

EAST HOUSING MARKET CHARACTERISTIC AREA

Temple Newsam, Garforth & Swillington, Cross Gates & Whinmoor, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill, City & Hunslet

NB Very small parts of Killingbeck & Seacroft, Middleton Park & Rothwell Wards fall within the East HMCA

INTRODUCTION

1.0 East Housing Market Characteristic Area and Wards

- 1.1 Plan 1 shows the boundaries of the wards that fall, to a greater or lesser extent, within East Housing Market Characteristic Area (HMCA). The plan also shows the areas of greenspace by type that fall in the area. Copies of plans are available upon request. Please e-mail ldf@leeds.gov.uk.
- 1.2 The greenspace sites shown on the plan and used in the following assessment are those which were identified and surveyed during the citywide Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment (referred to as the Open Space Audit) in 2008 and not the allocated greenspace (N1, N1a, N5 and N6) identified in the UDP Review 2006. Many sites are in both but there are variations which must be noted: 1) some allocated sites are not included (where they have been developed); 2) others appear with amended boundaries; and 3) there are additional sites which are not currently allocated but have been identified through the audit as functioning as greenspace. Plan 2 overlays the existing UDP allocations with the boundaries of the Open Space Audit sites and thereby clearly shows the differences between the two. Appendix 1 contains a list of those allocated sites which do not appear on the plan and the reasons why they are not shown. It is proposed to delete these sites, revise the boundaries of some sites to reflect what is currently on the ground and designate the new sites identified through the Open Space Audit.
- 1.3 Housing Market Characteristic Areas are sub-areas recognising the diverse nature and characteristics of market areas across the City. These areas take account of topographical and settlement spatial definitions as well as operational housing markets in terms of house prices and land values. They reflect geographical areas that people tend to associate with finding properties to live in.
- 1.4 Whilst other subjects have been considered on an HMCA basis, the quantity of greenspace has been analysed according to wards because this allowed a more accurate analysis by ward population figures. The quality and accessibility of greenspace is assessed on an HMCA basis.
- 1.5 There are 8 wards that fall to a greater or lesser extent within the East Housing Market Characteristic Area. The majority of Temple Newsam and Cross Gates and Whinmoor Wards fall within the area along with parts of Garforth & Swillington, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill and City & Hunslet Wards. Very small parts of Killingbeck and Seacroft, Middleton Park and Rothwell Wards also lie within the East area.
- 1.6 Where an area of greenspace falls across the boundary of the ward then only the part of the greenspace that falls within the ward has been included in the analysis. Care has been taken to check this would not result in the division of a facility.

2.0 Total Greenspace in East Area

2.1 Total greenspace in all wards which fall within the East area is **996.027ha** on **111** greenspace sites. Excluding green corridors, cemeteries and golf courses the total is **658.751ha** which relates to **82** sites.

3.0 Core Strategy Policy G3: Standards for Open Space, Sport and Recreation

3.1 Policy G3 sets out standards for the following types of greenspace:

- Parks and Gardens
- Outdoor Sports Provision - excludes MUGAs, single goal ends and golf courses. Includes tennis courts, bowling greens, athletics tracks, synthetic pitches, adult pitches, junior pitches (football, rugby, cricket)
- Amenity greenspace – excludes cemeteries.
- Children and young people's equipped play facilities – includes MUGAs skate parks, teen shelters, play facilities.
- Allotments – both used and unused.
- Natural greenspace - excludes green corridors.

3.2 There are no standards in the Core Strategy for cemeteries, green corridors and golf courses (but these are shown on Plan 1 for completeness).

QUANTITY OF GREENSPACE

4.0 Methodology

4.1 The tables below show the breakdown of provision, or **quantity**, for each of the 6 types of greenspace defined in Policy G3 in the Core Strategy. The quantities have been divided by the total population of each ward to give a standard which can be compared against the standards in Policy G3.

4.2 The ward population is taken from the ONS Population Census 2011. Ward Populations are as follows:

Ward	Population
Cross Gates & Whinmoor	22,099
Temple Newsam	21,543
Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	24,843
City & Hunslet	33,705
Middleton Park	26,228
Garforth & Swillington	19,811
Killingbeck & Seacroft	23,749

NB: As the part of Rothwell ward which is in the East area features no greenspace, the population figures for Rothwell have deliberately been excluded from this table.

4.3 Child populations are taken from the ONS Population Census 2011 and the 2007 mid year estimates. The 2011 census figures are grouped in 5 year categories so there are accurate figures for 0 - 4, 5 – 9 and 10 – 14 year olds. The next category is 15 – 19 year olds so the 2007 mid year estimates have been used to estimate the number of 15 and 16 year olds. These estimates are broken down to individual years so the number of 11 and 12 year olds in 2007 (15 and 16 year olds in 2011)

has been added to the 2011 population figures to give an estimate of children and young people by ward. This is set out below:

Ward	Population aged 0 -16 years
Cross Gates & Whinmoor	4,380
Temple Newsam	4,625
Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	5,796
City & Hunslet	4,492
Middleton Park	6,387
Garforth & Swillington	3,689
Killingbeck & Seacroft	5,688

NB: As the part of Rothwell ward which is in the East HMCA features no greenspace, the population figures for Rothwell have deliberately been excluded from this table

4.4.1 Core Strategy policy G3 identifies the following standards for quantity of greenspace:

Greenspace type	Quantity per 1000 population
Parks and Gardens	1 hectare
Outdoor sports provision	1.2 hectares (excluding education provision)
Amenity greenspace	0.45 hectares
Children and young people's equipped play facilities	2 facilities per 1,000 children (excluding education provision)
Allotments	0.24 hectares
Natural Greenspace	0.7 hectares (main urban area and major settlements, 2 ha other areas)

5.0 Quantities by types and Wards

5.1 The quantities of greenspace types compared to the Core Strategy standards are as follows for each of the wards in the East area.

Parks and Gardens:

5.2 Parks and Gardens Cross Gates & Whinmoor Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
143	Manston Park	5.323
110	Whinmoor Park	2.083
1511	Swarcliffe Langbar	2.012
	Total	9.418

5.2.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $9.418 \div 22.099 = 0.426$ hectares

5.2.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Cross Gates & Whinmoor ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.3 *Parks and Gardens Temple Newsam Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
367	Temple Newsam Road Amenity / Sports Area	2.576
127	Halton Dean - Primrose Valley	34.457
97	Temple Newsam Estate	338.111
	Total	375.144

5.3.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $375.144 \div 21.543 = 17.41$ hectares

5.3.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Temple Newsam ward comfortably exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens. The overwhelming majority of this surplus is attributable to the Temple Newsam estate which is owned by Leeds City Council and is open to the public.

5.4 *Parks and Gardens Burmantofts & Richmond Hill*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
437	Nowell Mount	3.702
299	Ebors Playing Fields	3.213
304	Bow Street Rec Ground	1.962
40	East End Park	20.233
	Total	29.110

5.4.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $29.110 \div 24.843 = 1.71$ hectares

5.4.2 Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.4.3 *Parks and Gardens City & Hunslet*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1050	Leasowe Recreation Ground	1.910
1072	Old Run Road	2.896
13	Hunslet Moor	6.114
64	Hunslet Lake	1.971
124	Grove Road Recreational Ground	1.032
1054	Beza Street Recreation Ground	2.328
	Total	16.251

5.4.4 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $16.251 \div 33.705 = 0.482$ hectares

5.4.5 Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, City & Hunslet ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has a deficiency of provision in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.4.6 *Parks and Gardens Middleton Park*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
794	Throstle Recreation Ground	6.281
1044	Low Grange View	1.603
1025	Windmill Road Rec	1.489
955	Cranmore Rise	0.464
1072	Old Run Road	9.882
1066	Winrose Crescent	0.874
844	St Peters Playing Field	1.604
74	Middleton Park	142.296
Total		164.493

5.4.7 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $164.493 \div 26.228 = 6.27$ hectares

5.4.8 Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Middleton Park ward far exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has a large surplus provision in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens. This surplus of parks and gardens is namely attributable to the presence of Middleton Park itself.

5.4.9 *Parks and Gardens Garforth & Swillington Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
51	Glebelands Recreation Ground	4.245
23	Barley Hill Park	3.161
1319	Valley Drive Playground	0.370
1232	Goose Fields	1.065
97	Temple Newsam Estate	1.495
	Total	10.336

5.4.10 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $10.336 \div 19.811 = 0.52$ hectares

5.4.10 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Garforth & Swillington ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.4.11 *Parks and Gardens Rothwell Ward*

5.4.12 No greenspace within the Rothwell Ward falls inside the East Area boundary.

5.4.13 *Parks & Gardens Killingbeck & Seacroft*

5.4.14 Although the southern tip of Killingbeck and Seacroft falls within the East area, only 4 sites are caught within the boundary and none of these sites are of the Parks & Gardens typology.

5.5 **Parks and Gardens - Overall Conclusions**

If the totals for the wards which feature greenspace within the East area boundary are added together it creates an overall average standard of **3.357 hectares per**

1,000 population. This is over the Core Strategy standard, however this figure as an average will be distorted by the Temple Newsam Estate and Middleton Park.

Outdoor Sports Provision

5.6 Methodology

5.6.1 Outdoor sports facilities in educational use have been excluded as these are only available for use by the children attending that school and it cannot be assumed that they are available for the public to use. Golf courses have also been excluded.

5.6.2 There are instances where outdoor sports provision occurs within other primary typologies. We have identified these and used the Sport England Comparison Standards to extract out the size of facilities as follows:

- Playing pitch (adult) = 1.2ha
- Junior pitch = 0.5ha
- Bowling green = 0.14ha
- Tennis court = 0.0742
- Cricket pitch = 1.37ha
- Synthetic turf pitch = 0.7ha

5.7 Outdoor Sports Provision Cross Gates & Whinmoor Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
1762	Red Hall Playing Fields
224	Manston St James Playing Fields
1435	Cross Gates Cricket Pitch
1860	Crossgates Recreational Hall
156	Skelton Wood Sports Field
511	Penda's Playing Field
1434	Leeds Lions AFC Football Pitch
143	Manston Park
1829	John Smeaton Sports Centre
110	Whinmoor Park
1511	Swarcliffe Langbar

5.7.1 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	15	18
Junior Pitches	4	2
Cricket Pitches	1	1.37
Tennis Courts	4	0.2968
Bowling Green	3	0.42
Synthetic Pitches	1	0.7
Total		22.786

5.7.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $22.786 \div 22.099 = 1.03$ hectares

5.8 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Cross Gates & Whinmoor ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

5.9 **Outdoor Sports Provision Temple Newsam Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
367	Temple Newsam Road Amenity / Sports Area
1449	Colton Sports Association
346	Wyke Beck (Halton Moor/Osmondthorpe)
127	Halton Dean - Primrose Valley
1184	Whitkirk
97	Temple Newsam Estate

5.9.1 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	23	27.6
Junior Pitches	2	1
Cricket Pitches	1	1.37
Tennis Courts	4	0.2968
Bowling Green	3	0.42
Synthetic Pitches	1	0.7
Total		31.38

5.9.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $31.38 \div 21.543 = 1.456$ hectares

5.9.3 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Temple Newsam ward slightly exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

5.9.4 **Outdoor Sports Provision Burmantofts & Richmond Hill**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
437	Nowell Mount
299	Ebors Playing Fields
294	Pontefract Lane (Aysgarth Amenity Space)
345	Osmondthorpe Recreation Ground
521	East Leeds Cricket and Sports Club
236	Cavalier Hill Recreation Ground
297	East Leeds Rugby League Pitch
302	St Agnes Pitch
351	Skelton Road (Private Sports Pitch)
352	Wades Charity Pitches
40	East End Park
322	Irish Centre Sports Pitch

5.9.5 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	12	14.4
Junior Pitches	4	2
Cricket Pitches	0	0
Tennis Courts	0	0
Bowling Green	2	0.28
Synthetic Pitches	1	0.7
Total		17.38

5.9.6 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $17.38 \div 24.843 = 0.70$ hectares

5.9.7 Conclusions - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

5.9.8 Outdoor Sports City & Hunslet

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
912	Skelton Grange Road Pitch
1050	Leasowe Recreation Ground
319	Thomas Danby Pitches
16	South Leeds Sports Centre
13	Hunslet Moor
915	Pepper Road Recreation Ground
64	Hunslet Lake
124	Grove Road Recreational Ground
1053	Hunslet Green (Community Sports Club)
1054	Beza Street Recreation Ground
7	Lady Pit Lane Allotments & POS

5.9.9 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	11	13.2
Junior Pitches	4	2
Cricket Pitches	0	0
Tennis Courts	0	0
Bowling Green	2	0.28
Synthetic Pitches	1	0.7
Total		16.18

5.9.10 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $16.18 \div 33.705 = 0.48$ hectares

5.9.11 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, City & Hunslet ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

5.9.12 **Outdoor Sports Provision Middleton Park Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
1056	South Leeds Stadium
794	Throstle Recreation Ground
1853	Acre Close, Bowling Green
1072	Old Run Road
797	Blenkinsop Field
35	Cranmore Recreation Ground
844	St Peters Playing Field
846	St Georges Centre
841	Middleton Leisure Centre Pitch 2
1036	Windmill PS
847	Leeds Corinthians RUFC
848	Middleton Leisure Centre Pitch 1
843	Sharp Lane (Belle Isle)

5.9.13 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	13	14.2
Junior Pitches	6	3
Cricket Pitches	0	0
Tennis Courts	6	0.445
Bowling Green	3	0.42
Synthetic Pitches	11	7.7
Total		25.76

5.9.14 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $25.76 \div 26.228 = 0.98$ hectares

5.9.15 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Middleton Park ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

5.9.16 **Outdoor Sports Provision Garforth & Swillington Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
1333	Berry Road Playing Field
1334	Berry Lane Cricket Pitch
1124	Wheatley Park Football Ground
1125	Brierlands Lane Pitches
51	Glebelands Recreation Ground
23	Barley Hill Park
1319	Valley Drive Playground
1015	Firthfields POS
1854	Garforth and Swillington Bowling Club
1725	Swillington Minors Welfare Club

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
1013	Ash Lane Pitch
1228	Green Lane Cricket Club
1232	Goose Fields

5.9.17 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	12	14.4
Junior Pitches	10	5
Cricket Pitches	2	2.74
Tennis Courts	2	0.1484
Bowling Green	4	0.56
Synthetic Pitches	0	0
Total		22.85

5.9.18 Quantity (per thousand people) $22.85 \div 19.811 = 1.15$ hectares

5.9.19 Conclusions - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Garforth & Swillington Ward falls below the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is has a deficiency in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

5.10 Outdoor Sports Provision Rothwell Ward

5.10.1 No greenspace within the Rothwell Ward falls inside the East Area boundary.

5.10.2 Outdoor Sports Killingbeck & Seacroft Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
1855	Crossgates Bowling Club

5.10.3 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above site is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Bowling Green	1	0.14

Conclusions – Only a small part of the ward falls within the East area so the figures for the rest of the ward have not been included as these would not be a true reflection of provision in the East area.

5.10.4 Outdoor Sports Provision – Overall Conclusions

5.10.5 If the totals for all wards are added together it creates an overall average standard of **0.793 hectares per 1,000 population**, and all of the wards are deficient in outdoor sports provision, falling below the standard of 1.2ha per 1000 population.

5.10.6 *Amenity Greenspace Cross Gates & Whinmoor Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
198	Naburn Gardens	0.284
1274	Swarcliffe Mill Green Close	0.233
1275	St Margaret Clitherow Roman Catholic Church - Whinmoor	0.357
201	Naburn Chase Play Area	0.254
209	St James The Great Cemetery	0.880
283	Kelmscott Green (Stanks Amenity Space)	1.503
191	Ash Tree Approach Greenspace	0.275
511	Penda's Playing Field	4.599
1577	Smeaton Approach	0.412
1578	Penda's Fields (Adjacent)	1.898
1371	Grimes Dyke Whinmoor	4.313
117	Chippies Quarry(AKA Scholes Brick Works)	1.513
197	Coal Road - Sherburn Road North	1.667
214	Mill Green View 'Village Green'	0.842
215	Mill Green View Amenity Space	0.429
194	Swarcliffe Parade Greenspace	0.216
195	Southwood Gate Backland	0.394
196	Southwood Crescent Amenity Space	0.748
	Total	20.817

5.9.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $20.817 \div 22.099 = 0.94$ hectares

5.9.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Crossgates and Whinmoor ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of amenity greenspace.

5.10 *Amenity Greenspace Temple Newsam*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
368	Halton Moor Public House (Land to rear of)	1.634
360	Coronation Parade Amenity Space	0.575
275	Cartmell Drive	2.209
289	The Crescent, Selby Road	0.365
365	Selby Road Amenity Space	0.339
1206	New Nemple Gate POS	1.112
1444	Meynell Road	0.378
	Total	6.612

5.10.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $6.612 \div 24.843 = 0.266$ hectares

5.10.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Temple Newsam ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy

standard and so has a deficiency in provision in terms of the quantity of amenity greenspace.

5.11 *Amenity Greenspace Burmantofts & Richmond Hill*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
292	Easy Road	1.019
334	Torre Drive (Semi - Circle)	0.201
335	Torre Grove	0.619
438	Torre Crescent	0.398
295	Richmond Hill Rec Centre (Next to)	0.197
294	Pontefract Lane (Aysgarth Amenity Space)	1.188
313	Shakespeare Lawn Village Green Area	0.190
373	Cromwell Heights	0.729
305	Grantham Tower Play Area	0.793
309	Scarsgill Close Amenity Area	0.266
523	Neville POS	2.241
310	Beckett Street Amenity Corridor	3.614
306	Saxton Gardens (Dolphins Greenspace)	0.679
298	Richmond Hill Amenity Space	0.510
312	Trent Road (Arcadia Access) - Greenspace west of	1.330
349	Rookwood Road Amenity Space	0.605
382	St Mary's Churchyard	0.507
383	St Marys Street Greenspace	0.313
348	Osmondthorpe Lane and Rookwood Road (Between)	0.301
1530	Glendales Field	0.522
323	Temple View Road Green Space	0.199
324	Raincliffe Road Recreation Ground	0.982
343	Rookwood Crescent	0.384
	Total	17.787

5.11.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $17.787 \div 24.843 = 0.715$ hectares

5.11.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has small surplus provision in terms of the quantity of amenity greenspace.

5.12 *Amenity Greenspace City & Hunslet*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
85	Park Square	0.622
11	Dewsbury Road Traffic Island (Turbine Site)	0.757
3	Lady Pit Lane	0.191
1059	Thwaites Mill Paddock	3.049

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
178	Drydock POS	0.502
179	City Gate	0.515
182	Merrion Gardens	0.224
84	Parish Church Gardens (Penny Pocket Park)	0.941
1270	Midland Garth POS	0.216
1285	Rocheford Walk POS	1.200
190	Queen Square	0.256
188	Leeds City Office Park	0.266
184	Belgrave Street POS	0.248
177	Calverley Street (Leeds MET)	0.380
1057	Leasow Road Sub Station	0.333
1886	Whitefield Way, Hunslet	0.455
	Total	10.155

5.12.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $10.155 \div 33.705 = 0.301$ hectares

5.12.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, City & Hunslet ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has small deficiency in terms of the amenity greenspace provision.

5.13 **Amenity Greenspace Middleton Park**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1067	Aberfield Drive (rear of)	0.304
1004	Bodmin Crescent	0.434
830	Middleton Park Crescent (rear of)	0.249
793	Sissons Road	0.212
1024	The Clearings POS	0.550
1026	Winrose Drive	0.626
970	South Hill Grove	0.669
914	Middleton Ring Road	2.924
813	Intake Square	0.598
798	Acre Road	0.355
846	St Georges Centre	0.701
996	Belle Isle Road	0.555
799	Middleton Park Green	0.435
	Total	8.612

5.13.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $8.612 \div 26.228 = 0.328$ hectares

5.13.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Middleton Park ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has small deficiency provision in terms of the quantity of amenity greenspace.

5.14 **Amenity Greenspace Garforth & Swillington Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1017	Inverness Road POS	0.347
1018	New Sturton Bus Turnaround POS	0.249
1726	Swillington Recreation Ground	0.673
1231	Long Meadows	1.204
1487	East Garforth Field	0.737
	Total	3.210

5.14.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $3.210 \div 19.811 = 0.16$ hectares

5.14.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Garforth & Swillington ward falls below the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has deficiency in provision in terms of the quantity of amenity greenspace.

5.15 **Amenity Greenspace Rothwell Ward**

5.15.1 No greenspace within the Rothwell Ward falls inside the East area boundary.

5.16 **Amenity Greenspace Killingbeck & Seacroft**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
249	York Road Bridle Path	0.316
245	Maryfield Avenue	0.333
	Total	0.649

5.17 **Amenity Greenspace – Overall Conclusions**

5.17.1 If the totals for all wards are added together it creates an overall average standard of **0.394 hectares per 1,000 population**. This is below the Core Strategy standard however this figure is an average so whilst there is sufficient provision in Cross Gates & Whinmoor ward and Burmantofts & Richmond Hill wards, there is a slight under provision elsewhere.

Children and Young People's equipped play facilities:

5.18 **Methodology**

5.18.1 The population figures used for children and young people are an estimate using the 2011 Census figures and the 2007 mid-year estimates. See paragraph 4.3 for a fuller explanation.

5.18.2 The lists below exclude play facilities that are in educational use, since these are only available during the school day and by the children attending that particular school.

Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Cross Gates & Whinmoor

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
1284	Farndale Approach Playground
201	Naburn Chase Play Area
143	Manston Park
1829	John Smeaton Sports Centre
1511	Swarcliffe Langbar

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	3
Child Play Area	3
Skate Park	0
Teen Shelter	1
TOTAL	7 FACILITIES

5.19.1 **Requirement and provision** – $4.380 \times 2 = 9$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Cross Gates & Whinmoor is slightly deficient in terms of Children and Young People’s Equipped Play provision as it has **7** facilities.

5.19 Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Temple Newsam

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
366	Kyffin Avenue Play Area
360	Coronation Parade Amenity Space
415	East Leeds Leisure Centre - playground adjacent to
97	Temple Newsam Estate

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	1
Child Play Area	4
Skate Park	0
Teen Shelter	2
TOTAL	7 FACILITIES

5.20.1 **Requirement and provision** – $4.625 \times 2 = 9$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Temple Newsam has a deficiency in terms of Children and Young People’s Equipped Play provision as it has **7** facilities.

5.20 Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Burmantofts & Richmond Hill

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
335	Torre Grove
437	Nowell Mount
301	St Agnes MUGA
299	Ebors Playing Fields
305	Grantham Tower Play Area
306	Saxton Gardens (Dolphins Greenspace)
304	Bow Street Rec Ground

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
40	East End Park

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	4
Child Play Area	5
Skate Park	1
Teen Shelter	6
TOTAL	16 Facilities

5.21.1 **Requirement and provision** - $5.796 \times 2 = 12$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Ward is well provided for in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **16** facilities, four more than the required amount.

5.21 **Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities City & Hunslet**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
319	Thomas Danby Pitches
16	South Leeds Sports Centre
13	Hunslet Moor
915	Pepper Road Recreation Ground
64	Hunslet Lake
124	Grove Road Recreational Ground

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	6
Child Play Area	4
Skate Park	1
Teen Shelter	0
TOTAL	11 Facilities

5.22.1 **Requirement and provision** - $4.492 \times 2 = 9$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore City & Hunslet ward has a slight surplus in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **11** facilities.

5.22 **Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Middleton Park**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
794	Throstle Recreation Ground
1025	Windmill Road Rec
955	Cranmore Rise
1066	Winrose Crescent

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	4
Child Play Area	3
Skate Park	0
Teen Shelter	1
TOTAL	8 Facilities

5.23.1 **Requirement and provision** - $6.387 \times 2 = 13$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Middleton Park Ward is under provided for in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has only **8** facilities.

5.23 Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Garforth and Swillington Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
51	Glebelands Recreation Ground
23	Barley Hill Park
1319	Valley Drive Playground
1015	Firthfields POS
1726	Swillington Recreation Ground

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	1
Child Play Area	5
Skate Park	1
Teen Shelter	0
TOTAL	7 Facilities

5.18.1 **Requirement and provision** - $\times 2 = 10$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Garforth and Swillington Ward is slightly deficient in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **7** facilities.

5.19 Childrens & Young People's Equipped Play Facilities Rothwell

5.19.1 No greenspace within the Rothwell Ward falls inside the East area boundary.

5.20 Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Killingbeck & Seacroft

5.20.1 There are no children and young people's play facilities in the part of Killingbeck and Seacroft which falls within the East area.

5.21 Children and Young People's Equipped Play Facilities – overall conclusions

5.21.1 If the totals for all wards which feature children and young people's equipped play facilities are added together it creates an overall requirement for 62 facilities and an actual provision of 56 facilities. This falls short of the Core Strategy standard however this figure is an average so whilst there is a surplus of provision in City & Hunslet ward and Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward there is an under provision in all other wards.

Allotments:

5.22 Allotments Cross Gates & Whinmoor Ward

5.22.1 There are no allotments in Cross Gates and Whinmoor, therefore the ward records 0ha per 1000 population representing a significant under provision.

5.23 Allotments Temple Newsam Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
248	Byelaw Men's Field Allotments	0.868
1451	School Lane Allotments	0.565
290	Field Terrace (Primrose Lane) Allotments	0.215
	Total	1.648

5.23.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $1.648 \div 21.543 = 0.076$ hectares

5.23.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.076 hectares per 1000 population, Temple Newsam ward falls below the recommended standard and so has a deficiency in provision in terms of the quantity of allotments.

5.24 *Allotments Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
522	Red Road Allotments	1.210
350	Osmondthorpe Allotments	1.492
321	Pontefract Lane Disused Allotments	0.702
	Total	3.404

5.24.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $3.404 \div 24.843 = 0.137$ hectares

5.24.2 **Conclusions** -Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Ward has an under provision in the quantity of allotments.

5.25 *Allotments City & Hunslet Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1051	Telford Terrace Allotments	0.521
1058	Sandon Mount Allotments (Woodhouse Hill Street)	0.288
7	Lady Pit Lane Allotments & POS	1.914
	Total	2.723

5.25.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $2.723 \div 33.705 = 0.08$ hectares

5.25.2 **Conclusions** -Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, City & Hunslet Ward has a significant under provision in the quantity of allotments.

5.26 *Allotments Middleton Park Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1032	White House Farm Allotments	1.599
	Total	1.599

5.26.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $1.599 \div 26.228 = 0.06$ hectares

5.26.2 **Conclusions** -Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Middleton Park Ward has a significant under provision in the quantity of allotments.

5.26 Allotments Garforth & Swillington Ward

SITE ID	SITE NAME	AREA HA
1432	Swillington Common Allotments.	2.215
1377	Hollinhurst Allotments	0.339
1016	Firthfields Allotments	0.557
1012	Bank Row Allotments	0.401
1227	Church Lane Allotments	1.433
1723	Preston View Allotments	0.301
1376	Whitehouse Ave Allotments	1.721
464	Primrose Allotments	0.207
	Total	7.174

5.27.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $7.174 \div 19.811 = 0.36$ hectares

5.27.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Garforth & Swillington Ward exceeds the recommended standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of allotments.

5.28 Allotments Rothwell Ward

5.28.1 No greenspace within the Rothwell Ward falls inside the East area boundary.

5.29 Allotments Killingbeck & Seacroft Ward

5.29.1 There are no allotments in the small area of Killingbeck & Seacroft which falls within the East area.

5.30 Allotments – overall conclusions

5.30.1 If the totals for all wards are added together it creates an overall average standard of **0.096 hectares per 1,000 population** which is below the Core Strategy standard. Only Garforth & Swillington ward records a slight surplus in provision per 1000 population.

5.31 Natural Greenspace

NB As the wards within East area fall within the Main Urban Area, in accordance with policy G3 of the Core Strategy, a lower benchmark threshold of 0.7ha/1000 population will apply

5.32 Natural Greenspace Cross Gates & Whinmoor

SITE ID	SITE NAME	AREA HA
199	Ringwood Crescent	0.296
207	Hawthorn Farm Nature Area	6.242
192	Little Swarcliffe Plantation	0.954
193	Great Swarcliffe Plantation	3.611
	Total	11.103

5.32.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $11.103 \div 22.099 = 0.502$ hectares

5.32.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Cross Gates & Whinmoor Ward exceeds the recommended standard and so has a surplus provision in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

Natural Greenspace Temple Newsam

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
371	Selby Road and Halton Moor Avenue (Junction off)	0.303
346	Wyke Beck (Halton Moor/Osmondthorpe)	24.991
1443	Austhorpe Lane Woodland	2.890
1447	High Bank Approach	0.268
1442	Barrowby Drive	0.407
	Total	28.859

5.33.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $28.859 \div 21.543 = 1.33$ hectares

5.33.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Temple Newsam Ward significantly exceeds the recommended standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

5.34 ***Natural Greenspace Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Ward***

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
522	Red Road Allotments	1.210
350	Osmondthorpe Allotments	1.492
321	Pontefract Lane Disused Allotments	0.702
	Total	3.404

5.34.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $3.404 \div 24.843 = 0.137$ hectares

5.34.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Ward falls below the recommended standard and so has a deficiency in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

5.35 ***Natural Greenspace City & Hunslet***

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1001	Jack Lane	1.541
999	Haigh Park Road Pond	4.363
	Total	5.904

5.35.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $5.904 \div 33.705 = 0.175$ hectares

5.33.1 **Conclusions** – Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, City & Hunslet Ward falls below the recommended standard and so has a deficiency in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

Natural Greenspace Middleton Park Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
561	West Wood	21.976
551	Sissons Wood / Westwood - Dismantled railway next to	6.762
884	Kippow Springs / Throstle Carr Beck	0.258
155	Sissons Wood	5.364
803	Middleton Park Circus (2)	0.363
35	Cranmore Recreation Ground	3.635
843	Sharp Lane (Belle Isle)	12.571
561	West Wood	21.976
	Total	50.929

5.36.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $50.929 \div 26.228 = 1.94$ hectares

5.36.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Middleton Park Ward significantly exceeds the recommended standard and so has surplus in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

5.37 Natural Greenspace Garforth & Swillington ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1383	Peascroft Wood	3.266
1384	Peascroft Wood (Adjacent to)	1.155
1378	Lower North (Lake)	26.705
101	Town Close Hills	0.184
1830	Skelton Lane	54.423
1727	Wakefield Road	3.694
1379	Preston Hill	9.090
1014	Hawkes Nest Wood Garforth	5.634
57	Hollinhurst Wood	13.118
1724	Primrose Hill Drive	0.993
1229	Kennet Lane Meadows	3.185
1137	Leventhorpe Lagoon and Ings	41.183
1885	Land off Preston Lane	0.400
	Total	163.030

5.37.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $163.030 \div 19.811 = 8.22$ hectares

5.37.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 2 hectares per 1000 population, Garforth & Swillington Ward significantly exceeds the recommended standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

5.38 Natural Greenspace Rothwell Ward

5.38.1 No greenspace within the Rothwell Ward falls inside the East area boundary.

5.39 Natural Greenspace Killingbeck & Seacroft

5.39.1 There are no recorded sites of natural greenspace in the Killingbeck & Seacroft ward which fall within the East area.

5.40 Natural Greenspace – overall conclusions

5.40.1 Across the wards there is an average of 1.53 ha of natural greenspace per 1000 population. It should be noted that this figure is an average of all the wards which fall to a lesser or greater amount within the East area and is likely to be significantly distorted by surpluses in Garforth & Swillington ward. Much of this greenspace may not actually lie within the East area and therefore this may mask a deficiency.

6.0 Overall summary

6.1 The table below summarises the analysis of quantity of provision by greenspace type and Ward.

	Parks and Gardens	Outdoor Sports (excluding education)	Amenity	Children & Young People Equipped Play	Allotments	Natural
Standard	1ha/1000 people	1.2ha/1000 people	0.45ha/1000 people	2 facilities/1000 children	0.24ha/1000 people	0.7ha/1000 people
Cross Gates & Whinmoor	Deficiency (-0.574ha)	Deficiency (-0.17ha)	Surplus (0.49ha)	Deficiency of 2 facilities	Deficiency (-0.24ha)	Deficiency (-0.198ha)
Temple Newsam	Surplus (16.41ha)	Surplus (0.256ha)	Deficiency (-0.184ha)	Deficiency of 2 facilities	Deficiency (-0.076ha)	Surplus (0.63ha)
Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	Surplus (0.71ha)	Deficiency (-0.32ha)	Surplus (0.265ha)	Surplus of 4 facilities	Deficiency (-0.164ha)	Deficiency (-0.563ha)
City & Hunslet	Deficiency (-0.518ha)	Deficiency (-0.72ha)	Deficiency (-0.149ha)	Surplus of 2 facilities	Deficiency (-0.16ha)	Deficiency (-0.525ha)
Middleton Park	Surplus (5.27ha)	Deficiency (-0.22ha)	Deficiency (-0.122ha)	Deficiency of 5 facilities	Deficiency (-0.18ha)	Surplus (1.24ha)
Garforth & Swillington	Deficiency (-0.48ha)	Deficiency (-0.05ha)	Deficiency (0.29ha)	Deficiency of 7 facilities	Surplus (1.2ha)	Surplus (7.52ha)
Rothwell	0ha within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary
Killingbeck & Seacroft	0ha within HMCA boundary	0.14ha for area within HMCA	0.394ha within HMCA boundary	0 facilities within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary
Average (total figure)	Surplus (3.357ha)	Deficiency (0.793ha)	Deficiency (0.394ha)	Deficiency of 6 facilities	Deficiency (0.096ha)	Surplus (0.83ha)

6.2 **Cross Gates & Whinmoor:** The ward is deficient across all greenspace typologies with the exception of amenity space which records a small surplus over the standard set in Core Strategy policy G3 . In order to rectify these deficiencies there may be an opportunity for potential new development to either provide new on site greenspace or to generate the funds to lay out new areas of greenspace which are currently deficient.

6.3 **Temple Newsam:** Temple Newsam has a mixture of surplus and deficiency across the various typologies. The ward scores poorly in terms of the quantity of Amenity space, Children & Young People Equipped Play facilities and Allotments, but scores well against the other typologies, especially parks and gardens. The areas where the ward features deficiencies are typical of a ward located as close to the city centre as Temple Newsam. The ward's unusually large surplus of Parks and Gardens is largely attributable to the fact that much of the Temple Newsam estate

lies within the ward. Some of this may be suitable for laying out as allotments, Children & Young People's equipped play provision or amenity space. This could be delivered by the Council following the payment of commuted sums. If the typology of an area of greenspace is to be changed, it will need to be carefully assessed to ensure it is suitable and appropriate for the new type and not a well used and valued area of the original typology.

- 6.4 **Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward:** This ward has a mixture of surplus and deficiency across the various typologies. It is deficient in outdoor sports, allotments and natural greenspace, though it has a small surplus of amenity greenspace, children and young people's equipped play facilities and parks and gardens. Some of this surplus amenity greenspace and parks and gardens may be suitable for laying out as outdoor sports facilities, allotment provision or natural greenspace using the potential methods outlined above. A comprehensive assessment will be required to determine the most appropriate use of surplus natural greenspace, whether this be for alternative greenspace typologies or potential development which could generate the funds to lay out new areas of greenspace which is currently deficient.
- 6.5 **City & Hunslet ward:** City & Hunslet ward is deficient in parks & gardens, outdoor sports provision, amenity space, and allotment provision and natural greenspace. The ward fares better in terms of children and young people equipped play facilities provision recording a surplus of 4 facilities. New greenspace could be created in City & Hunslet through either on site contributions or could be delivered by the Council following the payment of commuted sums.
- 6.6 **Middleton Park:** Middleton Park has deficiencies in outdoor sports provision, amenity space, children and young people equipped play facilities and allotment provision. The ward fares better in terms of park and garden provision and natural open space provision with a healthy surplus of both typologies. Some of this surplus greenspace may be suitable for laying out as outdoor sports, amenity space, children and young people equipped play facilities or allotment provision using the potential methods outlined above. A comprehensive assessment will be required to determine the most appropriate use of surplus natural greenspace, whether this be for alternative greenspace typologies or potential development which could generate the funds to lay out new areas of greenspace which is currently deficient.
- 6.7 **Garforth & Swillington:** There are a mixture of surpluses and deficiencies across the various greenspace typologies and a considerable variation in the amount of surplus/deficient land per type. Again there is a noticeable surplus of natural greenspace. Some of this may be suitable for laying out as parks and gardens, amenity space or equipped play facilities using the potential methods highlighted above. A comprehensive assessment will be required to determine the most appropriate use of surplus natural greenspace, whether this be for alternative greenspace typologies or potential development which could generate the funds to lay out new areas of greenspace which is currently deficient.
- 6.8 **Rothwell:** No greenspace within the Rothwell Ward falls inside the East HMCA boundary.
- 6.9 **Killingbeck & Seacroft:** Although the southern tip of Killingbeck and Seacroft falls within the East area, only 4 sites are caught within the boundary.

QUALITY OF GREENSPACE.

7.0 Methodology

7.1 Core Strategy Policy G3 identifies the following standards for the quality of greenspace:

Greenspace type	Quality
Parks and Gardens	7
Outdoor sports provision	7
Amenity greenspace	7
Children and young people's equipped play facilities	7
allotments	7
Natural Greenspace	7

7.2 Each type of greenspace should meet a quality score of 7. This score is determined by assessing an area against a number of criteria, such as i) how welcoming; ii) level of health and safety; iii) cleanliness and maintenance; iv) conservation, habitats and heritage.

7.3 The quality plan indicates whether the quality of each area of greenspace in the East area meets the required standard (a score of 7 and above) or not (a score of 6.9 or below). This only shows those areas of greenspace within the East Housing Market Character Area boundary. Those areas within those Wards but outside the East boundary are excluded.

7.4 The table below summarises key information about each typology.

	Parks and Gardens	Outdoor Sports	Amenity Greenspace	Children and Young People	Allotments	Natural Greenspace
Number of sites	8	23	26	8	5	11
Number scoring 7 and above	1	4	3	2	1	0
Number scoring below 7	7	19	23	5	4	7
Highest score	7.33	8.8	8.25	7.3	7.09	5.71
Lowest score	3.84	0	1	4.07	1.07	2.66
Average score	5.59	4.90	5.22	5.62	3.99	4.22

7.5 **Conclusions:** Overall, the plan and table show a predominance of sites (65 out of 81) which fall below the required quality standard of 7, which indicates an issue of substandard greenspace provision in the East area across all typologies. The lack of good quality parks and gardens, natural greenspace and allotment sites is particularly noticeable.

ACCESSIBILITY OF GREENSPACE

8.1 Core Strategy Policy G3 identifies the following standards for accessibility of greenspace. Each type of greenspace should be within the distance specified.

Greenspace type	Accessibility distance
Parks and Gardens	720m
Outdoor sports provision	Tennis courts – 720m Bowling greens and grass playing pitches – 3.2km Athletics tracks and synthetic pitches – 6.4km
Amenity greenspace	480m
Children and young people's equipped play facilities	720m
Allotments	960m
Natural Greenspace	720m

8.2 Plans which show the required buffers as set out above, for each greenspace type are available. Please contact Leeds City Council directly at ldf@leeds.gov.uk. Some conclusions are drawn out below:

8.2.1 Parks and Gardens

The overwhelming majority of residential properties within the East area have very good accessibility to Parks & Gardens, with the majority of the populated areas lying within 720m (a 10 minute walking distance) of parks and gardens. Only a very small proportion of residential properties fall beyond the 720m (10 minute walking distance) standard.

8.2.2 Outdoor Sports Provision

The whole East area is within the required accessibility distance (3.2km) for grass playing pitches, including bowling greens. Temple Newsam is well served by tennis courts and the majority is within the (720m or 10 minute walking distance), with facilities beyond the East boundary in Killingbeck & Seacroft and Harewood also serving the East area.

8.2.3 Amenity Greenspace

Generally, the East area is well served by amenity greenspace, with large areas of most wards able to access some form of amenity greenspace within the 480m buffer. The northern edge of Temple Newsam ward is the most poorly served area in terms of amenity space accessibility, with Cross Gates & Whinmoor the best served ward with the bulk of development falling within the 480m buffer.

8.2.4 Children and Young People's Equipped Play Facilities

Most of the built up area of the East area is within 720m of play facilities, however the southern part of Burmantofts & Richmond Hill is the worst served.

8.2.5 Allotments

A large part of the East area is within the 960m threshold for allotments, though accessibility to the north east of Cross Gates & Whinmoor is notably poor in comparison to the rest of the East area.

8.2.6 Natural Greenspace

Only the eastern edges of Cross Gates & Whinmoor and Temple Newsam wards lie beyond the accessibility to 20ha of natural greenspace within 2km Core Strategy G3 threshold. The majority of the East area lies within 720m of natural greenspace, though there are notable areas which lie beyond the 720m buffer,

most notably parts of Temple Newsam ward and to the south of Cross Gates & Whinmoor.

8.3 **Conclusions:** Accessibility to greenspace across the East area is generally very good, with most areas lying within the accepted accessibility buffers contained within Policy G3. Accessibility to Natural Greenspace is particularly poor as is accessibility to allotments, however accessibility to parks and gardens scores highly, namely due to the Temple Newsam estate's vast size meaning that a large percentage of the area is within the benchmark threshold. Similarly accessibility to children's and young people's play facilities is good. This is again attributable to the large range of facilities on the Temple Newsam Estate.

9.0 **OVERALL CONCLUSIONS FROM THE GREENSPACE ANALYSIS IN EAST AREA:**

9.1 **Quantity**

9.1.1 The East area has several deficiencies in terms of quantity across the various greenspace typologies. There is generally a good quantity of park & garden provision and natural greenspace provision, though the area is lacking against core strategy standards in outdoor sports provision, children and young people's equipped play provision and lacking in terms of allotment provision.

9.1.2 The most striking deficiencies across all of the typologies are outdoor sports provision and allotments, with each ward failing to reach the standard of 1.2ha per 1000 population and 0.24ha per 1000 population respectively.

9.1.3 All wards suffer deficiencies in different areas but record surpluses in other typologies. In order to rectify some of the deficiencies, the laying out some of the surplus areas of alternative greenspace types could be one way which would solve the existing deficiencies. Alternatively new areas which aren't greenspace currently could be laid out to improve quantity of provision. This could be delivered by a developer as a requirement on new residential development or by the Council following the payment of commuted sums. If the typology of an area of greenspace is to be changed, it will need to be carefully assessed to ensure it is suitable and appropriate for the new type and not a well used and valued area of the original typology.

9.2 **Quality**

9.2.1 Across the East area, the majority of sites (65 out of 81) are below the required quality standard of 7, which indicates an issue of substandard greenspace provision across all typologies in the area. The lack of good quality parks and gardens, natural greenspace and allotment sites is particularly noticeable.

9.3 **Accessibility**

9.3.1 Accessibility to all types of greenspace is generally good across the East area. Temple Newsam ward generally features much better access to all types of greenspace, however this is largely attributable to the typologies represented by the Temple Newsam estate.

QUESTIONS ABOUT GREENSPACE PROVISION IN EAST

General

- G1. Do you have any comments on the proposed boundary amendments, additions and deletions to the greenspace provision in the area as shown on greenspace plan A?**
- G2. Do you think the Council should consider changing the type of greenspace where that type of greenspace is in surplus (ie more than meets the standard) to another type of greenspace that falls short of the standards?**
- G3. Do you think the Council should consider allowing development of any of the greenspace sites where that type of greenspace is in surplus (ie more than meets the standard)? If so, which sites?**
- G4. The quality of many existing greenspace sites in the area falls below the required standard. Do you agree that resources (including commuted sums obtained from planning permissions and legal agreements) should be channelled to improving quality of existing sites?**
- G5. Alternatively, if a site is of poor quality and/or disused, do you think it is better to consider allowing development of that site to generate resources to invest in greenspace elsewhere?**
- G6. Do you agree that, where opportunities arise, new greenspace provision should be provided in areas that fall below accessibility distance standards, to ensure residents have adequate access to different types of greenspace?**
- G7. Have you any other comments/suggestions about greenspace provision in the area?**

Specific to East:

- G8. A small part of the existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) designation at Thorp Park has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2039, see page 9 of Issues and Options). It was not identified as in a greenspace use in the Open Space Audit and has clearly not been delivered through Policy N5, therefore it is proposed to delete the allocation. Do you agree this land could be developed for housing rather than being left as a possible future greenspace opportunity?**
- G9. The existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) allocation at Barrowby Lane, Manston has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2086, see page 10 of Issues and Options). It was not identified as in a greenspace use in the Open Space Audit and has clearly not been delivered through Policy N5, therefore it is proposed to delete the allocation (called Thorp Park for greenspace purposes). Do you agree this land could be developed for housing rather than being left as a possible future greenspace opportunity?**

- G10. The existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) designation at Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2090A and 2090B, see page 10 & 11 of Issues and Options). The majority of the site and additional land were identified as a city park (Temple Newsam) in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site could be developed for housing or should it be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies)?**
- G11. Part of the existing UDP N1 designation at Cartmell Drive, Halton has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2144, see page 11 of Issues and Options). The majority of the site was identified as natural greenspace in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?**

Appendix 1

UDP designated greenspace sites not identified as greenspace in the Open Space Audit – proposed to be deleted

Open Space type	Ref number	Address	Reasons for proposed deletion
N1	15/8/2	A61/M1 traffic island	Traffic island surrounded by M1 and A61, inaccessible
N1	15/27	Stourton Sidings	Area surrounded by motorway roundabout, inaccessible.
N1	15/28	Stourton Sidings,	Area surrounded by motorway and slip road, inaccessible.
N5 (proposed open space)	m256	Thorp Park	Partly rough ground and partly agricultural fields. Not in a greenspace use.