.

Rank (1-5)

1

Access Comments

Appears to be insufficient space to accommodate an adopted access road.

Rank (1-5)

2

Local network comment

High levels of on-street parking in Westfied Estate. Congestion on A65.

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

None that would overcome site deficiencies.

Total score

5

Support?

No

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Culverted watercourse in eastern part of site

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 3031

Site Name: Ghyll Mount, Yeadon, LS19 7GA

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site, not particularly well related to the existing settlement pattern. Highways concerns re access - adoptable highway not considered achievable.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

41

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 3033

Site Name: High Fold Farm, Warm Lane, Rawdon, LS19 7DN

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	Residential - Dwellings
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2:	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 3:	Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm
Other uses:	
Site State:	Mixed

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2640.72	Distance to bus stop (metres)	353.99
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	4123
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 3
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.39	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 3033

Site Name: High Fold Farm, Warm Lane, Rawdon, LS19
7DN

Planning History

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

Site Ref: 3033

Site Name: High Fold Farm, Warm Lane, Rawdon, LS19 7DN

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?: Yes

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have marginal effect on the setting & special character of historic features, which

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Development of site 3033 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, but development along with sites 1104 and 2162 would be contained by development on 3 sides.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 3033

Site Name: High Fold Farm, Warm Lane, Rawdon, LS19 7DN

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Poor access to Public Transport, Health facilities, Local Primary and Secondary Schools.

Rank (1-5)

1

Access Comments

Although there are opportunities for access along Apperley Lane the existing footway provision is substandard where it exists and there is generally no footway along the Apperley Lane site frontage. Opportunity for limited access on to Warm Lane. However footways also substandard in this location.

Rank (1-5)

3

Local network comment

Congestion on A65. Poor footway connections on Apperley Lane and Warm Lane site frontages.

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

Footway improvements and Traffic Regulation Orders. Full assessment of impact on A65 and Apperley Lane may require other measures.

Total score

7

Support?

Yes, with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Within Source Protection Zones 2, a risk based approach will be applied to the consideration of development proposals with the exception of development involving sub-water table storage; deep soakaway; underground storage of hazardous substances; sewage, trade and storm effluent, or other contaminated discharges to ground. These will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that they are necessary, are the only option available, and where adequate safeguards against possible contamination can be agreed. Within Source Protection Zones developers will be expected to provide full details of the proposed construction of new buildings and construction techniques, including foundation design as

Environment Agency Constraints:

SPZ2

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

Site Ref: 3033

Site Name: High Fold Farm, Warm Lane, Rawdon, LS19 7DN

part of their proposals.

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Surface water sewer in northern part of site

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Development of site 3033 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, but development along with sites 1104 and 2162 would be contained by development on 3 sides. Highways consider that the site can be suitably accessed.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

214

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 3034

Site Name: Cold Harbour Farm, Bayton Lane, Yeadon and Rawdon Billings

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 2:	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 3:	Other
Other uses:	Local Nature Area
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	3002.83	Distance to bus stop (metres)	307.46
Nearest Railway Station	Horsforth	Bus Stop ID	1024
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 4
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.77	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.08	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 3034

Site Name: Cold Harbour Farm, Bayton Lane, Yeadon
and Rawdon Billings

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
H28/669/77/	Detached silage barn and cow cubicle building to farm.	06/12/1977	06/02/1978	A	12.09

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

Site Ref: 3034

Site Name: Cold Harbour Farm, Bayton Lane, Yeadon and Rawdon Billings

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have a significant effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Large site. Development would have a significant impact on the openness of the green belt and result in a large area of urban sprawl. Site currently performs important countryside function and surrounds an important nature area.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	1.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 3034

Site Name: Cold Harbour Farm, Bayton Lane, Yeadon and Rawdon Billings

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Unknown

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

80% of this site is accessible to Public Transport, but only approx 30% of the site is accessible to services.

Rank (1-5)

2

Access Comments

Bayton Lane too narrow and has no footway but mitigation can be completed, left turn out of site only onto Bayton Lane. Access to Larkfield Road required through another site (this access essential for larger site) but access not suitable due to brow of hill access visibility issues. Access to Belmont Grove likely to be unsuitable due to junction with A658/B6152 unless significant signalisation/road improvements are completed (which may still not work) and footways put in on Belmont Grove.

Rank (1-5)

2

Local network comment

Local congestion issues on A658, A65, Bayton Lane.

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

No suitable mitigation for access onto Larkfield Mount which is essential to progress larger site and distribute trips on network, other mitigation around network possible on Bayton Lane and Bellmount Grove.

Total score

6

Support?

No

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

n/a

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported - Great Crested Newts to consider.

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Should this come to fruition, we would request land from part of the development for new school provision.

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

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

Site Ref: 3034

Site Name: Cold Harbour Farm, Bayton Lane, Yeadon and Rawdon Billings

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site covers the area commonly known as Rawdon Billings and envelopes Billing Hill, a protected nature area. The site is large and development would have a serious impact on the openness of the Green Belt and result in a large area of urban sprawl. The area and capacity has been split - 2.66ha, capacity of 70 in North Leeds housing market characteristic area, majority (56.25ha) in Aireborough.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

1888

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 3326

Site Name: Land north of Bayton Lane, Rawdon

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2:
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses: SEGI on site.
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2969.50	Distance to bus stop (metres)	326.37
Nearest Railway Station	Horsforth	Bus Stop ID	11647
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 4
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0.01	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 3326

Site Name: Land north of Bayton Lane, Rawdon

Planning History

<i>Planning App No.</i>	<i>Proposal</i>	<i>Received</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Site %</i>
H28/241/81/	Insulation of dwellings within the 45m contour in accordance with condition 9, application number 77/28/00436	28/07/1981	24/08/1981	A	24.57

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. The site contains a Site of Ecological or Geological Interest (SEGI) and is not considered suitable for development. The area not covered by a SEGI is separated from the settlement.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Average accessibility to all services.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access Comments

Access onto adopted highway achievable, Bayton Lane has narrow width and no footways for large volumes of traffic.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

Significant local congestion at peak times, unlikely to be able to mitigate.

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

highway works, signal improvements

Total score

9

Support?

no

Need to combine with other sites:

yes with site 3034 and comprehensive highway improvements

Suitability for partial development:

yes

Highways Agency

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). The northern section of this site is Rawdon Ponds Site of Ecological and Geological Importance (SEGI) - an important site for Great Crested Newts (European Protected species). The site includes breeding ponds and terrestrial feeding and hibernating habitat.

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

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

Site Ref: 3326

Site Name: Land north of Bayton Lane, Rawdon

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site contains a Site of Ecological or Geological Interest (SEGI) and is not considered suitable for development. The area not covered by a SEGI is separated from the settlement and given the sensitive nature of the area development is not considered appropriate.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

200

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Red

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

Site Ref: 3329

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

Site Details

Northing:	438903	Area sq m:	35700.67	Ward	Horsforth
Easting:	422303	Area Ha:	3.570067	HMCA:	Aireborough

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2130.84	Distance to bus stop (metres)	245.03
Nearest Railway Station	Horsforth	Bus Stop ID	2947
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 3
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	Yes	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Agricultural fields to the rear of properties on Layton Lane. The site is bounded to the east by a tree line, though there is limited tree coverage on the remainder of the site. Site slopes from north to south.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 3329

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

Planning History

Site Ref: 3329

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Partial
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Due to the enclosed nature of the site, development would have limited impact on the Green Belt.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 3329

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

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Good accessibility to employment and Public Transport, poor accessibility to local services.

Rank (1-5)

4

Access Comments

Frontage with side road off Laytone Lane, possible junction works with A65. Adopted spur road between 24 & 26 Layton Lane is wide enough to create access to the site, access also available between 64 & 68 but is private. A single point of access would be adequate for the proposed level of development c100 units. Support with mitigation.

Rank (1-5)

5

Local network comment

Local congestion issues.

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

Total score

11

Support?

yes with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

no

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wooded beck corridor that runs down the eastern side of this site, and the hedgerow/line of trees that runs across the site. The beck and lowland mixed deciduous woodland are UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority habitats. A minimum 20 metre buffer to be provided to the wooded areas and planted with native shrubs, small trees. A minimum 5 metre buffer on both sides of the hedgerow/line of trees across the site (this feature provides a valuable east-west habitat link and any break in it for access should be kept to an absolute minimum and mitigated for by significant hedgerow planting elsewhere around the boundaries).

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

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

Site Ref: 3329

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

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site is well contained due to the trees along the eastern boundary, which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and provide natural screening. Due to the enclosed nature of the site, development would have limited impact on the Green Belt. The adopted spur road between 24&26 Layton Lane is wide enough to create access to the site, access also available between 64 & 68 but is private. A single point of access would be adequate for the proposed level of development c100 units.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

93

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 3331

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

Site Details

Northing:	438506	Area sq m:	10112.83	Ward	Horsforth
Easting:	422117	Area Ha:	1.011283	HMCA:	Aireborough

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2:	Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 3:	Forestry - Unmanaged Forest
Other uses:	
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2389.26	Distance to bus stop (metres)	120.13
Nearest Railway Station	Horsforth	Bus Stop ID	12849
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 3
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	Yes	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Triangular site to the south of Knott Lane/Layton Lane junction. Site is bounded by trees to the south. There is some further tree coverage in the centre of the site, which acts as screening for small managed area of site. Site slopes to the south.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 40px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 3331

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

Planning History

Site Ref: 3331

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site, but well contained and would not constitute sprawl if developed.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 3331

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

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Good accessibility to all services.

Rank (1-5)

5

Access Comments

Frontage with Knott Lane good, possible junction works with A65.

Rank (1-5)

5

Local network comment

Local congestion issues.

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

Total score

12

Support?

yes with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

no

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wooded beck corridor that runs down the eastern side of this site, and the hedgerow that runs part of the way along the eastern boundary. The beck and lowland mixed deciduous woodland are UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority habitats. A minimum 20 metre buffer to be provided to the wooded/beck corridor and planted with native shrubs, small trees.

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

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

Site Ref: 3331

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

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site, but well contained and would not constitute sprawl if developed. Could be developed along with site 4095; the sites would need to jointly provide a realignment of Knott Lane to provide a 90 degree approach to the A65. Accessibility by public transport and to facilities is good.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

21

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 3366

Site Name: Harrogate Road, Yeadon (adjacent to Airport)

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2:	Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
Neighbouring Use 3:	Transport - Terminals and Interchanges
Other uses:	Residential - Dwellings
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	3040.44	Distance to bus stop (metres)	195.57
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	2046
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 3366

Site Name: Harrogate Road, Yeadon (adjacent to Airport)

Planning History

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

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Yes
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Self contained between existing housing and airport runway. Development would constitute rounding off of settlement.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 3366

Site Name: Harrogate Road, Yeadon (adjacent to Airport)

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs)

Suitability: LDF to determine

Achievability: Long term (11+ years)

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Poor accessibility to Public Transport and employment, good accessibility to local services.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access Comments

Frontage with Victoria Avenue but access works required as access visibility and road layout challenging. Site would need to be accessed from a new roundabout on Victoria Avenue.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

Significant local congestion at peak times, unlikely to be able to mitigate all sites in area including this one.

Rank (1-5)

2

Mitigation measure

access signals/rdt will be required, poss cumulative fund for congestion in area

Total score

9

Support?

Yes, with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

no

Suitability for partial development:

yes

Highways Agency

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance Yeadon Tarn Local Nature Area (LNA) (immediately adjacent to north-west) - an important site for wildfowl and passerine birds, amphibians and water voles. Provide a buffer zone between the development and the LNA of 20 metres.

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Combined and surface water sewers cross the site and converge in the centre

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

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

Site Ref: 3366

Site Name: Harrogate Road, Yeadon (adjacent to Airport)

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Self contained between existing housing and airport runway. Development would constitute rounding off of settlement. Site would need to be accessed from a new roundabout on Victoria Avenue.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

102

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 4019

Site Name: Kirkland House, Queensway, Yeadon

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Residential - Residential institution
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space
 Neighbouring Use 3: Retail - Shops
 Other uses:
 Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Flat	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1613.50	Distance to bus stop (metres)	131.36
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	1269
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Urban
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%)	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0.01	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 4019

Site Name: Kirkland House, Queensway, Yeadon

Planning History

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

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?

If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 4019

Site Name: Kirkland House, Queensway, Yeadon

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Accessibility to public transport. employment, health and education good.

Rank (1-5)

5

Access Comments

Access possible from Queensway, traffic calming may need to be reconfigured.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

No concern for level of development possible.

Rank (1-5)

4

Mitigation measure

Total score

13

Support?

Yes

Need to combine with other sites:

No

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

Comments Awaited

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Combined and foul sewers in northern boundary

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 4019

Site Name: Kirkland House, Queensway, Yeadon

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Brownfield site located in residential area. Site was formerly in residential use as a care home. Residential use therefore considered acceptable and no Highways issues raised.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 17 **Floorspace sq m (Non residential):** 0

Residential Conclusion:
Green

Retail Conclusion:
 Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:
 Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 4020

Site Name: Hollins Lane/Hawstone Avenue, Guiseley

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Agriculture
 Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	1177.15	Distance to bus stop (metres)	195.77
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	3062
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 4
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	Yes
Public Rights of Way:	Yes		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.84	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 4020

Site Name: Hollins Lane/Hawstone Avenue, Guiseley

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging but there is no defensible boundary

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Development would form an extension to the existing residential area on the eastern boundary. However, development could set a precedent for unrestricted urban sprawl.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 4020

Site Name: Hollins Lane/Hawstone Avenue, Guiseley

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Poor accessibility to public transport and employment, health and education good accessibility.

Rank (1-5)

3

Access Comments

Access onto Hollins Hill would require widening to provide ghost island right turn due to proximity with Park Rd junction which is to be signalised.

Rank (1-5)

4

Local network comment

Local capacity issues.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Widening of Hollins Lill for ghost island

Total score

10

Support?

Yes with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

No

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

Comments Awaited

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Supported

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 4020

Site Name: Hollins Lane/Hawstone Avenue, Guiseley

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Development would form an extension to the existing residential area on the eastern boundary. However, development could set a precedent for unrestricted urban sprawl.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 80 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion:

Amber

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 4043

Site Name: Ings Lane, Guiseley

Site Details

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

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1:	Agriculture
Existing Use 2:	
Existing Use 3:	
Neighbouring Use 1	Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2:	Transport - Transport tracks & ways
Neighbouring Use 3:	
Other uses:	Pub
Site State:	Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Partially well-defined
Natural Landscape:	Limited Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	899.20	Distance to bus stop (metres)	166.46
Nearest Railway Station	Guiseley	Bus Stop ID	6546
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 3b
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	No	Conservation Areas	Yes
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Land to the west of Netherfield Road, bounded by railway line to the west and Ings Lane to the south. Open fields are beyond the northern boundary. Public house to the south west. Tree line provides screening along this boundary. There is little tree coverage on the remainder of the site. Site slopes down towards the railway line.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 4043

Site Name: Ings Lane, Guiseley

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Partial
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

Green Belt site. Site is contained by existing development & the railway line and so relates relatively well to the existing settlement.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

The site is outside bus and rail accessibility standards but local centre and health/education accessibility reasonable

Rank (1-5)

3

Access Comments

No footway nearside - required to achieve access

Rank (1-5)

3

Local network comment

A65 congestion.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

footway and TM measures

Total score

9

Support?

yes with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). No site based designations but this site consists mainly of low lying damp grassland (UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitat Lowland Rush Pasture) and has records of breeding and wintering Red and Amber list Birds of Conservation Concern - including Teal, Lapwing, Curlew, Snipe. The railway line helps to provide a wildlife corridor function along the western boundary.

Boundary Amendment

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and boundary amended as per drawing RM/4043. Mitigation will be required to off-set the loss of an area of wet grassland within the site by creating new wet scrapes in the excluded area to the north-west. Mitigation will be required to provide permanent fencing along the north boundary to reduce potential unauthorised access that would disturb ground nesting wildfowl, and measures agreed to protect and enhance the adjacent/on-site areas of wet grassland. The boundary with the railway to be enhanced through appropriate planting of a minimum 20 metre buffer.

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

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

Site Ref: 4043

Site Name: Ings Lane, Guiseley

Esholt

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Site is contained by existing development & the railway line and so relates relatively well to the existing settlement. Sufficient frontage for access, would require footway on frontage and crossing points to footway opposite. Accessibility to public transport poor, other facilities acceptable. Development of site 3026 first is considered preferable.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 94 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion: Amber

Retail Conclusion: Not assessed

Employment Conclusion: Not assessed

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

Site Ref: 4095

Site Name: Land to west of Knott Lane, Rawdon

Site Details

Northing:	438657	Area sq m:	19246.16	Ward	Horsforth
Easting:	422040	Area Ha:	1.924616	HMCA:	Aireborough

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
 Existing Use 2:
 Existing Use 3:
 Neighbouring Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale
 Neighbouring Use 2:
 Neighbouring Use 3:
 Other uses:
 Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography:	Sloping	Boundaries:	Existing well defined
Natural Landscape:	No Tree Cover	Road Frontage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance to Rail Station (metres):	2429.17	Distance to bus stop (metres)	60.96
Nearest Railway Station	Horsforth	Bus Stop ID	14185
SFRA Flood Zone:	0.00	Within 300m of retail centre boundary:	
Environment Agency Flood Zone:	0.00	Agricultural Land Class:	Grade 3
Health and Safety Executive Hazard:	No	Strategic Employment Buffer:	0.00
Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:	Yes	Conservation Areas	No
Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):	0.00	Listed Buildings:	No
Public Rights of Way:	No		

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

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

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.95	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 150px; height: 30px;"></div>
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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

Site Ref: 4095

Site Name: Land to west of Knott Lane, Rawdon

Planning History

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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

- Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?
- Would development result in isolated development?
- Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?
- Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Yes
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land?

Overall sprawl conclusion:

Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

- Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?
- Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development?

Overall Coalescence Conclusion:

No merging of settlements

Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

- Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area?
- Does the site provide access to the countryside?
- Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?
- Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?
- Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?
- Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

- Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature?
- If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:

Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features

Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:

The site is well contained by existing development and would not constitute sprawl if developed.

Conformity with Core Strategy

Major Urban Area:	0.00	Major Settlement	1.00
Urban Extension Area:	0.00	Smaller settlement	0.00
<u>Regeneration Priority Area:</u>			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00
East Leeds			

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

Site Ref: 4095

Site Name: Land to west of Knott Lane, Rawdon

SHLAA Conclusions

Availability:

Suitability:

Achievability:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro

Accessibility comment

Good access to Public Transport - reasonable to other services.

Rank (1-5)

4

Access Comments

Could be developed along with 3331, the sites would need to jointly provide a realignment of Knott Lane to provide a 90 degree approach to the A65.

Rank (1-5)

3

Local network comment

A65 congestion issue.

Rank (1-5)

3

Mitigation measure

Total score

10

Support?

yes with mitigation

Need to combine with other sites:

3331

Suitability for partial development:

Highways Agency

Network Rail :

Biodiversity

West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Boundary Amendment

Natural England:

Education

Drainage/Water/Flooding

Environment Agency Comments:

Environment Agency Constraints:

Yorkshire Water Comments:

Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Utilities

Gas:

Electric:

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

Site Ref: 4095

Site Name: Land to west of Knott Lane, Rawdon

Telecom:

Fire and Rescue Services:

Built Heritage

Leeds City Council:

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:

English Heritage:

Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment

Could site be effectively managed	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes	No	Maybe
	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes	No	
	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes	No	Unknown
	(Text)		

Conclusion of Assessment

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Site is well contained by existing development and would not constitute sprawl if developed. Could be developed along with site 3331; the sites would need to jointly provide a realignment of Knott Lane to provide a 90 degree approach to the A65. Accessibility by public transport and to facilities is good.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 61 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion:

Green

Retail Conclusion:

Not assessed

Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

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