AA8

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 428291 Area sq m: 38723.89 Ward Morley South
Easting: 427285 Area Ha: 3.872389 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):369.83Distance to bus stop (metres)271.25Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID509SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.82	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?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes
Site		Site Type	
OSS Group Valley Road Morley		Specialised Waste Management Sites	

r laming motor					
Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/488/90/	Alterations, to form locker ro om, shower rooms and toile ts, and extension, to form can teen and kitchen, toworks.	03/12/1990	07/03/1991	А	17.86
H23/491/74/	Single storey building compris ing maintenance shed, first aid room, rest room, tea room, reception area, store, gen	23/10/1974	07/07/1975	А	15.36
06/07548/OT	Outline application to erect residential development, plus retaining wall and access improvement works	18/12/2006	16/03/2007	R	100.00
H23/31/78/	Alterations and extension, to form despatch and sorti ng area, canteen, porch and to ilets to works. (outline a	16/01/1978	13/03/1978	А	17.68
06/01412/FU	Detached building comprising works with storage and offices	03/03/2006	31/03/2008	Α	12.12
H23/593/77/	Outline application to erect d etached sorting block, with canteen and toilets, to works.	01/09/1977	21/11/1977	Α	17.86
11/02670/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 4 of Planning Application 09/01338/FU	23/06/2011	09/09/2011	А	32.07
09/01338/FU	Single storey extension to works	26/03/2009	19/06/2009	Α	32.07
11/04951/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 of Planning Application 09/01338/FU	25/11/2011	08/10/2012	SPL	32.07
H23/139/81/	Five, 127, 288 litre oil storag e tanks, to oil storage depot .	20/03/1981	27/04/1981	Α	10.83
23/250/98/FU	Laying out of enlarged parking area to factory	17/07/1998	23/02/1999	Α	57.70
23/238/03/MIN	Additional plant and machinery to oil processing plant	29/04/2003	01/07/2003	Α	17.67
23/122/94/FU	First floor office extension	22/04/1994	09/06/1994	Α	17.98
H23/344/80/	Addition of water pollution co ntrol plant, to side of mill.	24/04/1980	28/07/1980	Α	18.36
H23/534/80/	7, 127, 288 litre oil storage t anks, to oil storage yard.	14/08/1980	15/09/1980	Α	10.92
23/201/93/FU	Detached prefabricated office unit	08/06/1993	13/08/1993	Α	42.40
H23/244/91/	Additional oil storage tanks t o oil refinery.	14/06/1991	05/11/1991	Α	39.63
H23/411/80/	Use of land for stone redressi ng.	06/06/1980	06/10/1980	Α	15.58
H23/186/91/	Erection of 2.1m high fence to vacant site.	10/05/1991	25/06/1991	Α	27.92
H23/426/90/	Six oil storage tanks to oil r efinery.	22/10/1990	31/05/1991	R	39.45

BAA

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built u	p areas		
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon dev	relopment?		
Would development result in isolated developme	nt?		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ box	undaries with existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "round	off" the settlement pattern?:		
Do natural/physical features provide a good exist area and undeveloped land?	ing barrier between existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:			
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging			
Would development of the site lead to physical c	onnection of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good exis development?	ting barrier/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encr	oachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the	ne site and the existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countryside?			
Does the site include local or national conservation	on designated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	hedgerows that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultura	al 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 ar feature?	ea, listed building or other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this characte	r?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:			
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Conformity with Core Strategy	1		
Main Urban Area	lain Urban Area Extension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement M	fajor Settlement Extension	Greenfield	
	maller Settlement Extension	Mixed	
Villages/Rural V	illage/Rural Extension	_	
Development unrelate	ed to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay:	0.00

8AA

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions					
Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: Yes F	Physical Achievability: Long ter	m (11+ years)			
ummary of Infrastructure provider cor	mments and other planning req	uirements			
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro					
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)			
Mostly meets Core Strategy standards		4			
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)			
Access via Valley Rd is very poor - long narrow, unador footways, acute bends, poor forward visibility	1				
Local network comment	Rank (1-5)				
Potential cumulative impact with nearby sites		4			
Mitigation measure		Total scor			
None to compensate access issues		9			
Support? Need to combine wit	th other sites: Suitability for partic	al development:			
no					
lighways Agency					
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other Morley/Gildersome cluster.	sites. If site still included at next sift assess a	s part of			
Network Rail: Footbridge to replace nearby LC; Morley Station Improve ssues	ements (including disabled access) General as	set protection			
<u> Biodiversity</u>					
Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	<b>Boundary Amendment</b>				
Supported with mitigation to create a native woodland ec protect and enhance the woodland wildlife corridor which adjacent to the site.					
Natural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
Orainage/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.

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref:	126	Site Name:	Valley Mills, Va	alley Road, l	Morley, Leeds LS27
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Res	scue Services:				
English Heri	council: nire Archaeology tage:				
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Tr	aveller Site	e Assessment			
	oe effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed		(Text)			
Would gyps		Yes	No		Maybe
travellers li site?	ve on the	(Text)			
Proximity to		Yes (Text)		No	
gypsies and	u travellers	(Text)			
	of previous	Yes (Text)	No		Unknown
encampme		,			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Tr	aveller Site	e Assessment			
	oe effectively	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
managed		(TEAL)			
Would gyps	sies and	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
site?	ve on the	(TOX)			
Proximity to gypsies and		Yes (Text)		No	
gypsies and	u travellers	(TOXI)			
	of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampme	nts	(Text)			

# **Conclusion of Assessment**

Conclusion summary:

Site is within urban area, accessible to Morley town centre. Currently in employment use, bounded by steep hillside to the south and railway to the north. Access is over short, narrow bridge on unadopted private highway. Highways concerned about very poor access.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 116 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red Not assessed Not assessed

Site Ref: 137A Site Name: Britannia Road, Morley, Leeds

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 426696 Area sq m: 16234.06 Ward Morley South
Easting: 426130 Area Ha: 1.623406 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

✓

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 0.00 Distance to bus stop (metres) 0.00

Nearest Railway Station Bus Stop ID

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

Site Ref: 137A Site Name: Britannia Road, Morley, Leeds

Site Ref: 137A Site Name: Britannia Road, Morley, 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?: 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 137A Site Name: Britannia Road, Morley, Leeds East Leeds **SHLAA Conclusions** Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively Yes No Maybe managed (Text) Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? Proximity to housed No Yes (Text) gypsies and travellers **Experience of previous** Unknown Yes No (Text) encampments **Conclusion of Assessment** Conclusion summary: Site A is situated between existing housing to the west and east and is considered acceptable in principle for residential Site Capacity (dwellings units): 0 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0 **Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:** 

Site Ref: 137B Site Name: Britannia Road, Morley, Leeds

# **Site Details**

Northing: 426574 Area sq m: 27082.81 Ward Morley South
Easting: 426180 Area Ha: 2.708281 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 0.00 

Distance to bus stop (metres) 0.00

Nearest Railway Station Bus Stop ID

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

Site Ref: 137B Site Name: Britannia Road, Morley, Leeds

Site Ref: 137B Site Name: Britannia Road, Morley, 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?: 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 137B Site Name: Britannia Road, Morley, Leeds East Leeds **SHLAA Conclusions** Availability: Suitability: Achievability: Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively Yes No Maybe managed (Text) Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? Proximity to housed No Yes (Text) gypsies and travellers **Experience of previous** Unknown Yes No (Text) encampments **Conclusion of Assessment** Conclusion summary: Site B has employment uses to 3 sides including an access road through from the existing employment uses. The preferred use is employment. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 0 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0 **Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:** 

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 426709 Area sq m: 9909.15 Ward Morley South
Easting: 426884 Area Ha: 0.990915 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Wholesale distribution

Existing Use 3: Office

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Retail - Restaurants and Cafes

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1399.32Distance to bus stop (metres)84.90Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID13144SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/449/89/	Laying out of access, car park and landscaping to mill.	31/08/1989	06/11/1989	А	15.48
PREAPP/07/00110		15/05/2007		PRECAG	100.00
H23/166/74/	Outline application to lay ou t new access and erect a singl e storey light industrial unit (floor area 585.sq m (6, 500 s	13/06/1974	30/09/1974	R	98.38
H23/612/80/	Change of use, of mill to ligh t industrial units and erect ion of detached baling shed.	24/09/1980	17/11/1980	Α	97.60

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of la	rge built up areas			
Would development lead to/constitute	e ribbon development?			
Would development result in isolated	development?			
Is the site well connected to built up a	rea (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?			
Would development of the site effective	vely "round off" the settlement pattern?:			
Do natural/physical features provide a 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 development?	a good existing barrier/boundary to contain			
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 c	ountryside?			
Does the site include local or national	I conservation designated areas?			
Does the site include areas of woodla significant unprotected tree/hedge co	ands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or ver?			
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3	a agricultural land?			
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?			
Overall countryside Encroachment Co	<u>onclusion</u>			
Preserve the setting and special ch	naracter of historic towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a consteature?	servation area, listed building or other historical			
If yes, could development preserve the	nis character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conc	lusion:			
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion	:			
Conformity with Core S	Strategy			
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfi	ield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfi	eld	
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed		
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension				
Developm	ent unrelated to existing development			
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00	
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	vay:	0.00	

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

HLAA C	onclusions						
Availability:	Medium term (6-1	0 y Suitabilit	ty: Yes		Achievability: N	/ledium term (	6-10 years)
Summary	of Infrastruc	ture provi	der con	nments and of	ther plannin	g require	ments
	Council Highw	ays inc Metr	<u>o</u>				
Accessibility						į	Rank (1-5)
primary educa		f the site lies w	rithin the acc	lies within the acces cessibility standard f es		or	4
Access Com	nments						Rank (1-5)
Access would	d require mitigatio	n works					4
Local netwo	ork comment						Rank (1-5)
Potential cun	nulative impact wi	th adjacent site	S				4
Mitigation m	neasure						Total score
							12
							12
Support?		Need to co	mbine with	other sites:	Suitability fo	or partial deve	elopment:
yes		no			n/a		
Highways A	Agency						
Potential for of Morley/Gilders		in combination	with other s	sites. If site still inclu	uded at next sift a	ssess as part	of
Network Ra	<u>iil :</u>						
Biodiversity	ı						
	re Ecology and l	LCC Ecology	Officer:	Boundary	/ Amendment		
Supported	<b>3,</b>						
Natural Engla	and:						
Education							
Drainage/W	/ater/Flooding						
	Agency Comme	nts:		Environment Aç	gency Constraint	is:	
Yorkshire Wa	ater Comments:			Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water Ti	reatment Wor	rks Comme
LCC Flood R	isk Management	<u>:</u>		ı			

Site Ref: 141	Site Name:	Leeds	ommon, Moriey,
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology	Sarvica		
English Heritage:	Service.		
3			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Existing mill. The site could conti	nue in employment u	se but would be suitable for conversi	ion to residential in principle.
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	36	Floorspace sq m (Non resi	dential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	ssessed	Green

Site Ref: 148 Site Name: Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe, WF3

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 426716 Area sq m: 30621.19 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 431713 Area Ha: 3.062119 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Agriculture

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):4947.94Distance to bus stop (metres)180.56Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID7675

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	10.27	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?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes
Site		Site Type	
Britannia Recycling Robin Hood (Closed)		Other (Waste) Specialist Misc - Loose Ends	

# **Planning History**

Site Ref: 148

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H22/301/74/	Installation of new weighbridg e, and second storey exten sion to form recording office, with external staircase,	25/10/1974	27/01/1975	Α	32.32
H21/66/83/	Laying out of access and erect ion of 2 furnaces, each with storage feed and preparation b uildings, filter buildings,	15/03/1983	11/06/1984	W	32.08
22/96/03/FU	2m high fence and additional fence to wall to boundary of recycling centre	10/03/2003	02/05/2003	Α	32.08
H22/143/87/	Alterations and first floor ex tension, to form offices, to of fice block, to works.	24/08/1987	28/09/1987	Α	32.18
H21/242/82/	Laying out of access road and erection of furnace, withrefin ery area, stores, despatch are a and flux store with relax	03/12/1982	28/03/1983	W	32.08
08/02668/FU	Variation of condition 3 of permission reference 22/265/04/OT (service infrastructure and employment area access)	01/05/2008	02/07/2008	Α	85.81
20/130/06/OT	Variation of condition nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13-16, 18, 21-24, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34-36 (phasing of development & reserved matters	04/01/2006	30/06/2006	Α	88.42
H21/273/78/	Alterations, including realign ing, of existing 2.4m (8ft) high fence and erection of ne w 2.4m (8ft) high fence, to	24/05/1978	19/06/1978	Α	32.32
H22/183/85/	Laying out of access and erect ion of 2m high stone bound ary wall and landscaping to wo rks.	01/11/1985	23/12/1985	W	14.07
22/265/04/OT	Outline application to layout access and erect residential light industrial and office development	29/06/2004	16/08/2005	Α	85.09
08/04893/RM	Laying out of access road and erection of 2 two storey office blocks and 10 industrial units, with car parking and landscaping	15/08/2008		APPRET	97.52
H22/4/84/	Outline application to lay out access road and erect indus trial and warehouse developmen t with ancillary offices, t	09/01/1984	11/06/1984	W	32.39

Site Ref: 148 Site Name: Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe, WF3

### 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 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:** Only 10% of site within green belt. Far west of site. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield

**Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00 Site Ref: 148 Site Name: Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe, WF3

East Leeds

Gas:

SHLAA Conclusions	
Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: No Achievability:	Unknown
Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planni	ng requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	
Accessibility comment	Rank (1-5)
The site has access to 2 buses per hour and lies within the accessibility zone for primary & secondary education and primary health	3
Access Comments	Rank (1-5)
Existing access onto Lingwell Gate Lane	5
Local network comment	Rank (1-5)
Spare capacity but cumulative issues	4
Mitigation measure	Total score
	12
Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability	for partial development:
yes	
Highways Agency	
Network Rail :	
Biodiversity	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment	
Supported	
Natural England:	
Education	
Drainage/Water/Flooding	luto.
Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constrai	iiitə:
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:	
<u>Utilities</u>	

Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	• Assessn	nent			
Could site be effectively	Yes	N	No	Maybe	Ī
managed	(Text)	,			
Would gypsies and	Yes	N	No	Maybe	-
travellers live on the	(Text)	1.			-
site?					
Proximity to housed	Yes		No		-
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		140		1
Experience of previous	Yes		No	Unknown	4
encampments	(Text)	<u>                               </u>	NO	Olikilowii	-
•					
Conclusion of Asses	oment				L
Conclusion of Asses	Sment				
Conclusion summary:					
The site is within the settlement a evidence of historic use - hardsta		itable for either emplo	oyment or residential use	. Site is unused land, with	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	:	54 Floorsp	oace sq m (Non residen	tial):	0
Residential Conclusion:	ı	Retail Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:	
Green	1	Not assessed		Not assessed	

Site Name: Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe, WF3

Site Ref: 148

Si	ite	De	tail	S

Northing: 425538 Area sq m: 10784.43 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 430904 Area Ha: 1.078443 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Neighbouring Use 3: Agriculture

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 4702.80 
Distance to bus stop (metres) 107.80

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 4839

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Pitch set much lower than surrounding residential development.

### **UDP Designation**

			,
Greenbelt - N32 (%):	92.50	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 (%):	imary 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:	92.50		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Site Ref: 173 Site Name: Football Ground Rear Of 58

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/407/74/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to si te, part vacant, part football field (total site area: 1.31	10/09/1974	23/12/1974	R	99.14
08/01157/FU	Erection of changing room facilities and laying out of new vehicular access and 9 parking spaces to football ground	27/02/2008	23/04/2008	W	99.86

Site Ref: 173 Site Name: Football Ground Rear Of 58

#### 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 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:** Potential for further sprawl to south east. Site close to settlement but doesn't relate well due to level difference. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area:

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.

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

Site Ref: 173 Site Name: Football Ground Rear Of 58

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions					
Availability: Long term (11+ year Su	uitability: LDF	to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11	+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure p	rovider co	mments an	d other plann	ning require	ments
Leeds City Council Highways inc	Metro				
Accessibility comment					Rank (1-5
The site has access to 2 buses per hour primary education but does not meet oth		lies within the acc	essibility standard	for	2
Access Comments				'	Rank (1-5
Required access improvements would r	equire 3rd part	y land on Cave La	ane		2
Local network comment					Rank (1-5
The scale of development should not ca	ause an issue o	n the local netwo	rk		5
Mitigation measure					Total sco
Needs improvements to Cave Lane in 3	Brd party control				9
					9
Support? Need	to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitabili	ty for partial dev	elopment:
no					
Highways Agency					
n/a					
Network Rail :					
<u>Biodiversity</u>					
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Eco	logy Officer:	Bour	ndary Amendmen	t	
Supported					
Natural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
Drainage/Water/Flooding					
Environment Agency Comments:		Environme	nt Agency Constr	aints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire \	Water Waste Wate	er Treatment Wo	rks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:					
_					
<u>Utilities</u>					

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:	O a mada a		
West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
Liigiisii Heritage.			
Gypsy Traveller Site	Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	·	
Site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	-	1
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	nsible south eastern bou	ndary, which could set a pre	ecedent for further sprawl. The site is
an N6 protected playing pitch des Highways concerns regarding ac			section, page 37, question G8.
	·	. ,	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 29	Floorspace sq m (Nor	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Co	onclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Red		Red

Site Name: Football Ground Rear Of 58

Site Ref: 173

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 429767 Area sq m: 8020.37 Ward Beeston and Holbeck Easting: 429647 Area Ha: 0.802037 HMCA: Outer South West

#### **Site Characteristics**

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

 Natural Landscape:
 Limited Tree Cover
 Road Frontage
 ✓

 Distance to Rail Station (metres):
 2282.79
 Distance to bus stop (metres)
 472.67

 Nearest Railway Station
 Cottingley
 Bus Stop ID
 527

 SFRA Flood Zone:
 0.00
 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):		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?: Yes

_					
Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H21/265/75/	Amendment to previous applicat ion involving alterationsto an cillary offices, each with toi lets, to units 2, 4, and 5 and	23/05/1975	04/08/1975	Α	92.50
21/390/96/FU	Entrance porch to offices of warehouse	31/12/1996	20/02/1997	Α	23.17
21/144/03/FU	Change of use of vacant light industrial/storage units to construction training centre	12/05/2003	31/07/2003	W	32.94
H21/349/77/	change of use of warehouse with ancillary offices, to wareh ouse with ancillary offices and light industrial premises.	20/07/1977	01/08/1977	Α	15.66
H21/142/74/	Laying out of access road & er ection of 5 warehouse units , each including an ancillary office & w.cs., in two blocks	20/06/1974	21/10/1974	Α	92.50
H21/18/82/1	Amendment to previous applicat ion involving the ancil lary office condition for the alterations, including	28/11/1989	13/12/1989	Α	28.04
H21/218/76/1	Amendment to previous applicat ion involving the relax ation of the personal conditio n on the permission for the ch	09/12/1982	04/01/1983	Α	12.65
H21/431/74/	Laying out of access road and erection of 5 warehouse units, each unit with ancillary off ice and toilets, and 30 car	26/11/1974	03/02/1975	Α	92.50
H21/453/80/	Change of use, involving alter ations, of warehouse to light industrial unit with offices.	28/10/1980	17/11/1980	Α	11.64
PREAPP/08/00166		08/05/2008		PRECAG	100.00
H21/18/82/	Alterations, including new sta ircase, and to form first floor offices, to warehouse.	29/01/1982	15/02/1982	Α	27.00
H21/218/76/	Change of use of warehouse wit h ancillary offices to light industrial premises with anci llary offices, and laying	28/04/1976	07/06/1976	Α	12.65

### 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area:

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.

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	S			
Availability: Unknown	Suitability:	No	Achievability: Unk	nown
Summary of Infrastr	ucture provide	r comments and	d other planning i	equirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Poor accessibility				1
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Access from Westland Road	į.			5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Congestion issues				3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				9
Support?	Need to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitability for n	artial development:
no Support?	Need to comb	ine with other sites.	Suitability for p	artial development.
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology an	d LCC Ecology Offi	cer: Boun	ndary Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Flooding	<del></del> '	Environmo	nt Aganay Canatrainta	
Environment Agency Comr	nents:	Environmen	nt Agency Constraints:	
Vl-1: W-( 0		Variation V		
Yorkshire Water Comments	5:	Yorkshire V	Vater Waste Water Trea	ment works comme
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	ent:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Site Ref: 304	Site Name:	Park Farm Industrial LS11	Estate, Westand Road,		
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage					
Leeds City Council:					
West Yorkshire Archaeolog	y Service:				
English Heritage:					
Gypsy _Traveller Sit	e Assessmen	it			
Could site be effectively		No	Maybe		
managed	(Text)				
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe		
travellers live on the	(Text)	INO	INICIPO		
site?					
Proximity to housed	Yes	No			
gypsies and travellers	(Text)				
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown		
encampments	(Text)				
Conclusion of Asses	ssment				
Conclusion summary:					
Existing employment site within concerns regarding poor access		ea. Employment considered the	most appropriate use. Highways		
Site Capacity (dwellings units): 29 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0					
Residential Conclusion:	Residential Conclusion: Retail		<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>		
Red	Not a	assessed	Lime Green		

Site Ref: 309 Site Name: Thorpe Hall, Middleton Lane, Thorpe

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 426979 Area sq m: 41757.82 Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward 431673 Easting: Area Ha: 4.175782 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Existing Use 3: Vacant & Derelict - Vacant building

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Natural Landscape:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Road Frontage

**~** Distance to Rail Station (metres): 4841.21 Distance to bus stop (metres) 164.60 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 2849

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Limited Tree Cover

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Listed building on site.

### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	75.89	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)

No

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Yes

Site Ref: 309 Site Name: Thorpe Hall, Middleton Lane, Thorpe

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
PREAPP/08/00210		07/03/2008		PRECAG	100.00

Site Ref: 309 Site Name: Thorpe Hall, Middleton Lane, Thorpe

#### 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 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 listed building on site giving area a special character. Heavily treed boundary reduces potential for further sprawl. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development

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.

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Inner South Leeds:

Site Ref: 309 Site Name: Thorpe Hall, Middleton Lane, Thorpe

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: LDF	to determine Ad	chievability: Medium ter	m (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider co	mments and oth	er planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
The site has access to 2 buses per hour, all of the site live secondary education and primary health	es within the accessibilit	y zone for primary &	3
Access Comments		'	Rank (1-5
Access preferable from Thorpe Lower Lane			5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Spare capacity but cumulative issues			4
Mitigation measure			Total scor
			12
Support? Need to combine with	th other sites:	Suitability for partial of	levelopment:
yes			
Highways Agency			
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	mendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u> Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Age	ncy Constraints:	
Environmenta.		.c, cononanto	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water V	Vaste Water Treatment \	Norks Comme
LCC Flood Bick Management			
LCC Flood Risk Management:			
<u>Utilities</u>			

Site Ref: 309	Site Name:	Thorpe Hall, Middleton Lan	e, Thorpe
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Duilt Heritage			
Built Heritage  Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
gg			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Wastel associate and	V	NI	Marila
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?	,		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	cmont		
Conclusion of Asses	Smem		
Conclusion summary:			
Part Green Belt site/part existing	UDP employment al	location. Development of the site would e the listed building on site which is paramo	extend the settlement to the
		l enhance the listed building could be acce	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 70	Floorspace sq m (Non resident	<b>ial)</b> : 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion: E	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Red		lot assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 424722 Area sq m: 9055.82 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428507 Area Ha: 0.905582 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Residential - Dwellings

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Other

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Significant Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3718.86Distance to bus stop (metres)102.50Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID11844

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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:	1.00
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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/248/87/	Alterations, including new sta ircase and extensions, toform porch to front and first floor bathroom and two bedrooms t	10/08/1987	19/10/1987	R	94.84
PREAPP/08/00272		25/06/2008		PRECAG	100.00
23/390/98/FU	Single storey front extension	30/11/1998	04/02/1999	Α	10.41
H23/12/88/	Alterations and extension, to form hall, dining room, loung e and kitchen, to cottage.	09/01/1988	21/03/1988	R	94.56

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs)	) Suitability: Yes	Physical	Achievability: Medium term	m (6-10 years)
ummary of Infrastruc	ture provider co	mments and ot	ther planning requi	rements
_eeds City Council Highwa	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			ı	Rank (1-
The site has access to 2 buses education, but outside the zone				3
Access Comments			'	Rank (1-5
Highway frontage but adequate	visibility not achievable	•		2
Local network comment			'	Rank (1-5
Potential cumulative impact with	h adjacent sites			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Improve visibity at access but re	equires removal of tree	s (Tree Preservation C	Order) and stone wall.	9
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial d	levelopment:
no				
Highways Agency				
n/a <mark>Network Rail :</mark>				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and L	.CC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	/ Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Commer	nts:	Environment Aç	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water Treatment V	Vorks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:				
<u>Utilities</u>				

Site Ref: 314	Site Name:	Boyle Hall, Haigh Mo	or Road, WA
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Service	es:		
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archae	ology Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller	Site Assessmen	nt	
Could site be effecti	vely Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	,	
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the			,
site?			
Proximity to housed	l Yes	No	
gypsies and travelle		110	
Experience of previous	ous Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	INO	OTIKHOWIT
Conclusion of As	recement		
Conclusion of As	Sessillent		
Conclusion summary:			
Site within the existing sett main building which is liste			Orders (TPOs) on site surrounding the
_		•	
Site Capacity (dwellings	units): 9	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	ail Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not:	assessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 333 Site Name: Off Whitehall Road

#### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428542
 Area sq m:
 15780.71
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 421942
 Area Ha:
 1.578071
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):5041.12Distance to bus stop (metres)162.95Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID2764

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

#### **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
23/477/92/FU	Laying out of car park	24/12/1992	05/10/1993	Α	11.77
06/01728/OT	Outline application to layout access road and erect residential development	16/03/2006	13/06/2006	W	99.05
H23/59/84/	Outline application to erect residential development to vacant site (site area 0.45ha)	29/02/1984	09/02/1994	W	11.77
H23/461/80/	Outline application to erect e xtension, to form enlar ged factory.	03/07/1980	26/01/1981	W	33.56
H23/104/85/	Outline application to erect residential development	27/03/1985	30/06/1995	Α	11.73
23/318/93/FU	4 bedroom detached house with integral double garage	03/09/1993	13/12/1993	Α	11.73
23/13/95/FU	Amendment to condition no 17 of application no 23/477/92/fu (hours of use)	12/01/1995	16/05/1995	R	19.99
07/01231/FU	Laying out of access road and erection of 46 houses and 17 flats	23/02/2007	14/05/2007	W	100.00
H23/344/86/	Alterations and extension, to form enlarged warehouse and d etached open store, to works.	01/12/1986	02/03/1987	Α	65.97
23/244/93/OT	Outline application to erect detached dwelling	07/07/1993	18/11/1993	Α	11.73
06/04650/OT	Outline application to layout access road and erect residential development	01/08/2006	19/10/2006	W	99.17
07/05878/FU	Laying out of access road and erection of 49 houses	18/09/2007	15/12/2009	R	100.00

Site Ref: 333 Site Name: Off Whitehall Road

#### 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 333 Site Name: Off Whitehall Road

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions  Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	Yes Achievahility: Short term	(O. E. ma)
	/tollievability. Chort telli	` ,
Summary of Infrastructure provider	comments and other planning requi	irements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		<b>-</b>
Accessibility comment	or items with the exception of primary schools	Rank (1-5
The site is well served by Public Transport and all se	ervices with the exception of primary schools	4
Access Comments		Rank (1-5
Accesses on to Moor Top, West Street and Whitehand conflict with HGVs, but an acceptable solution segregating adjacent commercial uses		3
Local network comment		Rank (1-5
Small scale of development is unlikely to have a ma	ajor impact on local highways	4
Mitigation measure		Total sco
Means to improve vehicular access		11
	e with other sites: Suitability for partial	development:
yes with mitigation		
Highways Agency		
	other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as	part of
Morley/Gildersome cluster  Network Rail :		
Network Itali .		
<u>Biodiversity</u>		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	er: Boundary Amendment	
Supported		
Natural England:		
Education		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Vorkokiro Water Comments:	Vorkshire Water Wests Water Transferred	Works Commit
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	vvorks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:	ı l	

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 333	Site Name:	Off Whitehall Road	
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site:			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	·	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	117	
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion aumments			
Conclusion summary:  Site within the existing settlemen	t Noise from the nei	ghbouring factory use would need to be	e mitigated as part of any
future planning application (previ acceptable in principle.	ously refused permis	sion on these grounds). Otherwise, res	sidential development
ассертавле пт рипсіріе.			
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 49	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Conclusion:		l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green		ssessed	Not assessed
	1101 a		

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 430358 Area sq m: 12292.76 Ward Beeston and Holbeck Easting: 428762 Area Ha: 1.229276 HMCA: Outer South West

#### **Site Characteristics**

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Other

Other uses: Care centre and car audio

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries:

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1407.23Distance to bus stop (metres)70.24Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID6860

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Site Ref: 341

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
21/339/03/FU	Change of use of works to offices and leisure complex	27/11/2003	27/01/2004	W	99.96
H21/401/78/	Use of unit for assembly and m aintenance of printing equip ment, including work area, off ices and stores, and laying	17/07/1978	23/11/1978	Α	34.93
21/106/04/FU	Change of use of light industrial works to leisure complex and offices	08/04/2004	28/06/2005	0	99.14
0-21/3/99/MOD	Alterations to factory to form show room and offices	05/01/1999	08/01/1999	M01	99.65
H21/269/78/	One, externally illuminated, i ndividual letter sign, size 0.6m (2ft 11 ins) x 12.8m (42 feet), height above ground 5.2	24/05/1978	30/10/1978	А	25.32
H21/211/78/	Alterations, including re-roof ing of toilet area, and to fo rm locker room, and wash up ro om, and extension, to form cr	21/04/1978	30/10/1978	А	32.73
H21/195/88/	Change of use of retail store to show room, training facil ities and offices.	12/09/1988	20/10/1988	Α	62.60
H21/75/74/	Outline application to erect 5 and 6 storey warehouse premi ses with ancilliary office acc ommodation and car parking fa	15/05/1974	22/07/1974	R	62.67
10/04404/FU	Erection of retail store with car parking and landscaping	27/09/2010		PCO	99.91
H21/359/80/	Four, 6m high aluminium flagpo les, to diy shop.	01/08/1980	18/08/1980	R	62.29
H21/444/78/	10 warehouse units, each with ancillary offices and toile ts with car parking areas, ser vicing areas, access roa	03/08/1978	09/07/1979	А	61.27
H21/437/78/	Outline application to erect 1 0 warehouse units, each with ancillary offices and wit h car parking areas, to	31/07/1978	14/11/1978	W	61.26
21/213/03/FU	Change of use of works to offices and leisure complex	11/07/2003	03/10/2003	R	99.14
21/23/97/FU	Alterations to frontage and single storey front extension to offices	27/01/1997	12/03/1997	Α	99.96
H21/449/74/	Alterations, including new roo fing and offices, to units 2-3, and alterations includin g new offices entrance a	28/11/1974	17/03/1975	Α	99.87
H21/325/81/	Four, 6m high aluminium flag p oles to d.i.y shop.	22/12/1981	26/01/1982	Α	61.59
H21/77/90/	Alterations, including new ent rance and to form addit ional offices, to works.	20/03/1990	12/04/1990	Α	35.70
H21/583/79/	Change of use, involving alter ations, including re-cl adding of walls and to form of fice and toilets, of warehou	26/10/1979	29/09/1980	W	54.84
PREAPP/08/00112		09/04/2008		PRECAG	100.00
PREAPP/08/00114		10/04/2008		PRECAG	100.00

H21/167/78/	Alterations, including new fro ntage and entrance canopyand t o form offices, interview room s, kitchen, restroom a	31/03/1978	30/10/1978	А	27.11
H21/43/88/	8 internally illuminated wall signs, size of each 1.7m x 0.6m, height of each of 3 ab ove ground 4.7m (underside	26/02/1988	20/02/1989	W	12.94
H21/326/81/	4, non illuminated flag pole s igns, size of each 1.9m x1.4m, height of each above ground 4 .6m (underside) to d.i.y shop	22/12/1981	26/01/1982	Α	61.67
H21/286/89/	Change of use, involving alter ations, including new front age and extension, to form ent rance canopy, of diy retail	06/10/1989	05/12/1989	Α	62.34
H21/103/80/	Laying out of accesses and alt erations and extension, to fo rm retail sales area, with off ices, toilets and staff room	27/02/1980	04/06/1980	Α	62.52
PREAPP/08/00332		26/09/2008		PREEXP	100.00
21/159/98/FU	Alterations to elevations and service yard and wall to moorhouse avenue frontage	15/06/1998	16/09/1998	А	99.65
H21/299/80/	External illumination to exist ing fascia sign, size 12.6m x 1.8m height above ground 4. 9m (underside), to works and	12/06/1980	07/07/1980	Α	13.06

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: Yes	s Achievability: Short terr	n (0-5yrs)
Summary of Infrastructure provider co	omments and other planning requ	iirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment	1	Rank (1-5
Meets Core Strategy standards		5
Access Comments		Rank (1-5
An access from Moorhouse Ave can be achieved, exist and would have to be relocated	sting access is not within the full site boundary	5
Local network comment		Rank (1-5
Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites and lo	cal congestion at Tommy Wass junction	4
Mitigation measure		Total sco
		14
Support? Need to combine v	with other sites: Suitability for partia	development:
yes	n/a	
Highways Agency		
n/a		
Network Rail :		
Biodiversity_		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported		
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme
TOTASING WALET COMMENTS.	TOTASHINE Water Waste Water Healthen	T TYOINS COIIIIIE
LCC Flood Risk Management:		
<u>Utilities</u>		

Site Ref: 341	Site Name: Jubilee	Works, Old Lane,	Beeston
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Company Transcaller City			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Cleared and vacant site. Pending	g application for supermarket which	ch is currently recommende	d for refusal (out of centre
site). Employment or residential	development considered acceptal	ole in principle.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 44 Floo	orspace sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conclusio		Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Retail Conclusio Red	II.	Green

#### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428292
 Area sq m:
 51479.70
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 424404
 Area Ha:
 5.14797
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant & Derelict - Vacant building

Existing Use 2: Office

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Wholesale distribution

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2567.48Distance to bus stop (metres)178.64Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID13819SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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:	0.00		
Protected Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

No

# **Planning History**

Site Ref: 343

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
11/00270/ADV	Two illuminated signs	24/01/2011	23/03/2011	Α	53.02
11/9/00062/MOD	Laying out of access road, refurbishment of existing industrial units and construction of 4 new industrial units (use classes B1(c), B2 and B8), with service areas, car parking and landscaping NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO 09/03934/FU Extension of security fence and installation of security gate	07/04/2011	17/05/2011	M01	66.14
09/03934/FU	Laying out of access road, refurbishment of existing industrial units and construction of 4 new industrial units (use classes B1(c), B2 and B8), with service areas, car parking and landscaping	08/09/2009	07/12/2009	A	66.14
23/162/05/OT	Outline application to layout access road for proposed office hotel and residential development	31/03/2005	21/11/2006	W	100.00
H23/537/77/	Amendment to reserved matters application no. 76/23 /00903 for laying out of acces s road, and erection f 3 wareh	05/08/1977	22/08/1977	Α	17.97
H23/832/76/	Outline application to erect w arehouse with offices, to va cant site. (site area 0.23ha ( 0.56 acre)).	22/10/1976	29/11/1976	Α	53.52
12/00039/FU	Installation of solar photovoltaic panels to roof of three industrial units	06/01/2012	22/03/2012	Α	29.08
10/02804/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 of Planning Application 09/03934/FU	17/06/2010	09/09/2010	SPL	66.14
23/90/00/FU	Laying out of hardstanding area to works	02/03/2000	21/12/2001	А	14.54
23/216/01/FU	Change of use vehicle storage facility to plant repair workshop	11/06/2001	28/01/2002	Α	19.95
09/00130/DEM	Demolition	15/01/2009		APPRET	14.06
H23/55/74/	Application for additional fou I drain in warehouse units 7 and 8.	24/04/1974	10/06/1974	Α	25.65
10/9/00020/MOD	Laying out of access road, refurbishment of existing industrial units and construction of 4 new industrial units (use classes B1(c), B2 and B8), with service areas, car parking and landscaping NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Removal of first floor windows	28/01/2010	12/02/2010	M01	66.14
11/02012/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 24 and 25 of Planning Application 09/03934/FU	13/05/2011	01/07/2011	Α	66.14
10/05535/FU	Removal of condition 15 (lockable gate including hours of use) of application 09/03934/FU (for refurbishment of existing industrial units and erect 4 new industrial units)	08/12/2010	18/02/2011	Α	66.16

H23/192/80/	Laying out of access road and erection of 4 warehouse units in 2 blocks, 3 each with offi ces and toilets, one with c	13/03/1980	28/04/1980	А	17.20
H23/729/80/	Outline application to erect d etached warehouse unit and b lock of 4 warehouse units, wit h 50 car parking spaces, to	18/12/1980	20/07/1981	W	16.71
H23/833/76/	Single storey warehouse unit, with ancillary offices and t oilets, to vacant site. (site area 0.24ha (0.59 acre	22/10/1976	29/11/1976	А	53.52
H23/42/74/	Change of use of warehouse for premises to light indus try and manufacture and testin g of fork lift trucks.	18/04/1974	10/06/1974	А	25.57
10/05572/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 2 and 7 of Planning Application 09/03934/FU	08/12/2010	26/01/2011	А	66.14
H23/903/76/	Laying out of access road, and erection of 3 warehouse units, 1 with 2-storey ancillary of fice block, with 24 ca	19/11/1976	07/02/1977	A	17.86

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusio	ns				
Availability: Unknown	Suitability: No		Achievability:	Unknown	
Summary of Infrast	ructure provider co	mments and ot	her planni	ng requiren	nents
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment					Rank (1-5)
Good accessibility					4
Access Comments				Ĭ	Rank (1-5)
Existing access points ade	quate				4
Local network comment				l	Rank (1-5)
	ut the site has a fallback pos g use on site would be minin		nd planning con	sent,	4
Mitigation measure					Total scor
Improvements to local foot	way provision				12
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability	for partial deve	lopment:
yes with mitigation					
Lighways Agency					
Potential for cumulative imp Morley/Gildersome/Ardsley	act in combination with othe cluster.	er sites. If site still inclu	ided at next sift	assess as part	of
Network Rail :					
Biodiversity					
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	•	Amendment		
Supported					
Natural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
Drainage/Water/Floodi					
Environment Agency Com	iments:	Environment Ag	ency Constrai	nts:	
Yorkshire Water Commen	ts:	Yorkshire Water	· Waste Water	Treatment Wor	ks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managem	ent:				

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 343	Site Name:	Off Gelderd Road, G	ildersome
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Cympy Troyollor City	Accessmen	4	
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessifier		
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes (Text)	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
0			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Existing employment area. Site h erected.	as planning permissi	on and work has started with on	e of the 4 proposed new units now
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	0	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not a	ssessed	Green

Site Ref: 536 Site Name: Nook Farm, West Ardsley

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 424843 Area sq m: 10515.62 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428390 Area Ha: 1.051562 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

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: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3561.00Distance to bus stop (metres)96.66Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID11844SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
06/01180/RM	Laying out of access road and erection of 28 houses with landscaping	22/02/2006	11/01/2007	Α	97.85
H23/27/90/	Outline application to lay out access, drainage and publi c open space and erect residen tial development to agricultur	23/01/1990	27/03/2003	0	99.99
H23/137/91/	13 dwelling houses, comprising 7, 4 bedroom detached house s each with integral garage an d 6, 3 bedroom detached h	09/04/1991	22/05/1991	Α	35.71
23/539/02/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	12/12/2002	24/02/2003	Α	97.86
H23/445/90/	Two non-illuminated site signs and 9 non-illuminated flag signs to residential developme nt.	02/11/1990	18/12/1990	Α	36.63
H23/598/80/	Outline application to erect d etached house with garag e, to vacant site (site area 0 .02ha)	18/09/1980	23/10/1980	W	11.24

Site Ref: 536 Site Name: Nook Farm, West Ardsley

#### 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 536 Site Name: Nook Farm, West Ardsley

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	Yes Achievability: Short	term (0-5yrs)
Summary of Infrastructure provider	comments and other planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
The site has access to 2-3 buses per hour, and lies secondary education, and primary health	within the accessibility zone for primary &	4
Access Comments	Rank (1-5)	
Access achievable from Haigh Moor Road		5
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Cumulative issues		4
Mitigation measure		Total scor
		13
Support? Need to combin	ne with other sites: Suitability for pa	rtial development:
yes		
<u>Highways Agency</u>		
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with Morley/Gildersome/Ardsley cluster.	other sites. If site still included at next sift assess	s as part of
Network Rail :		
<u>Biodiversity</u>		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office Supported	er: Boundary Amendment	
Natural England:		
Education		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatm	nent Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		

<u>Utilities</u>

Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy Traveller Site	Assessme	ent		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)	110		IMayoo
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	110		Waybo
site?				
Proximity to housed	Yes (Text)		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)	112		1
	_			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Site within existing settlement. S				
has since expired. (Overlaps with	n site 3373). Resi	dential development th	nerefore acceptable in p	rinciple.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 28	3 Floorspace	e sq m (Non residentia	II):
Residential Conclusion:	Re	tail Conclusion:	En	nployment Conclusion:
Green				

Site Name: Nook Farm, West Ardsley

Site Ref: 536

Site Ref: 562 Site Name: East Ardsley PS, Fall Lane, East Ardsley

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 425621 Area sq m: 7784.79 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 430787 Area Ha: 0.778479 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

☑
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 4559.30 Distance to bus stop (metres) 45.23

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 5697

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Site Ref: 562

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
23/274/05/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	14/06/2005	03/10/2006	А	99.86
H23/558/75/	Laying out of new pedestrian access to school premises	01/08/1975	23/02/1976	Α	89.32
08/00313/RM	Laying out of access road and erection of 14 flats and 31 houses, with car parking and landscaping	18/01/2008	23/04/2008	W	99.99
12/02720/FU	36 houses with new access roads	21/06/2012		PCO	99.31
07/07933/OT	Variation of condition 12 of 23/274/05/OT relating to visibility splays	21/12/2007	16/04/2008	Α	99.72
PREAPP/08/00222		10/06/2008		PRECAG	99.84
23/138/04/FU	Relocation of detached prefab single storey & siting of 1 single & one-2 storey prefab classroom units to school	11/03/2004	21/04/2004	Α	99.86
12/00048/FU	New access roads and 38 houses	06/01/2012		APPRET	99.31

Site Ref: 562 Site Name: East Ardsley PS, Fall Lane, East Ardsley

#### 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 562 Site Name: East Ardsley PS, Fall Lane, East Ardsley

East Leeds

Gas:

SHLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: Yes	Achievability: Short term (0-5yrs)			
Summary of Infrastructure provider co	omments and other planning requirements			
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment	Rank (1-			
100% 2buses per hour, 100% primary, does not meet o	other standards 2			
Access Comments	Rank (1-			
Adequate highway frontage for access				
Local network comment	Rank (1-			
scale of development should not cause an issue	5			
Mitigation measure	Total sco			
	11			
Support? Need to combine w	ith other sites.			
Support? Need to combine w	rith other sites: Suitability for partial development:			
yes				
Highways Agency				
n/a				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment			
Supported				
Natural England:	L			
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:			
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme			
LCC Flood Risk Management:				
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeolog	gy Service:		
English Heritage:			

Site Ref: 562

Site Name: East Ardsley PS, Fall Lane, East Ardsley

Site Ref: 562 Site Name: East Ardsley PS, Fall Lane, East Ardsley

# Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
100% 2buses per hour, 100% primary, does not me	et other standards	2
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Adequate highway frontage for access		4
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
scale of development should not cause an issue		5
Mitigation measure		Total score
		11
Support? Need to combin	ne with other sites:	Suitability for partial development:
yes		
Highways Agency n/a Network Rail:		
Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	nr. Poundary Am	ondmont.
Supported	er: Boundary Ame	enament
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency	y Constraints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Wa	ste Water Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		
<u>Utilities</u> 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 Yes No Maybe managed (Text) Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? **Proximity to housed** No Yes gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown (Text) encampments **Conclusion of Assessment** Conclusion summary: This is a brownfield site set within the existing settlement. Residential development acceptable in principle. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 25 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): **Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:** Green Not assessed Not assessed

Site Name: East Ardsley PS, Fall Lane, East Ardsley

Site Ref: 562

### **Site Details**

Northing: 428073 Area sq m: 8041.40 Ward Morley South
Easting: 426988 Area Ha: 0.80414 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Other

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Retail - Restaurants and Cafes

Neighbouring Use 2: Other

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings
Other uses: Building contractors

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):40.70Distance to bus stop (metres)146.21Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID1740

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

١	Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes	
	Site		Site Type		
	Albert Road Morley (Morley Waste Traders	s)	Vehicle Dismantling and Scrap Metal		

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/287/74/	Outline application to erect metal products yard to vacan t site.	31/07/1974	23/12/1974	W	98.12
H23/955/78/	Laying out of access road, and erection of light indus trial unit, with 2 general off ices, 2 directors offices, p	12/12/1978	19/02/1979	Α	55.58
10/03141/OT	Outline Application to layout access and erect residential development	08/07/2010	28/12/2011	Α	98.42
23/78/04/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	22/01/2004	28/06/2004	W	92.33
H23/853/77/	Laying out of access road and erection of factory, compr ising workshop and parts depar tment, interview room, rece	12/12/1977	30/01/1978	Α	97.57
09/03433/OT	Outline application to layout access and erect residential development	05/08/2009	29/03/2010	W	98.38
23/72/03/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	05/11/2002	20/05/2003	W	99.27
H23/406/78/	Laying out of access and erect ion of factory, compr ising workshop and parts depar tment, messroom, 2 storey a	19/05/1978	10/07/1978	Α	98.37
23/469/04/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	05/08/2004	22/03/2005	R	99.27

# 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? Are these in agricultural use? Does the site contain buildings? 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development

Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

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

Aire Valley:

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: Yes	S A	chievability:	Short term (0-5yrs)
Summary of Infrastructure provider co	omments and oth	er planni	ng requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy standards			5
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Adequate frontage for access			4
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Scale of development should not cause an issue			4
Mitigation measure			Total scor
			13
Support? Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
yes			
Highways Agency			
n/a			
Network Rail :			
Footbridge to replace nearby LC; Morley Station Improsissues	vements (including disab	oled access) G	General asset protection
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	<u>-</u>	Amendment	
Supported with mitigation if the wildlife corridor function Albert Valley Road Local Nature Area is protected and enhnaced i.e. provide a minimum 10 metre buffer along northern boundary.			
Natural England:			
Education			
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>		_	
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Age	ency Constrai	ints:
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.

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref: 563	Site Name:	Albert Road, Morley	
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Site	Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
O T !! O'			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		

# **Conclusion of Assessment**

Conclusion summary:

Site currently in employment use however could be brought forward for residential development. Development for residential could provide an opportunity for improved access to the train station to the north (current access is adjacent site to East).

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 40 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Green Not assessed

Site Ref: 637 Site Name: Royds Lane, Wortley, LS12

### **Site Details**

Northing: 431284 Area sq m: 53381.05 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 427058 Area Ha: 5.338105 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Office

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Significant Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1256.58Distance to bus stop (metres)311.04Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID8064

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.78	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?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes
Site		Site Type	
Royds Lane Holbeck/Beeston recent pp		General Waste Management Sites	

# **Planning History**

Site Ref: 637

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H24/65/89/	Alterations and extension to f orm enlarged store area and I aying out of additional car pa rk to cash and carrywarehouse.	06/03/1989	21/04/1989	Α	15.49
24/440/96/OT	Outline application to erect 5 industrial units and to lay out access road and car parking	24/12/1996	16/06/1998	Α	81.71
07/07482/FU	Use of land for recycling of inert and non-hazardous construction and excavation wastes, to produce aggregates and soils	30/11/2007	03/03/2009	Α	17.38
H24/560/74/	Three single storey warehouse units, each with toilets, and w ith forty car parking spaces t o vacant site. (total flo	29/11/1974	24/03/1975	R	13.71
24/217/01/RE	Renewal of outline permission for 5 industrial units with access road	23/05/2001	16/08/2001	Α	74.25
24/334/04/RE	Renewal of outline permission for 5 industrial units with access road	29/06/2004	28/09/2004	Α	73.20
09/05553/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	23/12/2009		PCO	99.30
06/02324/OT	Outline application to layout access road and erect a mixed use development comprising offices, retail and residential development comprising 258 dwellings	11/04/2006	01/02/2008	A	98.85
08/04175/FU	Replacement lighting to front car park to cash and carry	10/07/2008	31/10/2008	Α	13.81
H24/275/84/	Change of use of part of wareh ouse car park to wareh ouse garden centre.	21/11/1984	07/01/1985	Α	15.70
H24/335/88/	Alterations and extension, to form enlarged store area, to ex isting cash and carry warehous e.	23/11/1988	23/01/1989	Α	15.48
H24/347/77/	Outline application to lay out access roads and erect 8 war ehouse units, to site of forme r locomotive sheds.	21/06/1977	04/07/1977	A	55.19
H24/347/77/1	Renewal of outline permission to lay out access roads and e rect 8 warehouse units to site of former locomotive	12/02/1980	02/06/1980	Α	51.26

Site Ref: 637 Site Name: Royds Lane, Wortley, LS12

### 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 637 Site Name: Royds Lane, Wortley, LS12

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Long term (11+ year Suitability: Yes	Achievability: Long ter	m (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider com	ments and other planning req	uirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
20% of the site has access to 4 buses per hour. 70% of th for primary education but none for secondary education. A zone for primary health.		3
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Access achievable via Royds Lane		4
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Congestion on Ring Road		3
Mitigation measure		Total score
Signalisation of A58/ A6120 roundabout may be required.	, local pedestrian improvements	10
Support? Need to combine with	other sites: Suitability for partia	al development:
Yes with mitigation		
<u>Highways Agency</u> n/a <u>Network Rail :</u>		
Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but are semi-mature woodland, UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priorit Habitat, within the site. All the area to the north east include the disused railway are currently valuable and supply a will corridor function alongside Gelderd Road, as does the discrailway running along the south and south-east. Possible the Red parts of this site would meet Local Wildlife Site (Secological and Geological Importance (SEGI) criteria.	excluded and boundary substantial drawing RM/637. Mitigation will still ensure impacts on adjacent woodla habitat are addressed. Parts of the Local Wildlife Site - need to be assistant.	ly amended as per be required to and/scrub/grassland site are potential
Natural England:	ı	
Education		
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>		
Environment Agency Comments:	<b>Environment Agency Constraints:</b>	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatmer	nt Works Comme

Site Ref: 637	Site Name:	Royds Lane,	Wortley, LS12	2
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:			
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessmen	•		
	Assessifien			
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Site:				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			•
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Planning permission for residenti	al development recer	ntly approved, applica	tion no. 09/05553/O	T. Site will become 'lime
green' when plan is updated.				
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	258	Floorspace	sq m (Non residenti	al):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	E	mployment Conclusion:
Green	Not a	ssessed	N	ot assessed

#### **Site Details** 427115 Area sq m: 88330.78 Northing: Ward Morley South 427503 Easting: Area Ha: 8.833078 HMCA: Outer South West 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 uses: Site State: Greenfield Site Detail Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1128.19 Distance to bus stop (metres) 450.35 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 7850 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes Public Rights of Way: Yes Other comments/observations on site characteristics: **UDP Designation**

#### 98.85 Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%): 0.00 Greenbelt - N32 (%): Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%): 0.00 Rural Land - RL1: 0.00 City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%): Town Centre - S2: 0.00 0.00 0.00 Greenspace - N1: 0 Special Landscape Area - N37: Other?: Allotments - N1A: 0.00 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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/9/82/	Outline application to erect i ndustrial development, tovacan t site. (site area 49.27ha).	19/01/1982	11/11/1982	W	99.03

# 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 existin	ng 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 area and undeveloped land?	n existing urban	
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 settlem	ments?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundar development?	ry to contain	
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 exist	ting urban area?	
Does the site provide access to the countryside?	$\checkmark$	
Does the site include local or national conservation designated area	as?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	e protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site contain buildings?	in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion		
The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from e	encroachment	
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building o feature?	or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this character?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and spe	ecial character of historic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Beck separates site from residential area creating a strong defensible safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and development		
Conformity with Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Ext	tension Brownfield	
Major Settlement Major Settlement Ext	tension Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement E	Extension Mixed	
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extensi	ion	
Development unrelated to existing development	opment	
Regeneration Priority Area:		
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

East Leeds

vailability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
ummary of Infras	structure provider co	omments and other planning requ	irements
-	•	, , ,	
eeds City Council H	lighways inc Metro		Rank (1-5)
Accessibility comment	ss to 4 huses per hour 20% o	f the site is within the accessibility zone for	
	o primary health and 30% to		3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Access available from To	opcliffe Lane (through industri	al estate or fom eastern part of site)	3
Local network commer	nt	1	Rank (1-5)
Likely to require off-site r	mitigation and cumulative imp	acts	4
Mitigation measure			Total scor
Must have pedestrian co	nnections to north and west o	f site	10
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites: Suitability for partial	development:
yes with mitigation	could combine with 3	3120, 1285 1279 &	
lighways Agency			
ikely to require significar	nt physical mitigation		
letwork Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported			
latural England:			
<u>iducation</u>			
Prainage/Water/Flood	ding		
nvironment Agency Co		Environment Agency Constraints:	
orkshire Water Commo	ents:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme

<u>Utilities</u> Gas:

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment		
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	, 1.13	may20
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
			oundary to existing residential area.  ordering the site. Site has no road
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 231	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Cor	nclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Red		Not assessed

Site Ref: 1018A

### **Site Details**

Northing: 426923 Area sq m: 268375.61 Ward Morley South
Easting: 427684 Area Ha: 26.837561 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2: Office

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

 Natural Landscape:
 Limited Tree Cover
 Road Frontage
 ✓

 Distance to Rail Station (metres):
 1384.93
 Distance to bus stop (metres)
 485.48

 Nearest Railway Station
 Morley
 Bus Stop ID
 8422

 SFRA Flood Zone:
 0.00
 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

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:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.62	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/130/74/	Single storey building for sto rage accommodation to works .	16/05/1974	12/08/1974	Α	29.65
H23/161/75/	Single storey workshop, compri sing plant repair area, medic al unit, w.c., office, store, tyre store, and tyrerepair are	13/03/1975	14/04/1975	Α	29.65
H23/9/82/	Outline application to erect i ndustrial development, tovacan t site. (site area 49.27ha).	19/01/1982	11/11/1982	W	98.54
H23/500/78/	Change of use of store to mung o and shoddy production, and m ungo and shoddy production to store.	22/06/1978	10/07/1978	Α	29.65

# 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 be area and undeveloped land?	etween existing urban						
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 s	settlements?						
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/bodevelopment?	oundary to contain						
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:							
No merging of settlements							
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment							
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the	e existing urban area?						
Does the site provide access to the countryside?	$\checkmark$						
Does the site include local or national conservation designated	d areas?						
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows the significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	nat are protected, or						
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	$\checkmark$						
Does the site contain buildings?	these in agricultural use?						
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion							
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding th	e countryside from encroachment						
Preserve the setting and special character of historic town							
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed buil feature?	ding or other historical						
If yes, could development preserve this character?:							
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:							
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting ar	nd special character of historic features						
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:							
Site is isolated from main urban area and relates poorly. Exist development reducing potential for further sprawl. Site perforn							
Conformity with Core Strategy							
Main Urban Area Main Urban Ar	ea Extension Brownfield						
Major Settlement Major Settleme	ent Extension Greenfield						
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settler	ment Extension Mixed						
Villages/Rural Village/Rural E	extension						
Development unrelated to existing	development						
Regeneration Priority Area:							
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley: 0.00						
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway: 0.00						

East Leeds

Utilities Gas:

vailability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
- aa.	Canazin,	Achievability.	
ummary of Infrast	ructure provider co	omments and other planning red	quirements
eeds City Council Hig	ghways inc Metro		
ccessibility comment			Rank (1-5
	to 4 buses per hour, 20% or primary health and 30% for	of the site area within the accessibility zone for r secondary education	3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Access available from Top	ocliffe Lane (through industri	ial estate or fom eastern part of site)	3
ocal network comment			Rank (1-5
ikely to require off-site mi	itigation and cumulative imp	pacts	4
Mitigation measure			Total scor
Must have pedestrian con	nections to north and west o	of site	10
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites: Suitability for part	ial development:
res with mitigation	could combine with 3		
ighways Agency			
kely to require significant	physical mitigation		
etwork Rail :			
iodiversity			
est Yorkshire Ecology a	and LCC Ecology Officer:	<b>Boundary Amendment</b>	
upported			
atural England:			
<u>ducation</u>			
rainage/Water/Floodi	ng		
nvironment Agency Con	nments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
orkshire Water Commer	nts:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatme	ent Works Comme

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment		
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Green Belt site. Land on hill top	eck (site A) from resider	ntial area, with much better c	al areas and Capitol Park. Site is connection to existing Capitol Park
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 704	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail C Red	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion: Not assessed

Site Ref: 1018B

### **Site Details**

Northing: 426422 Area sq m: 6431.08 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 431743 Area Ha: 0.643108 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage 

✓

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 5067.05 Distance to bus stop (metres) 37.73

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 8631

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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

**Planning History** 

# 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 d								
Would development result in isolated development	nent?							
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	oundaries with existing bu	ilt up area)?	✓					
Would development of the site effectively "rour	nd off" the settlement patte	rn?:	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 physica	connection of settlements	?						
Do natural/physical features provide a good exdevelopment?	cisting barrier/boundary to	contain	✓					
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:								
No merging of settlements								
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment							
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing u	rban area?						
Does the site provide access to the countrysid	e?							
Does the site include local or national conserva-	ation designated areas?							
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are prot	ected, or						
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?		$\checkmark$					
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in ag	ricultural use?						
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion								
The site does not perform an important role in	safeguarding the countrys	ide from encroad	chment					
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic towns							
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or oth	er historical						
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	ter?:							
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:								
Development of the site would have no effect of	on the setting and special of	character of histo	oric features					
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	g ,							
Well contained site with good links to the settle	ement. Does not provide a	ccess to the cou	ntryside.					
Conformity with Core Strateg	ЭУ							
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extensi	on 🔳	Brownfield					
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extensi	on 🔳	Greenfield					
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Exten	sion 🔳	Mixed					
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension							
Development unrela	ated to existing developme	ent 🔳						
Regeneration Priority Area:								
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire	Valley:		0.00				
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 Wes	st Leeds Gatewa	ay:	0.00				

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Short term (0-5yr	s) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
ummary of Infrastruc	cture provide	er comments ar	nd other planni	ing requirements
_eeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
The site has access to 2 buses secondary education, and prin		within the accessibility	zone for primary &	3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Access via Long Thorpe Road	I			5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Spare capacity but cumulative	issues			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				12
Support?	Need to comb	oine with other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
yes				
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Off	icer: Bou	ındary Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding		Postoni	ont Ago	into
Environment Agency Comme	ents:	Environm	ent Agency Constra	ints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Varkshira	Water Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
TOTASHINE WATER COMMINENTS:		TOTASTIIFE	TTALE: TVASLE TVALE!	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management	<u> </u>			
<u>Utilities</u>				

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	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. Unused area of Development of the site would be existing defensible boundaries.			
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 17	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ntial): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conc	lusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not assesse	ed	Not assessed

Site Name: Land of Long Thorpe Lane, Thorpe, Wakefield, WF3 3BZ

Site Ref: 1029

### **Site Details**

Northing: 425500 Area sq m: 134795.33 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 430019 Area Ha: 13.479533 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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: Residential - Residential institution

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):4015.22Distance to bus stop (metres)225.21Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID9823

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	1.00
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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/888/75/	Outline application, to erect residential development, to ag ricultural land. (site area 13 .83ha (34.15 acres))	18/11/1975	12/01/1976	R	99.73

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) Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: L	LDF to determine Achievability: Medium to	erm (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider	comments and other planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
The site has access to 3 buses per hour. All of the s education, 30% for primary health. It lies outside the		4
Access Comments	'	Rank (1-5)
Access achievable onto A650 - may require signalis	sation if combined with other sites	4
Local network comment	l	Rank (1-5)
Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites		4
Mitigation measure		Total scor
To be assessed by way of TA		12
	e with other sites: Suitability for partial	development:
yes with mitigation		
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with of Road cluster  Network Rail:	other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as	part of Dewsbury
Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	r: Boundary Amendment	
Supported		
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	<b>Environment Agency Constraints:</b>	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:	1 1	

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 1	032	Site Name:	Land off Bradfor	d Road , Eas	t Ardsley WF3
Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescu	ue Services:				
Built Heritage	<u>e</u>				
Leeds City Co	uncil:				
West Yorkshire	e Archaeology	Service:			
English Herita	ge:				
Gynsy Tra	veller Site	Assessmen	•		
		ASSESSITION	-		
Could site be	effectively	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
managed		(TOXI)			
Would gypsie	-	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live	on the	(Text)			
Proximity to		Yes	No	)	
gypsies and	travellers	(Text)			
Experience o	f previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampment		(Text)	·		
Conclusion	of Asses	sment			
Conclusion sum	mary:				
			AS) in the existing UDP, i	not within the Greer	n Belt. There are no
physical constrain	its with the site,	it is flat with a road fi	ontage.		
Site Capacity (dv	vellings units):	293	Floorspace sq m	(Non residential)	:
Residential Cond	clusion:	Retai	Conclusion:	Emp	oloyment Conclusion:
Green					

Site Ref: 1043 Site Name: Pylee House, Thorpe Lower Lane, Robin Hood, Wakefield, WF3 3BQ

### **Site Details**

Northing: 427351 Area sq m: 18702.41 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 432219 Area Ha: 1.870241 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Significant Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):4914.15Distance to bus stop (metres)263.02Nearest Railway StationWoodlesfordBus Stop ID9329

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.90	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:	99.43	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

Site Ref: 1043 Site Name: Pylee House, Thorpe Lower Lane, Robin Hood , Wakefield, WF3 3BQ

**Planning History** 

Site Ref: 1043 Site Name: Pylee House, Thorpe Lower Lane, Robin Hood , Wakefield, WF3 3BQ

# 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)?	$\checkmark$					
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the s	settlement pattern?:	No					
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barri							
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	n of settlements?						
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barridevelopment?	er/boundary to contain	✓					
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:							
No merging of settlements							
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachme	nt						
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site ar	nd the existing urban area?						
Does the site provide access to the countryside?							
Does the site include local or national conservation desig	nated areas?						
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgero significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	ws that are protected, or	<b>✓</b>					
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 safeguardi	ng the countryside from encroa	chment					
Preserve the setting and special character of historic	towns						
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed feature?	building or other historical						
If yes, could development preserve this character?:							
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:							
Development of the site would have no effect on the setti	ng and special character of hist	oric features					
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:							
Site is well contained between the settlement and the mothe green belt.	torway. Not considered to have	significant impact on					
Conformity with Core Strategy							
Main Urban Area Main Urba	n Area Extension	Brownfield					
Major Settlement Major Set	tlement Extension	Greenfield					
Smaller Settlement Smaller S	ettlement Extension	Mixed					
Villages/Rural Village/Ru	ral Extension						
Development unrelated to exist	sting development						
Regeneration Priority Area:							
Inner South Leeds: 0	.00 Aire Valley:	0.00					
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0	.00 West Leeds Gatewa	ay: 0.00					

Site Ref: 1043 Site Name: Pylee House, Thorpe Lower Lane, Robin Hood , Wakefield, WF3 3BQ

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusion	ns			
vailability: Unknown	Suitability: No		Achievability: Unknown	
ummary of Infrast	ructure provider co	omments and	other planning requ	irements
_eeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment Good accessibility				Rank (1-5)
3000 accessibility				5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Access via existing private ooks ok	access road from Thorpe L	Lower Lane would ne	eed widening but visibility	4
Local network comment			·	Rank (1-5)
Spare capacity				5
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Private access road from T	horpe Lower Lane would n	eed some improvem	ents (footways / width)	14
Support?	Need to combine v	vith other sites:	Suitability for partia	I development:
es with mitigation				
lighways Agency				
letwork Rail :				
Biodiversity				
	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Bounda	ary Amendment	
ite is Lowland Mixed Decidation Plan priority habitat.	ite-based designations but to duous Woodland UK Biodive The woodland forms a com orridor which runs beside the Leeds Habitat Network.	ersity nponent of		
latural England:		ı		
<u>iducation</u>				
)rainage/Water/Floodi	ng			
Environment Agency Com	iments:	Environment	Agency Constraints:	
orkshire Water Commen	ıts:	Yorkshire Wa	iter Waste Water Treatmen	t 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.

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref: 1043	Site Name:	Pylee House, Thorpe I Hood , Wakefield, WF:	
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	ace section, page 37,	question G9. Whilst the site is we	ignated in the existing UDP as N1 ell contained in terms of Green Belt
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 58	Floorspace sq m (Non re	esidential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 1064A Site Name: Bruntcliffe Road and Scott lane, Morley Leeds LS27

#### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 427014
 Area sq m:
 75798.28
 Ward
 Morley South

 Easting:
 425153
 Area Ha:
 7.579828
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses: Residential dwellings

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

✓

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 0.00 Distance to bus stop (metres) 0.00

Nearest Railway Station Bus Stop ID

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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:	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

Site Ref: 1064A Site Name: Bruntcliffe Road and Scott lane, Morley

Leeds LS27

Site Ref: 1064A Site Name: Bruntcliffe Road and Scott lane, Morley Leeds LS27

## 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?	?
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	
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield
Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension	
Development unrelated to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:	
Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gate	wav: 0.00

Site Ref: 1064A Site Name: Bruntcliffe Road and Scott lane, Morley Leeds LS27

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infrast	ructure provider co	mments and ot	her planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
	ess to 4buses per hour but Strategy standards for prin 6 to employment.			2
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Access achievable onto A6	650			4
Local network comment			, i	Rank (1-5)
Cumulative impact issues	with other nearby sites - con	gested area		3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Local mitigation may be re-	quired			9
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial of	development:
Support with mitigation				•
Highways Agency				
No objection subject to mitig	gation			
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Support				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floodi	ng			
Environment Agency Com	ments:	Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Commen	ts:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managem	ent:			
	. —			

		Leeds LS27	•
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	/ Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessm	ent	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		1
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
No. 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Site within the urban area. The a			een identified as a site to retain for
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	ı	0 Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	R	etail Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:

Site Name: Bruntcliffe Road and Scott lane, Morley

Site Ref: 1064A

Site Ref: 1064B Site Name: Bruntcliffe Road and Scott lane, Morley Leeds LS27

## **Site Details**

Northing: 426829 Area sq m: 13083.40 Ward Morley South
Easting: 425269 Area Ha: 1.30834 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 0.00 

Distance to bus stop (metres) 0.00

Nearest Railway Station Bus Stop ID

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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:	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

Site Ref: 1064B Site Name: Bruntcliffe Road and Scott lane, Morley

Leeds LS27

Site Ref: 1064B Site Name: Bruntcliffe Road and Scott lane, Morley Leeds LS27

## 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?	
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	
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield
Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension	2.0
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement Extension	Greenfield Mixed
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension	Mixed
Development unrelated to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:	
Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gate:	

Site Ref: 1064B Site Name: Bruntcliffe Road and Scott lane, Morley Leeds LS27

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
ummary of Infrastruct	ure provider co	omments and other planning req	uiromonts
diffinally of fifth astruct	ure provider co	onlinents and other planning req	unements
Leeds City Council Highwa	ys inc Metro		Donk (4. /
Accessibility comment 0% 4buses/h but some services secondary.	in the area, 30% empl	oyment, 100% primarym 0% health, 0%	Rank (1-
Access Comments			Rank (1-
Requires access through 1064A			1
			•
Local network comment			Rank (1-
cumulative impact issues with o	ther nearby sites - con	gested area	3
Mitigation measure			Total sco
1			
Local mitigation may be required			
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites: Suitability for partia	al development:
No support - requires access through 1064A	Yes - site 1064A		
Highways Agency			
No objection subject to mitigation	1		
Network Rail :			
<u> Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and L	CC Ecology Officer:	<b>Boundary Amendment</b>	
Ecology			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Orainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Commen	ts:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatmer	nt Works Comme
_CC Flood Risk Management:			
<u>Jtilities</u>			

Site Ref:	1064B	Site Name:	Bruntcliffe Road Leeds LS27	and Scott lar	ne, Morley
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Res	scue Services:				
Built Herita Leeds City C West Yorksh English Heri	Council: nire Archaeology	Service:			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Tı	raveller Site	Assessment	i		
Could site I managed	be effectively	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
Would gyps	sies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers li site?		(Text)	1 -		
Proximity to		Yes	No		
gypsies and	d travellers	(Text)			
	of previous	Yes (Text)	No		Unknown
encampme	nts	(Text)			
Conclusio	on of Asses	sment			
Conclusion su					
This site is part preen' when the	of a recent planni e plan is updated.	ng permission (12/01	332/OT) for residential de	velopment. The sit	te will become 'lime
Site Capacity (	(dwellings units):	0	Floorspace sq m	(Non residential):	
Residential Co Green	onclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Emp	loyment Conclusion:

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 424561 Area sq m: 116624.14 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 430179 Area Ha: 11.662414 HMCA: Outer South West

## 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:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

✓

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 4785.57 Distance to bus stop (metres) 474.43

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 7081

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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

## 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 d	evelopment?			
Would development result in isolated development	nent?	$\checkmark$		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	oundaries with existing built o	up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "rour	nd off" the settlement pattern?			
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	isting barrier between existin	g urban 🔽		
Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging				
Would development of the site lead to physica	connection of settlements?			
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex development?	isting barrier/boundary to cor	ntain 🗌		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but would significantly reduce the	green belt gap			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urba	an area?		
Does the site provide access to the countrysid	e?	$\checkmark$		
Does the site include local or national conserva	ation designated areas?			
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are protec	ted, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?	<b>~</b>		
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agric	ultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion				
The site performs an important role safeguardi	ng countryside from encroacl	nment		
Preserve the setting and special character of	of historic towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other	historical		
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	ter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:				
Development of the site would have no effect of	on the setting and special cha	aracter of historic fea	atures	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Site is isolated from settlement and developme	ent would have a high potenti	al to lead to further	sprawl.	
Conformity with Core Strateg	Jy			
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension		Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension		Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	on 🔳	Mixed	
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension			
Development unrela	ated to existing development			
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire V	alley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West I	_eeds Gateway:		0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: S	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastructure	provider comments an	nd other planning requir	ements
Leeds City Council Highways in	<u>c Metro</u>		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Poor accessibility fails all criteria			2
Access Comments		'	Rank (1-5
No suitable access			1
			•
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Potential cumulative imapct on local n	etwork		4
Mitigation measure			Total sco
			7
Support? Nee	d to combine with other sites:	Suitability for partial d	evelopment:
no			
Highways Agency			
No objection			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ec	ology Officer: Bou	undary Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to protect and corridor function across the site.	d enhance wildlife		
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environme	ent Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire	Water Waste Water Treatment W	orks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			
<u>Jtilities</u>			

		Pilden lane, East A	rdsley WF3
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	,	
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
			lated and unrelated to settlement and cedent for further unrestricted sprawl.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 262	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Site accessed from Woodhouse Lane and

Site Ref: 1067A

# **Site Details**

424898 Area sq m: 19757.13 Northing: Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward 430179 Easting: Area Ha: 1.975713 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

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 Distance to Rail Station (metres): 4541.07 Distance to bus stop (metres) 210.01

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 5832 SFRA Flood Zone:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

0.00

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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:	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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up are	eas	
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon develop	ment?	
Would development result in isolated development?		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ bounda	ries with existing built up area)?	$\checkmark$
Would development of the site effectively "round off"	the settlement pattern?:	Yes
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing larea and undeveloped land?	parrier between existing urban	<b>✓</b>
Overall sprawl conclusion:		
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl		
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging		
Would development of the site lead to physical conne	ection of settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing development?	barrier/boundary to contain	<b>✓</b>
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:		
No merging of settlements		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroach	nment	
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the sit	e and the existing urban area?	✓
Does the site provide access to the countryside?		
Does the site include local or national conservation d	esignated areas?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hed significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	gerows that are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural lar	nd?	✓
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion		
The site does not perform an important role in safegu	arding the countryside from encroad	chment
Preserve the setting and special character of hist	oric towns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, I feature?	isted building or other historical	
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 histo	oric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Well connected to settlement. Trees line the boundar	y and contain the site, reducing pot	ential for further sprawl.
Conformity with Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area Main	Urban Area Extension	Brownfield
Major Settlement Major	Settlement Extension	Greenfield
Smaller Settlement Small	er Settlement Extension	Mixed
Villages/Rural Village	e/Rural Extension	_
Development unrelated to	existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:		
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatewa	av: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusi	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:	,	Achievability:	
Summary of Infra	structure provider co	mments and ot	her planning require	ements
Leeds City Council H	lighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
The site has access to 3	buses per hour and ok for othe	er services		4
Access Comments			'	Rank (1-5
No suitable access				1
				<b>'</b>
Local network comme	nt			Rank (1-5
Potential cumulative imp	acct on local network			4
				•
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				9
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial de	evelopment:
no				
Highways Agency				
No objection				
Network Rail :				
<u> Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported with mitigation corridor function across t	to protect and enhance wildlife ne site.	e		
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Orainage/Water/Floo	ding			
Environment Agency Co	omments:	Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
orkshire Water Comm	ents:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment W	orks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ement:			

	Pilden I	ane, East Ardsley W	/F3
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment -		
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Green Belt site. The original SHI	LAA submission has been split in t ded by a tree line. Development v		
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 53 <b>Floo</b>	rspace sq m (Non residenti	<b>al)</b> : 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conclusion	n: E	mployment Conclusion:
Amber	Red	R	ed

Site Name: Site accessed from Woodhouse Lane and

Site Ref: 1067B

Site Ref: 1068 Site Name: Stoney Lane, East Ardsley, Wakefield, WF3

### **Site Details**

Northing: 424502 Area sq m: 7693.80 Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward 430648 Easting: Area Ha: 0.76938 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Agriculture

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage **~** Distance to Rail Station (metres): 5152.94 Distance to bus stop (metres) 128.90 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 13659 SFRA Flood Zone:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

0.00

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.69	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 300m of retail centre boundary:

Site Ref: 1068 Site Name: Stoney Lane, East Ardsley, Wakefield, WF3

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/585/89/	Detached concrete block cattle shed to agricultural site.	29/11/1989	04/06/1990	Α	92.51
H23/586/89/	Outline application to layout access and erect detachedbunga low to vacant site. (s ite area 0.06ha)	29/11/1989	04/06/1990	R	93.30

Site Ref: 1068 Site Name: Stoney Lane, East Ardsley, Wakefield, WF3

#### 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? **V** 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:** Site is well contained by roads on either side. Close to motorway and consequently relates poorly to settlement. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:

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.

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Site Ref: 1068 Site Name: Stoney Lane, East Ardsley, Wakefield, WF3

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
vailability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to	determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider com	ments and c	other plann	ing requirements
_eeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-
The site has access to 3 buses per hour and primary educ	ation, does not me	eet other standa	rds 3
Access Comments			Rank (1-
No suitable access			1
Local network comment			Rank (1-
Small development unlikely to impact on local network			5
Mitigation measure			Total sco
			9
Support? Need to combine with	other sites:	Suitability	y for partial development:
no			
lighways Agency			
n/a			
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	ry Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance wildlife corridor function across the site.			
latural England:			
Education			
<u> Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	Agency Constra	nints:
orkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
.CC Flood Risk Management:			
<u>Jtilities</u>			

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:	0			
West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:			
English Heritage.				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessr	ment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Site :				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. The site backs of boundary. The site currently acts concerns - no suitable access.				
Site Capacity (dwellings units):		21 Floorspace	sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:
Red		Not assessed		Not assessed

Site Name: Stoney Lane, East Ardsley, Wakefield, WF3

Site Ref: 1068

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 424938 Area sq m: 33090.98 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 430357 Area Ha: 3.309098 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Storage

Existing Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):4641.82Distance to bus stop (metres)132.85Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID9746

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	70.84	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:	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/202/90/	Outline application to erect r esidential development (site area 0.371ha)	03/05/1990	10/01/1991	W	11.38
H23/203/81/	use of land as a contractor's yard and the erection of a 1.8m high boundary fence.	31/03/1981	27/07/1981	Α	34.55
H23/178/86/	Tipping of hardcore and subsoi I, and re-soiling to agric ultural site. (site area 0.66ha) m	18/06/1986	10/08/1987	А	19.36

# 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? **V** Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain 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:** Site has strong links to settlement and is well contained by tree lined boundaries reducing the potential for further sprawl. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:

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.

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions					
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability: LDF	to determine	Achievability: Long term (1	1+ years)	
Summary of Infrastructure	provider co	mments and otl	her planning require	ements	
Leeds City Council Highways in	nc Metro				
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)	
All of the site has access to 3 buses peducation. 5% of the site falls within tand has access to some local service	the Core Strategy s			3	
Access Comments					
Tricky access from Bradford Road - b small frontage	ousy location, outsi	de of bend, limited spa	ace for right turn lane,	2	
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)	
Potential cumulative imapct on local	network			4	
Mitigation measure				Total scor	
				0	
				9	
Support? Ne	ed to combine wi	th other sites:	Suitability for partial de	evelopment:	
no			signifcantly smaller site n	night allow for	
			access solution		
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in com Road cluster.  Network Rail:	ibination with other	r sites. If site still inclu	ded at next sift assess as pa	rt of Dewsbury	
<u>Biodiversity</u>					
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC E		1.1	Amendment		
Supported with mitigation to protect an corridor function across the site.	nd enhance wildlife	•			
Natural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
Drainage/Water/Flooding					
Environment Agency Comments:		Environment Age	ency Constraints:		
Variable West O			Marie Marie To 1997	/ <b>^</b>	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment W	orks Comme	
LCC Flood Risk Management:		1 1			

<u>Utilities</u>

Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
File and Rescue Services.			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:	_		
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy Traveller Site	Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	110	
			1
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
onoumpmonto			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
			road and contained by a cricket ground
to the south, limiting the potential	for further sprawl. Hig	hways concerns re access.	
014-0			n no oldendell
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 87	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail C	Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Amber	Not ass	essed	Not assessed

Site Name: Manor farm East Ardsley WF3

Site Ref: 1069

#### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 424989
 Area sq m:
 15808.03
 Ward
 Morley South

 Easting:
 427017
 Area Ha:
 1.580803
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3118.34Distance to bus stop (metres)119.41Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID7824

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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		

Yes

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

#### 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? **V** 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:** Site relates well to settlement. Natural boundaries to the rear contain the site reducing the potential for further sprawl. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area:

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.

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

East Leeds

HLAA C	conclusions				
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs	) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: Long t	term (11+ years)
ummary	of Infrastruc	ture provide	er comments and	other planning re	quirements
	Council Highw	ays inc Metro			
	y comment	with avacation of	haalth and lagal as nices		Rank (1-5
Meets Core	Strategy standards	with exception of	health and local services	<b>)</b>	4
Access Co	mments				Rank (1-5
Site can on	y be accessed by v	ay of site 3078 o	r 1135		3
Local netw	ork comment				Rank (1-5)
Potential cu	mlative impact with	adjacent sites			4
Mitigation	measure				Total scor
	3078 - Pedestrian c gnalised junction	rossing on Dewst	oury Road, good pedestri	an links in and thorugh the	11
Support?		Need to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitability for pa	rtial development:
yes with mit	igation	MUST be com to achieve acc	bined with 3078 and or 1 ess	135	
Highways	Agency				
Potential for Road cluster		n combination wit	th other sites. If site still i	ncluded at next sift assess	s as part of Dewsbury
Network R	<u>ail :</u>				
Biodiversi	t <u>y</u>				
	hire Ecology and I	CC Ecology Off		dary Amendment	
Supported					
Natural Eng	land:				
<u>Education</u>					
	Vater/Flooding				
Environmer	t Agency Comme	nts:	Environmen	t Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire W	/ater Comments:		Yorkshire W	ater Waste Water Treatm	nent Works Comme
LCC Flood	Risk Management:				

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 1	072	Site Name:	Dewsbury Road, Woodki	irk, WF12
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescu	e Services:			
Built Heritage	9			
Leeds City Cou				
West Yorkshire	e Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritag	ge:			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Tra	veller Site	Assessmen		
Could site be	effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed		(Text)		
Would gypsie	s and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live site?	on the	(Text)		
Site !				
Proximity to h	noused	Yes	No	
gypsies and t		(Text)	-	
Experience of	f nrevious	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments		(Text)	110	- Cinaiowii
Conclusion	of Asses	sment		
		ornoni.		
Conclusion sum			5 11 11 11 11 11 11	
			area. Residential properties to the sonatural defensible boundary means the	
Site Capacity (dw	/ellings units):	43	Floorspace sq m (Non resid	lential):
Residential Cond	lusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Green		Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

## **Site Details**

 Northing:
 429410
 Area sq m:
 12999.28
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 423052
 Area Ha:
 1.299928
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Other

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: Existing use - equestrian use and scrap yard

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):4123.89Distance to bus stop (metres)226.59Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID392

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

L			

## **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 (%):	entre 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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/23/87/	Outline application to layout access road and erect resid ential development, to cleared site. (site area	28/01/1987	13/04/1987	R	76.44
H23/966/75/	Outline application, to erect detached bungalow, to va cant site.	15/12/1975	05/04/1976	А	16.22
06/06923/FU	Single storey side and rear extension to form one bed 'granny' flat to existing bungalow	21/11/2006	29/09/2009	FDO	87.97
H23/164/77/	Regrading of vacant site, new pond and drains, to form enlar ged mushroom farm (site areas 1.4ha (3.5 acres)).	14/03/1977	30/05/1977	Α	16.22
H23/228/77/	Detached single storey barn, t o smallholding.	15/04/1977	27/06/1977	А	16.22
H23/725/78/	Alterations and laying out of drain to barn.	11/09/1978	30/10/1978	А	16.22
H23/203/77/	Extension of existing tip to v acant site.	28/03/1977	09/05/1977	W	12.17

# 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)? $\Box$								
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 undéveloped 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 settler	ments?							
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/bounda development?	ry to contain	$\checkmark$						
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:								
No merging of settlements								
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment								
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the exis	ting urban area?							
Does the site provide access to the countryside?								
Does the site include local or national conservation designated area	as?							
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	e protected, or							
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?		<b>✓</b>						
Does the site contain buildings?	in agricultural use?							
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion								
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the cou	ntryside from encroad	chment						
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns								
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building of feature?	or other historical							
If yes, could development preserve this character?:								
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:								
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and spe	ecial character of histo	oric features						
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:								
Green Belt site. The site is brownfield (previously developed), surrobounding the site, so well contained and development would have li								
			J					
Conformity with Core Strategy								
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Ex	tension	Brownfield						
Major Settlement Major Settlement Ex	tension	Greenfield						
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement I	Extension	Mixed						
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extens	ion		_					
Development unrelated to existing devel	opment							
Regeneration Priority Area:								
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00					
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gatewa	ay:	0.00					

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

SHLAA Conclusions							
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Su	uitability: LDF to	o determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+	years)		
Summary of Infrastructure p	rovider con	nments and	other planni	ng requiren	nents		
Leeds City Council Highways inc	Metro						
Accessibility comment  Meets Core Strategy standards with exc	ention of advanti	an.		ſ	Rank (1-5)		
inteets core Strategy standards with exc	eption of education	ווכ			4		
Access Comments Rank							
Access achievable from Old Lane with	Access achievable from Old Lane with some widening and provision of new footways  4						
Local network comment					Rank (1-5)		
Small development unlikely to impact o	n local network				5		
					3		
Mitigation measure					Total score		
Widening of Old lane and provision of n	ew footways				13		
					10		
Support? Need	to combine with	n other sites:	Suitability	for partial devel	opment:		
yes with mitigation							
Highways Agency							
Potential for cumulative impact in combine Morley/Gildersome/Ardsley cluster.	nation with other	sites. If site still in	cluded at next sif	t assess as part o	f		
Network Rail :							
<u>Biodiversity</u>							
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Eco	logy Officer:	Bounda	ry Amendment				
Supported							
Natural England:							
<u>Education</u>							
Drainage/Water/Flooding							
Environment Agency Comments:		Environment A	Agency Constra	ints:	1		
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Wat	ter Waste Water	Treatment Work	s Comme		
LCC Flood Risk Management:		, ,			Į.		

Site Ref: 1077	Site Nam	ne: Nethertown Pig Fa Leeds, BD11 1LU	rm, Old Lane, Drighlington,
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Ser	rvices:		
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Arcl	naeology Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Travell	er Site Assessn	nent	
Could site be effe		No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies an		No	Maybe
travellers live on t site?	:he (Text)		
Proximity to hous		No	
gypsies and trave	Illers (Text)		
Experience of pre	vious Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of A	Assessment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. The sit	e is brownfield (previousl	y developed), surrounded by exist	ing housing and roads bounding the site,
so well contained and d	evelopment would have I	imited impact on the Green Belt.	
Site Capacity (dwelling	gs units):	46 Floorspace sq m (N	lon residential):
Residential Conclusio	n: I	Retail Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Green			

## **Site Details**

 Northing:
 430297
 Area sq m:
 41764.67
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 427109
 Area Ha:
 4.176467
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):356.91Distance to bus stop (metres)188.48Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID10242

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:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## 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:	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
06/07404/FU	Change of use and extensions of redundant farm buildings to form 7 dwelling houses	11/12/2006	29/08/2007	А	12.97
10/00852/EXT	Extension of time of planning application 06/07404/FU for change of use and extensions of redundant farm buildings to form 7 dwelling houses	24/02/2010	21/04/2010	А	11.94

# 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 de			
Would development result in isolated development			
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	oundaries with existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "roun	d off" the settlement pattern?:		
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	sting barrier between existing urban		
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 ex development?	isting barrier/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countryside	e?		
Does the site include local or national conserva-	ation designated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultu	ıral land?	$\checkmark$	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion			
Preserve the setting and special character of	of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	ter?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:			
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Conformity with Core Strateg	ıy		
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	0 "11	
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension		
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension	L	
Development unrela	ated to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	<i>ı</i> ay:	0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	S					
Availability: Short term (0-5)	yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determi	ne p	Achievability:	Medium term	n (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastro	ucture provide	er comments	s and oth	ner planni	ing require	ements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro					
Accessibility comment						Rank (1-5)
Good accessibilty						4
Access Comments						Rank (1-5)
Access via existing estate ro	ad					4
Local network comment						Rank (1-5)
Small scale development no	impact					5
						5
Mitigation measure						Total score
						13
Support?	Need to comb	oine with other s	ites:	Suitability	for partial de	evelopment:
yes						
Highways Agency						
n/a						
Network Rail :						
<u>Biodiversity</u>						
West Yorkshire Ecology an	d LCC Ecology Offi	icer:	Boundary	Amendment		
Supported						
Natural England:						
<u>Education</u>						
Drainage/Water/Flooding	<u>9</u>					
Environment Agency Comn	nents:	Envir	onment Age	ency Constra	ints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments	s:	Yorks	shire Water	Waste Water	Treatment W	orks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	nt:					
<u>Utilities</u>						

		Leeds, LS27						
Electric:								
Telecom:								
Fire and Rescue Services:								
Built Heritage	P. W. H. W							
Leeds City Council:								
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:							
English Heritage:								
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Gypsy _Traveller Site Assessment							
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe					
managed	(Text)							
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe					
travellers live on the	(Text)	<u>.</u>	· · ·					
site?								
Proximity to housed	Yes	No						
gypsies and travellers	(Text)							
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown					
encampments	(Text)	NO	Officiowif					
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	nt						
		T	NA de -					
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe					
J								
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe					
site?	(10/4)							
Proximity to housed	Yes (Text)	No						
gypsies and travellers	(Text)							
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown					
encampments	(Text)							
Conclusion of Asses	sment							
Conclusion summary:								
	contained by the mot	orway to the north western boundar	v and residential to the south east					
No Highways issues. Potential n	oise constraints from	n motorway will require mitigation.	, and reduce that to the south east.					

Site Name: Snittles Farm, New Village Way, Churwell,

## Site Capacity (dwellings units):

**Site Ref: 1096** 

## 7 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Amber

## **Site Details**

Northing: 429733 Area sq m: 99489.73 Ward Morley North
Easting: 426778 Area Ha: 9.948973 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 693.81 Distance to bus stop (metres) 448.81

Nearest Railway Station Cottingley Bus Stop ID 2924

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.01	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

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	13			
Availability:	Suitability:	,	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastr	ucture provider co	mments and ot	her planning req	uirements
Leeds City Council Hig	nways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Majority of site meets Core	Strategy standards with exc	ception of secondary ed	ducation	4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Difficult to achieve an accep	otable access without comir	ng through site 1099B		3
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Potential cumulative impact	on Churwell Hill			3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
May require mitigation on C	hurwell Hill			10
Support?	Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development:			al development:
yes with mitigation	potential to combine with 2125 and create two access points if not combined then development will need to be limited to 200 houses			
Highways Agency				
Likely to require significant p	hysical mitigation			
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology ar	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
		Supported		
Natural England:				
Education _				
Drainage/Water/Floodin		<b>.</b>		
Environment Agency Com	ments:	Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comment	s:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatme	nt Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	ent:			
-				

Site Ref:	1099A	Site Name:	Land at Hepworth A	Avenue, Churwell, LS27
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herit	age			
Leeds City	Council:			
	shire Archaeology	Service:		
English He	ritage:			
Gypsy _T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	_	(Text)	•	•
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers I	ive on the	(Text)	·	
Site?				
Proximity	to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies ar	nd travellers	(Text)		
Experience	e of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme	ents	(Text)	·	
Conclusi	on of Asses	sment		
Conclusion s	ummary:			
			orway to the north western bot n motorway will require mitigati	undary and residential to the south east. ion.
Site Capacity	(dwellings units)	: 261	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential C	onclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Amber				

## **Site Details**

 Northing:
 430048
 Area sq m:
 30814.73
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 426981
 Area Ha:
 3.081473
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3: Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 403.72 Distance to bus stop (metres) 393.08

Nearest Railway Station Cottingley Bus Stop ID 1507

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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:	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/313/89/	Outline application to lay out access and erect resid ential development to vacant s ite.	20/06/1989	18/12/1989	W	60.76

## 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? Are these in agricultural use? Does the site contain buildings? 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area:

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.

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusio	ns			
vailability:	Suitability:	,	Achievability:	
ummary of Infrasti	ructure provider co	omments and otl	her planning requi	rements
_eeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			Rank (1-5)
<b>-</b>	Strategy standards with ex	ception of secondary ec	ducation	4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Single point of access off N	lew Village Way - acceptab	le for up to 200 dwellin	gs	4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Potential cumulative impac	t on Churwell Hill			3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
may require mitigation on C	Churwell Hill			11
Support?	Need to combine w	rith other sites:	Suitability for partial o	levelopment:
yes with mitigation	potential to combine two access points	with 2125 and create	if not combined then de need to be limited to 20	
Highways Agency Likely to require significant policity  Network Rail:	ohysical mitigation			
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
ncidic grassland in east of the coor neutral grasslands alor	esignated sites but some vane site and less valuable sp	Juable ecies- Supported excluded a RM/1099. impacts on minimum 1	Amendment with mitigation if Red hatch nd boundary amended as p Mitigation will still be require adjacent habitats are addr 0 metre buffer alongside m shrubs and small trees.	per drawing red to ensure essed i.e.
latural England:				
Education				
Orainage/Water/Floodir Environment Agency Com		Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
orkshire Water Commen				

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.

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref: 1099B	Site Name:	Land at Hepworth Aver	nue, Churwell, LS27
Utilities Gas: Electric: Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services	:		
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeolo English Heritage:	ogy Service:		
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller S	ite Assessmen	t	
Could site be effective	ly Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No No	Unknown
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller S	ite Assessmen	t	
Could site be effective	ly Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown

# **Conclusion of Assessment**

Conclusion summary:

Site is not within Green Relt but contained by the motorway to the northwestern boundary and residential to the south east

Site Name: Land at Hepworth Avenue, Churwell, LS27

Site is not within Green Belt but contained by the motorway to the northwestern boundary and residential to the south east. No Highways issues. Potential noise constraints from motorway - this will need further consideration at detailed design stage.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 80 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Amber

Site Ref: 1099B

## **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428447
 Area sq m:
 163047.94
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 425163
 Area Ha:
 16.304794
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Existing Use 3: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1833.36Distance to bus stop (metres)451.19Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID6449

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:100.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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:	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/234/88/	Outline application, to layout access and erection of distr ibution depot with offices and car parking to vacant sit	03/06/1988	12/04/1990	W	29.80
23/60/03/OT	Outline application to erect business industrial and storage and distribution development	11/02/2003	22/06/2012	R	10.32
H23/667/80/	Extraction of coal and fire cl ay, to agricultural land.(site area 14.05ha). (county matter ).	04/11/1980	23/05/1984	Α	94.43
12/02470/OT	Outline application for proposed employment development for use classes B1(b) and B1(c) (Research and Development/Light Industrial Uses), B2 (General Industrial Uses) and B8 (Storage and Distribution Uses) with new accesses, associated infrastructure and landscaping	01/06/2012		PCO	78.15
23/47/96/OT	Outline application to erect mail distribution depot with offices	09/02/1996	28/02/2000	W	22.78
23/35/01/OT	Outline application to layout access and erect business park	22/01/2001	25/06/2012	R	82.99

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built	ıp areas	
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon de	velopment?	
Would development result in isolated developm	ent?	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ bo		
Would development of the site effectively "round	d off" the settlement pattern?:	
Do natural/physical features provide a good exist area and undeveloped land?	sting barrier between existing urban	
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 exidevelopment?	sting barrier/boundary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from end	roachment	
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 conserva	tion designated areas?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	, hedgerows that are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultu	ral land?	✓
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion		
Preserve the setting and special character o	f historic towns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation a feature?	rea, listed building or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this charact	er?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Conformity with Constant		
Conformity with Core Strateg		
	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield
,	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield
	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed
	Village/Rural Extension	
·	ted to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:		_
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay: 0.00

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: Medium to	erm (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastructure provid	er comments and ot	ther planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
The site meets the majority of the Core Strategy	standards		4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
An access could be achived from Asquith Aven signals may be required - a secondary access t			3
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites	and local congestion		3
Mitigation measure			Total score
Signalised junction and local junction improvem	ents		10
Support? Need to com	bine with other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
yes with mitigation		potential to develop no site only	orthern part of the
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination w Morley/Gildersome cluster  Network Rail:	ith other sites. If site still inclu	uded at next sift assess as	part of
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Of	ficer: Boundary	/ Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance corridor function provided by the adjacent Clubb Dean Woods Local Nature Area (LNA). Retain a metre corridor adjacent to the woodland and allowed revegetate naturally.	ed Oaks and minimum 20		
Natural England:			
Education			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Ag	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water	r 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.

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref:	1112	Site Name:	Land off Asquith Nepshaw Lane, G	Avenue/Geldered Road, ildersome
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herit Leeds City	<del></del> _			
West Yorks English He	hire Archaeology itage:	Service:		
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	be encouvery	(Text)	110	Maybe
Would gyp		Yes	No	Maybe
travellers I	ive on the	(Text)	·	
site?				
Proximity	to housed	Yes	No	
	d travellers	(Text)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Experience	e of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme	ents	(Text)		
		1		
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessment	t	
	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed		(Text)		
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers I		(Text)	1.00	,ayee
site?				
Proximity t	to housed	Yes	No	
	d travellers	(Text)	110	
Evnoriona	of provious	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme	e of previous ents	(Text)	INO	Unknown

# **Conclusion of Assessment**

Conclusion summary:

The site is a significant portion of a larger strategic employment allocation which is well located for this use. An application is currently pending for development of the larger employment allocation.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 428 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red Red Green

Site Ref: 1126 Site Name: Land at Bradford Road Drighlington

## **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428271
 Area sq m:
 8457.49
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 423937
 Area Ha:
 0.845749
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Residential institution

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3032.23Distance to bus stop (metres)193.85Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID8417

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

No

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/965/78/	Excavations to examine subsoil , to agricultural land.	15/12/1978	19/02/1979	А	92.07
11/01716/OT	Outline Application for specialist care village including new access	27/04/2011	18/10/2011	Α	93.77
H23/30/78/	Laying out of access, to propo sed hotel. (outl ine application no. mo 4894 ap proved subject to conditions	16/01/1978	10/04/1978	Α	89.81
23/572/04/FU	Change of use of vacant land to domestic garden	28/09/2004	13/12/2004	R	21.26
23/120/93/OT	Outline application to erect business park, day nursery and car parking	16/04/1993	22/04/1996	W	94.18
12/03346/OT	Outline application for residential development with means of access	01/08/2012		PCO	99.75
H23/217/77/	Outline application to erect 6 detached houses each with garage to vacant site. (s ite area 0.32ha (0.79 acre	04/04/1977	27/06/1977	R	29.44
23/119/93/OT	Outline application to erect hotel development with car parking	16/04/1993	22/04/1996	W	94.18
23/342/05/OT	Outline application to layout access and erect 2 storey 40 bedroom residential home with 18 car parking spaces	13/07/2005	30/05/2006	AP	75.28

Site Ref: 1126 Site Name: Land at Bradford Road Drighlington

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 1126 Site Name: Land at Bradford Road Drighlington

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suita	ability: LDF to determine	Achievability: Medium term (6-10 ye	ears)
Summary of Infrastructure pr	ovider comments and c	other planning requirement	S
Leeds City Council Highways inc N	<u>letro</u>		=\
Accessibility comment	ation of local convices	Ran	k (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy standards with excep	onion or local services		4
Access Comments		Ran	k (1-5)
Suitable access achievable onto Bradford	l Rd		5
Local network comment		Ran	k (1-5)
Small development unlikely to impact on	ocal network		_
			5
Mitigation measure		Tota	l scor
			14
Support? Need to	o combine with other sites:	Suitability for partial developme	ent:
yes			
Highways Agency			
n/a			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecolo	gy Officer: Bounda	ry Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding	Environment /	Agency Constraints:	
Environment Agency Comments:	Livioniment	Agency Constraints.	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wat	ter Waste Water Treatment Works Co	mme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			
<u>Utilities</u>			

Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:				
English Heritage:					
Gypsy _Traveller Site	<b>Assessment</b>				
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe	
managed	(Text)	,		•	
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe	
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	·			
Site?					
Proximity to housed	Yes		No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)				
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown	
encampments	(Text)				
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment				
Conclusion summary:					
Site within the existing settlemen					
development on one side and nu	rsing home on the oth	er. Suitable for resid	dential development	in principle.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units): 22 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):					
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conclusion:		E	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>	
Green	Not assessed		١	Not assessed	

Site Name: Land at Bradford Road Drighlington

Site Ref: 1126

Site Ref: 1135 Site Name: Former Woodkirk Station, Dewsbury Road, Woodkirk WF3

## **Site Details**

425167 Area sq m: 41098.04 Morley South Northing: Ward 427054 Easting: Area Ha: 4.109804 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Vacant and derelict - Derelict Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2940.85 Distance to bus stop (metres) 108.46 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 9394

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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:	73.23		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	1.01		

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes
Site		Site Type	
Howley Park Quarry & Brickworks Morley		Landfill Sites	
Howley Park Quarry & Brickworks Morley		Quarries	

Site Ref: 1135 Site Name: Former Woodkirk Station, Dewsbury Road, Woodkirk WF3

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/206/79/	Tipping of bulk excavation and demolition materials, to va cant railway cutting.	12/03/1979	19/08/1980	R	10.97
H23/206/81/	Outline application to layout access road and to erect resid ential development to former r ailway goods yard and statio	31/03/1981	06/07/1981	R	34.73
H23/178/81/	Outline application to lay out access and erect wareh ouse development, to former ra ilway station and goods yard	31/03/1981	06/07/1981	R	34.95
H23/176/81/	Outline application to erect I ight industrial devel opment, to former railway stat ion and goods yard. (site area	31/03/1981	06/07/1981	R	35.34

Site Ref: 1135 Site Name: Former Woodkirk Station, Dewsbury Road, Woodkirk WF3

# 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 settle	ement pattern?: No				
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier b					
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/b development?	oundary to contain				
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	•				
Does the site provide access to the countryside?	$\checkmark$				
Does the site include local or national conservation designate	ed areas?				
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	hat are protected, or				
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	$\checkmark$				
Does the site contain buildings?	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? $\hfill\Box$					
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:					
Site doesn't relate well to settlement. Would constitute ribbon	development with high potential for further sprawl.				
Conformity with Core Strategy					
Main Urban Area Main Urban A	rea Extension Brownfield				
Major Settlement Major Settlem	ent Extension Greenfield Greenfield				
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settle	ment Extension Mixed				
Villages/Rural Village/Rural	Extension				
Development unrelated to existing	development				
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley: 0.00				
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway: 0.00				

Site Ref: 1135 Site Name: Former Woodkirk Station, Dewsbury Road, Woodkirk WF3

East Leeds

HLAA C	onclusions									
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to o	determir	ne	Achie	vability:	Long ter	rm (11+	years)
Summary	of Infrastructi	ure provide	er comr	nents	and o	ther	planni	ing req	uiren	nents
Leeds City	/ Council Highway	s inc Metro								
Accessibilit	y comment									Rank (1-5)
Meets Core	Strategy standards w	ith exception of	health and	a local t	ervices					4
Access Co	mments								1	Rank (1-5)
Access ach	ievable from Dewsbu	ry Road - may r	equire sigr	nals						4
Local netw	ork comment								1	Rank (1-5)
Potential cu	mlative impact with a	djacent sites								4
Mitigation i	measure								J	Total scor
	3078 - Pedestrian cro gnalised junction	ssing on Dewsb	oury Road,	good p	edestrian	links in	and thro	ough the		12
Support?		Need to comb	ine with o	other si	tes:	Sı	uitability	for parti	al deve	lopment:
yes with mit	igation	best linked with comprehensive			or					
Highways	Agency									
Potential for Road cluster	cumulative impact in	combination wit	th other sit	es. If si	te still incl	luded a	t next sif	t assess a	as part c	of Dewsbury
Network R	<u>ail :</u>									
Biodiversi	<u>ty</u>									
	hire Ecology and LC			1	Boundary	-				
	ed (RED). No designa at and east ends of the		odland an	d	Supported excluded RM/1135. impacts o	and bo Mitiga	undary a ation will	mended a still be red	as per d quired to	lrawing o ensure
Natural Eng	land:				, , ,	,				
Education										
Drainage/V	Nater/Flooding									
Environmen	nt Agency Comments	<b>S</b> :		Envir	onment A	gency	Constra	ints:		
Yorkshire W	later Comments:			Yorks	hire Wate	er Wast	te Water	Treatme	nt Work	ks 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.

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref: 1135	Site Name:	Former Woodkirk Station, Woodkirk WF3	Dewsbury Road,
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		,
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site!			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
		elopment, steeply sloping and does not i	
settlement form. Development w	ouid result in linear d	levelopment and set a precedent for furt	ner sprawi into Green Beit.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 50	Floorspace sq m (Non residen	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

### **Site Details**

Northing: 426353 Area sq m: 72271.13 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428504 Area Ha: 7.227113 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture Existing Use 2: Other

Existing Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses: Equestrian Centre

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2332.94Distance to bus stop (metres)286.35Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID10891

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/239/88/	One, four bedroom detached hou se, to agricultural site.(outl ine application number 87/20/0 0298 approved subject to	06/06/1988	08/11/1988	А	41.26
H23/343/82/1	Amendment to previous applicat ion involving removal of condition 6, use as riding school, of use of land as stables an	11/09/1984	22/05/1985	А	19.82
H23/352/85/	Erection of detached vegetable store and implement shedto ag ricultural holding.	20/11/1985	23/12/1985	А	42.06
H23/343/82/	Use of land as stables and ass ociated grazing for horse s.	08/11/1982	07/03/1983	Α	19.79
H23/199/85/	Detached single storey agricul tural implement shed, to agric ultural site.	17/06/1985	12/08/1985	Α	39.22
H23/401/89/	Detached stone double garage w ith toilet to side of dwell ing house.	10/08/1989	05/10/1989	Α	40.80
23/146/94/FU	Poultry unit to farm	11/05/1994	06/04/1995	Α	40.04
07/01073/FU	Detached double garage to rear with external staircase and store over	19/02/2007	16/04/2007	Α	40.04

### 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?	$\checkmark$	
Would development result in isolated development?		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with exist	ting built up area)?	
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement	t pattern?: No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between area and undeveloped land?	en existing urban	
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 settle	ements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundadevelopment?	ary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:		
No merging of settlements		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the exist	sting 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 a significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	re protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	$\checkmark$	
Does the site contain buildings?	e in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion		
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the co	untryside from encroachment	
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building feature?	or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this character?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and sp	pecial character of historic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Would constitute ribbon development. Site does not relate well to s potential for further sprawl.	settlement but is well contained reducing the	
Conformity with Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area E	xtension Brownfield	
Major Settlement Major Settlement E	xtension Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement	Extension Mixed	
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Exten	sion	
Development unrelated to existing deve	elopment	
Regeneration Priority Area:		
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusi	ons		
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infra	structure provider con	nments and other plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council F			5 . 4 .
Accessibility comment  Mostly meets accessibility			Rank (1-5
Mostly meets accessibilit	y standards		4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Requires access through	h other parts of site 1143		3
Local network commer			Rank (1-5
Potential impacts at nea	by motorway junctions		3
Mitigation measure			Total scor
Potential for impact on S	Strategic Road Network		10
Support?	Need to combine wit	n other cites: Suitability	for partial development:
yes with mitigation	Need to combine with	Juliability	Tor partial development.
yes war magaaen			
Highways Agency			
Likely to require significa	nt physical mitigation		
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology	y and LCC Ecology Officer:	<b>Boundary Amendment</b>	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<b>Education</b>			
Drainage/Water/Floo	dina		
Environment Agency Co		Environment Agency Constra	ints:
Yorkshire Water Comm	ents:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ement:		
<u>Utilities</u>			

Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage					
Leeds City Council:					
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:				
English Heritage:					
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assess	ment			
Could site be effectively	Yes		No		Maybe
managed	(Text)				
Would gypsies and	Yes		No		Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)				
site?					
Proximity to housed	Yes		No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)				
Experience of previous	Yes		No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)				
					_
Conclusion of Asses	sment				
Conclusion summary:					
Green Belt site. SHLAA site 114 purposes of this assessment. Site	te A is the mos	st northern pai	rt and extends up to	the boundary wi	th the motorway. It is not
as well related to the existing set between roads with little chance					
contingent on the release of site					
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	:	162	Floorspace sq m	(Non residentia	<b>I)</b> : 0
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conc	lusion:	En	ployment Conclusion:
Red		Not assesse	d	No	t assessed

Site Name: Land off Old Thorpe Lane, Tingley WF3

Site Ref: 1143A

Electric: Telecom:

### **Site Details**

Northing: 426199 Area sq m: 92389.39 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428796 Area Ha: 9.238939 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

☑
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2643.86 Distance to bus stop (metres) 201.08

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 2610

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## 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:	0.07	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/261/79/	Outline application to erect r esidential development, to va cant site. (site area 3ha).	30/03/1979	18/06/1979	R	31.45
H23/98/89/	Outline application to lay out residential development, to ag ricultural site. (site area 2.9ha) hse (I3 an	06/03/1989	18/05/1989	W	31.32

### 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? **V** 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:** Well contained site with strong links to the settlement. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area:

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.

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:		A object objects	
tvaliability.	Guilability.		Achievability:	
ummary of Infrastr	ructure provider comm	nents and o	ther planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			Davida (4.)
Accessibility comment  Mostly meets accessibility s	tandarda		1	Rank (1-
viosity meets accessibility s	tanuarus			4
Access Comments			ı	Rank (1-
Various access points avaid	alble off Bradford Rd and thorpe	e Lane		4
Local network comment			'	Rank (1-5
Potential impacts at neaby	motorway junctions			3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Potential for impact on Stra	tegic Road Network			11
Support?	Need to combine with o	ther sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
yes with mitigation			P&R allocation should better to develop west terms of accessibility	
Highways Agency				
ikely to require significant p	physical mitigation			
Network Rail :				
<u> Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	y Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
<u> Drainage/Water/Floodir</u> Environment Agency Com		Environment A	gency Constraints:	
/orkshire Water Comment	s.	Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
C. C	<u>.</u>	. or norme water	Trace Trace	
₋CC Flood Risk Managem	ent:			
•				

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	Yes No	)	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes No	)	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		
site?			
D 1 1 1 1	V		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
gypsies and travellers	(TON)		
Experience of previous	Yes No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)		1
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
<u> </u>	covers a significant area north of Wes	et Ardelov and has been	solit in six soctions for the
	e B has strong links to the settlement		
and east, resulting in a low poten the existing UDP.	ial for further sprawl. The south easte	rn corner is designated a	as a Park and Ride site in
the existing obt .			
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	207 Floorspa	ce sq m (Non residentia	al):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conclusion:	Er	mployment Conclusion:
Green	Not assessed	No	ot assessed

Site Name: Land off Old Thorpe Lane, Tingley WF3

Site Ref: 1143B

### **Site Details**

Northing: 426125 Area sq m: 16226.35 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428722 Area Ha: 1.622635 HMCA: Outer South West

#### **Site Characteristics**

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

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 CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2648.16Distance to bus stop (metres)162.38Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID2610

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# LIDD Designation

# UDP Designation Greenbelt - N32 (%): 100.00 Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):

Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%): 0.00 Rural Land - RL1: 0.00 City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%): Town Centre - S2: 0.00 0.00 0.00 Greenspace - N1: 94.26 Special Landscape Area - N37: Other?: Allotments - N1A: 0.00 0.00 Proposed Greenspace - N5:

Nature Conservation Area - N50: 0.00
Protected Playing Pitch - N6: 0.00

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

No

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

No

0.00

### 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:** Well contained site with strong links to settlement. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development

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.

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

Gas:

Access Comments Rank Various access points available off Bradford Rd  Local network comment Rank Potential impacts at neaby motorway junctions  Mitigation measure Potential for impact on Strategic Road Network  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development yes with mitigation  Highways Agency Likely to require significant physical mitigation Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Forkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Comments:	HLAA Conclusi	ons			
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro Accessibility comment Accessibility comment Accessibility comment Access Comments Access Comments Access Comments Access Comments Access Comment Acc	Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Access Comments  Access Comments  Access Comments  Various access points available off Bradford Rd  Local network comment  Potential impacts at neaby motorway junctions  Mitigation measure  Potential for impact on Strategic Road Network  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development yields the require significant physical mitigation  Network Rail:  Siddiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Satural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints:  Corkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  Cores of the Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	ummary of Infras	structure provider co	mments and ot	her planning rec	juirements
Access Comments  Access Comments  Access Comments  Access Comment  Access Comments  Access Comment  Access Com		lighways inc Metro			
Access Comments  Various access points available off Bradford Rd  Local network comment  Rank Potential impacts at neaby motorway junctions  Mitigation measure  Total Potential for impact on Strategic Road Network  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development  yes with mitigation  Highways Agency  Likely to require significant physical mitigation  Network Rail:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Forkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments:	-				Rank (1-5
Various access points available off Bradford Rd  Local network comment Potential impacts at neaby motorway junctions  Mitigation measure Potential for impact on Strategic Road Network  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development yes with mitigation  Highways Agency Likely to require significant physical mitigation Network Rail:  Biodiversity Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported  Natural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints:  Finvironment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com  Corkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com  Cork Flood Risk Management:	Mostly meets accessibilit	y standards			4
Local network comment Potential impacts at neaby motorway junctions  Mitigation measure Potential for impact on Strategic Road Network  1  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development yes with mitigation  Highways Agency Likely to require significant physical mitigation Network Rail:  Siddiversity Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment  Supported  Natural England: Education  Prainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Finvironment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  CCC Flood Risk Management:	Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Mitigation measure Potential for impact on Strategic Road Network  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development yes with mitigation  Highways Agency Jikely to require significant physical mitigation Network Rail:  Biodiversity Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported  Jatural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  CCC Flood Risk Management:	Various access points a	vailable off Bradford Rd			4
Mitigation measure  Potential for impact on Strategic Road Network  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development yes with mitigation  Highways Agency  Likely to require significant physical mitigation  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments:	Local network comme	nt			Rank (1-5
Mitigation measure  Potential for impact on Strategic Road Network  1  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development yes with mitigation  Highways Agency Likely to require significant physical mitigation  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  LCC Flood Risk Management:	Potential impacts at nea	by motorway junctions			2
Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development yes with mitigation  Highways Agency Likely to require significant physical mitigation Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported  Natural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Forkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  CCC Flood Risk Management:					J
Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development yes with mitigation  dighways Agency Likely to require significant physical mitigation Network Rail:  Significant physical mitigation Network Rail:  Boundary Amendment Supported  Natural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com  CCC Flood Risk Management:					Total sco
Highways Agency   Likely to require significant physical mitigation   Network Rail :	Potential for impact on S	trategic Road Network			11
Highways Agency Likely to require significant physical mitigation Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported  Autural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Forkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments:  CCC Flood Risk Management:	Support?	Need to combine wi	ith other sites:	Suitability for part	al development:
Alkely to require significant physical mitigation  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Autural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Forwire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  CCC Flood Risk Management:	yes with mitigation				
Alkely to require significant physical mitigation  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Autural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Forwire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  CCC Flood Risk Management:	lighways Agency				
Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment  Supported  Vatural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Forkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments:  CCC Flood Risk Management:	ikely to require signification	nt physical mitigation			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Corkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com  CCC Flood Risk Management:	Network Rail :				
Supported  Natural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Corkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com  CCC Flood Risk Management:	<u> Biodiversity</u>				
Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Forkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments:	West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Forkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  LCC Flood Risk Management:	Supported				
Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Corkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com  LCC Flood Risk Management:	Natural England:				
Environment Agency Comments:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com  LCC Flood Risk Management:	<u>Education</u>				
Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com  CC Flood Risk Management:	Orainage/Water/Floo	ding			
CC Flood Risk Management:	Environment Agency Co	omments:	Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
LCC Flood Risk Management:					
	orkshire Water Comm	ents:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatme	nt Works Comme
	CC Flood Risk Manage	ement:			
	<u>Jtilities</u>				

Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		mayao
-			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
<u>*</u>	R covers a significant a	roa porth of Woot Ardslov a	nd has been split in six sections for the
purposes of this assessment. Si	te C is an existing play	ing pitch and designated as	N1 greenspace in the existing UDP.
Loss of greenspace would need t	to be considered through	gh the greenspace review.	See greenspace section, page 37,
question G10. The site also has	no road frontage so wo	ould need to be developed v	with 1143B.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 43	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail (	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not ass	sessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Land off Old Thorpe Lane, Tingley WF3

Site Ref: 1143C

Electric:

### **Site Details**

Northing: 426223 Area sq m: 296196.23 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 429430 Area Ha: 29.619623 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3102.76Distance to bus stop (metres)355.91Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID4865

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

- 1			

### **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:	0.01		

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/199/81/	Outline application to layout access roads and erect resid ential development, to agricul tural site. (site area	31/03/1981	06/07/1981	R	32.98

### 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? **V** Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain 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:** Well contained site with strong links to the settlement. Conformity with Core Strategy

#### Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusio			
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievabilit	y:
Summary of Infras	tructure provider co	mments and other plan	ning requirements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Just outside accessibility	cmena		3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Various access points av	ailable off Bradford Rd and T	horpe Lane	4
Local network commen	t		Rank (1-5
Potential impacts at near	by motorway junctions		3
Mitigation measure			Total scor
Potential for impact on St	rategic Road Network		10
Support?	Need to combine wi	ith other sites: Suitabi	lity for partial development:
yes with mitigation			
L			
Likely to require significan	nt physical mitigation		
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendme	nt
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flood	lina		
Environment Agency Co		Environment Agency Cons	traints:
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Water Waste Wa	ter Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ment:		
<u>Utilities</u>			

Fire and Rescue Services:						
Built Heritage						
Leeds City Council:						
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:					
English Heritage:						
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessn	nent				
Could site be effectively	Yes		No		Maybe	
managed	(Text)					
Would gypsies and	Yes		No		Maybe	
travellers live on the	(Text)		,		<sub>1</sub>	
site?						
Proximity to housed	Yes			No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)					
			1		T	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)		No		Unknown	
encampments	(TOXI)					
Conclusion of Asses	sment					
Conclusion summary:						
Green Belt site. SHLAA site 1143						
purposes of this assessment. Si and western boundaries. The sit						
opportunity for further sprawl into			,		, ,	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 4	12 Floo	orspace	sq m (Non residenti	ial):	0
Residential Conclusion:	i	Retail Conclusio	n:	E	Employment Conclusion	on:
Green	1	Not assessed		N	lot assessed	

Site Name: Land off Old Thorpe Lane, Tingley WF3

Site Ref: 1143D

Electric: Telecom:

### **Site Details**

Northing: 426110 Area sq m: 50655.49 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 429518 Area Ha: 5.065549 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3241.36Distance to bus stop (metres)274.85Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID4865

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.94	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:	19.52		

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/327/89/	Laying out of car park and 3 p laying pitches to vacant site. (this item	22/06/1989	05/11/1991	W	75.86
06/06080/FU	Amendment to previous approval 23/295/04/FU for erection of detached clubhouse	10/10/2006	20/02/2007	Α	85.82
0-23/48/05/MOD	Laying out of sports pitches and detached clubhouse	15/09/2005	17/10/2005	M01	98.86
10/03657/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 12, 13, 14 and 15 of Planning Application 23/295/04/FU	04/08/2010	05/04/2011	Α	98.86
07/03976/FU	Addition of glazed doors and roller shutter to club house	21/06/2007	10/08/2007	А	85.82
23/295/04/FU	Laying out of sports pitches and detached clubhouse	28/04/2004	19/01/2005	Α	98.86
0-23/4/06/MOD	Laying out of sports pitches and detached clubhouse NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: Amendments as drawing 100 Rev G and accompanying letter	16/01/2006	03/02/2006	M01	98.86

### 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?: 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? **V** Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain 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:** Strong links to settlement, fairly well contained by motorway to north. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development

Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

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

Aire Valley:

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusi	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
ummary of Infras	structure provider con	nments and ot	her planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council H	lighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			1	Rank (1-
Just outside accessibility	criteria			3
Access Comments				Rank (1-
Requires access through	n other parts of site 1143			3
Local network commer	nt		·	Rank (1-5
Potential impacts at neal	by motorway junctions			3
				3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Potential for impact on S	trategic Road Network			9
Support?	Need to combine with	h other sites:	Suitability for partial of	development:
no				
Highways Agency				
_ikely to require significar	nt physical mitigation			
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flood				
Environment Agency Co	omments:	Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Commo	ents:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ement:			
<u>Jtilities</u>				

Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	•	
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
			d has been split in six sections for the
			t of the playing field is protected being vould need to be considered through
the greenspace review. See green			read field to be definitioned timodgif
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 114	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail (	Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not ass	sessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Land off Old Thorpe Lane, Tingley WF3

Site Ref: 1143E

Electric: Telecom:

### **Site Details**

Northing: 426262 Area sq m: 112724.04 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 429762 Area Ha: 11.272404 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

✓

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3351.12 Distance to bus stop (metres) 225.24

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 8484

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### 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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/199/81/	Outline application to layout access roads and erect resid ential development, to agricul tural site. (site area	31/03/1981	06/07/1981	R	86.47
23/22/94/FU	Detached stable block tack room and barn	19/01/1994	14/06/1994	R	11.39

### 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? **V** Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain 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:** Well contained site with good links to settlement. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: 0.00

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.

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:	A -1 · 1 · 1 · 1 · 1 · 1 · 1 · 1 · 1 · 1	
Avallability.	Sullability.	Achievability:	
Summary of Infras	structure provider co	omments and other planning	requirements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment	and and a		Rank (1-
Just outside accessibility	сптепа		3
Access Comments			Rank (1-
Potential access to Com	mon Lane (limited to site 200	if no link through to site 1143)	4
Local network commer	nt		Rank (1-
Potential impacts at near	rby motorway junctions		3
Mitigation measure			Total sce
Potential for impact on S	trategic Road Network		10
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites: Suitability for	partial development:
yes with mitigation			
Highways Agency			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	<b>Boundary Amendment</b>	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
D			
Drainage/Water/Flood		Environment Agency Constraints:	
Environment Agency Co			
Environment Agency Co			
Environment Agency Co			
Environment Agency Co Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Trea	atment Works Comme
	ents:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Trea	atment Works Commo
		Yorkshire Water Waste Water Trea	atment Works Commo

Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment			
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe	
managed	(Text)			
Would avenies and	Voc	No	Movibo	
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	INO	Maybe	
site?				
Proximity to housed	Yes	No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown	
encampments	(Text)	INO	Olikilowii	
,				
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment			
Conclusion summers				
Green Belt site. SHLAA site 114:	3 covers a significant ar	ea north of West Ardsley an	nd has been split in six sections	for the
purposes of this assessment. Sit	te F is the most eastern	part of the site and like the	others is well contained by	
development to the south and the is well connected to the settlement				: itself
properties.	ne but only has a ornali re	saa nomago war aro majon	ty of the one oot bermin oxiting	
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	253	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Co	onclusion:	<b>Employment Conclu</b>	ision:
Amber	Not asse	ssed	Not assessed	

Site Name: Land off Old Thorpe Lane, Tingley WF3

Site Ref: 1143F

Electric:

Site Ref: 1166 Site Name: Land at Horsfall Street, Churwell, morley LS27

### **Site Details**

Northing: 428769 Area sq m: 10385.44 Ward Morley North 425660 Easting: Area Ha: 1.038544 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1463.34 Distance to bus stop (metres) 142.20 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 10523

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

No

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

No

Site Ref: 1166 Site Name: Land at Horsfall Street, Churwell, morley LS27

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
13/00336/FU	Detached dwelling	22/01/2013	10/04/2013	W	99.99

Site Ref: 1166 Site Name: Land at Horsfall Street, Churwell, morley LS27

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 1166 Site Name: Land at Horsfall Street, Churwell, morley LS27

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

HLAA Conclusion	ons						
Availability: Short term (0	)-5yrs)	Suitability:	No		Achievability:	Unknown	
Summary of Infras	tructu	re provide	r com	ments and o	other plann	ing requir	ements
Leeds City Council Hi	ghways	s inc Metro					
Accessibility comment							Rank (1-5)
Good accessibility							5
Access Comments						I I	Rank (1-5)
No highway frontage							1
Local network commen	t						Rank (1-5)
Spare capacity but cumul	ative issu	ues					3
Mitigation measure							Total score
No highway frontage so n	o measu	res are suitabl	Э				9
Support?		Need to comb	ine with	other sites:	Suitabilit	y for partial d	evelopment:
no							
Highways Agency							
Potential for cumulative im Morley/Gildersome/Ardsle			h other s	ites. If site still ind	cluded at next si	ft assess as pa	art of
Network Rail :							
<u>Biodiversity</u>							
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC	Ecology Offi	cer:	Bounda	ry Amendment		
Supported							
Natural England:							
<u>Education</u>							
Drainage/Water/Flood	ing						
Environment Agency Co	mments	:		Environment A	Agency Constra	aints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	nts:			Yorkshire Wat	er Waste Wate	r Treatment W	/orks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ment:						

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 (Text)		Maybe
Would gypsies and	Yes No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		,a,
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Assess	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Triangular piece of land behind exare consulting Education on all sit (ie as to whether the site could be	xisting residential properties. No suitate tes and any comments received will be needed for expansion).	ole access into site. Adja considered before makin	ncent existing school. We ng final decisions on sites
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	38 Floorspace	ce sq m (Non residentia	il): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conclusion:	En	nployment Conclusion:
Red	Not assessed	No	ot assessed

Site Name: Land at Horsfall Street, Churwell, morley LS27

Site Ref: 1166

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 431242 Area sq m: 62871.56 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 425498 Area Ha: 6.287156 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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 - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Other uses:

Site State: Mix

#### Site Detail

Natural Landscape:

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2220.49 Distance to bus stop (metres) 175.44

Nearest Railway Station Cottingley Bus Stop ID 1149

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Limited Tree Cover

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Mainly greenfield site, dwellings in the eastern section. Set between New Farnley and main urban area.

## **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?: Yes

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H24/546/76/	Laying out of drainage ditch, and levelling, to playi ng field.	27/07/1976	25/10/1976	Α	66.52

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built	t up areas		
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon of	levelopment?	✓	
Would development result in isolated development	ment?	✓	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	ooundaries with existing built up area)?	?	
Would development of the site effectively "round	nd off" the settlement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good exarea and undeveloped land?	kisting barrier between existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging			
Would development of the site lead to physica	I connection of settlements?	✓	
Do natural/physical features provide a good exdevelopment?	xisting barrier/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
Coalescence/merging settlements			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from er	ncroachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the countrysic	le?		
Does the site include local or national conserv	ation designated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	es, hedgerows that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	tural land?	✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural us	se?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>1</u>		
The site performs an important role safeguard	ing countryside from encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	cter?:		
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 fill the Green B coalescence of the settlements. Release of the			
Conformity with Core Strate	gy		
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed	
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension		
·	ated to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:	A. M. II		0.00
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Ga	ateway:	0.00

East Leeds

Utilities Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider co	omments and other planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Highy	vays inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
Good accessibility for employn accessibility for secondary and		approximately 50% of site with adequate	4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Good frontage with Whitehall other side of road	Road but requires round	labout or signalisation due to industrial site on	5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Congestion on Outer Ring Ro	ad and M621		3
			3
Mitigation measure			Total score
	on and Ring Road signals	s, possible mitigation for M621	12
			12
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites: Suitability for partial	development:
Yes with mitigation			
Highways Agency			
No objection subject to mitigat	ion		
Network Rail :			
<b>_</b>			
Biodiversity	1.00 51	David days Assess descript	
<b>West Yorkshire Ecology and</b> Supported	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<b>3</b> a a			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comme	ents:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:		

	Located to the South of employment area
Electric:	
Telecom:	
Fire and Rescue Services:	
Built Heritage	
Leeds City Council:	
West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:	
English Heritage:	

Site Ref: 1171A

Site Name: Harpers Farm, South of Whitehall Road,

# Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
Good accessibility for employment and health but 50% appr primary education	ox. accessibility for secondary and	4
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Good frontage with Whitehall Road but requires rounsabou other side of road	t or signalisation due to industrial site on	5
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
possible impact on Outer Ring Road and M621		3
Mitigation measure		Total score
Singalisation of access junction and poss mitigation to Ring	g Road and M621 signals	12
Support? Need to combine with o	other sites: Suitability for partial d	evelopment:
Yes with mitigation		
Highways Agency No objection subject to mitigation  Network Rail:		
<u>Biodiversity</u>		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	<b>Boundary Amendment</b>	
Supported		
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment V	Vorks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:		
Electric:		
Telecom:		
Fire and Rescue Services:		

#### **Built Heritage**

Site Ref: 1171A Site Name: Harpers Farm, South of Whitehall Road, Located to the South of employment area **Leeds City Council:** West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: **English Heritage:** Gypsy \_Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively Yes No Maybe managed (Text) Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? **Proximity to housed** No Yes gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown (Text) encampments **Conclusion of Assessment** Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. Development of the site would fill the Green Belt gap between Farnley and the main urban area, leading to coalescence of the settlements. Release of the site would create ribbon development along road frontage. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 0 165 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): **Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:** Not assessed Not assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 431377 Area sq m: 106610.69 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 425955 Area Ha: 10.661069 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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 - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

☑

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1936.41 Distance to bus stop (metres) 181.22

Nearest Railway Station Cottingley Bus Stop ID 1499

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	93.50	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?: Yes

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
24/338/94/FU	Use of field for car boot sales	08/12/1994	07/02/1995	R	88.20
H24/597/78/	3, 9.14m (30ft) floodlighting masts, to football field .	22/08/1978	27/11/1978	Α	99.72

# 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 d	evelopment?			
Would development result in isolated development	nent?			
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	oundaries with existing built up	o area)? ✓		
Would development of the site effectively "rour	nd off" the settlement pattern?:	No		
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	isting barrier between existing	urban		
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 ex development?	isting barrier/boundary to cont	ain $\square$		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible boundar	у			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urbar	n area?		
Does the site provide access to the countryside	e?			
Does the site include local or national conserva-	ation designated areas?			
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are protecte	ed, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?	<b>✓</b>		
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricu	ltural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion				
The site performs an important role safeguardi	ng countryside from encroachr	ment		
Preserve the setting and special character of	of historic towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other hi	storical		
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	ter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:				
Development of the site would have no effect of	on the setting and special chara	acter of historic featu	ures	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Relates well to main urban area. Potential for s	prawl as no defensible bound	ary to south.		
Conformity with Core Strateg	JY			
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension		Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension		Greenfield	_
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension		Mixed	_
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension			
Development unrela	ated to existing development			
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Val	ley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Le	eds Gateway:		0.00

East Leeds

Utilities Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	าร		
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrasti	ructure provider co	omments and other planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment	nymont and hoalth but 50%	approx. accessibility for secondary and	Rank (1-5)
primary education	byment and nealth but 50 %	approx. accessibility for secondary and	4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Good frontage with Whitehother side of road	all Road but requires rouns	about or signalisation due to industrial site on	5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Congestion on Outer Ring	Road and M621		3
Mitigation measure			Total score
Singalisation of access june	ction and Ring Road signals	s, poss mitigation for M621	12
Support?	Need to combine w	rith other sites: Suitability for partial	development:
Yes with mitigation			
Highways Agency			
No objection subject to mitig	gation		
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
Education			
Drainage/Water/Flooding	<u>ıq</u>		
Environment Agency Com	ments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Vanlankina Metan Oann		Vouleshine Water Warts Water Tax	Warles Correct
Yorkshire Water Comment	18:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managem	ent:		
	*****		

Floatrica			
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	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	INO	Maybe
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of provious	Yes	No	Unknown
Experience of previous encampments	(Text)	INU	Offkriowri
ondampmonto			
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment		
Canalysian aummeny			
Cross Bolt site. Bolates well to r	main urban area. Evictina	dovolonment on three sit	es of site. Sites 2078, 3056 4029 and
			Whitehall Road to Gelderd Road.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 279	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Co	onclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not asses	ssed	Not assessed

Site Name: Harpers Farm, South of Whitehall Road,

Located to the South of employment area

Site Ref: 1171B

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 429344 Area sq m: 34154.60 Ward Morley North
Easting: 424936 Area Ha: 3.41546 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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: Poorly defined

 Natural Landscape:
 Limited Tree Cover
 Road Frontage
 ✓

 Distance to Rail Station (metres):
 2376.65
 Distance to bus stop (metres)
 249.61

 Nearest Railway Station
 Morley
 Bus Stop ID
 13226

 SFRA Flood Zone:
 0.00
 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

#### **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?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	9.56		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

No

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/1024/79/	Outline application to lay out access and erect 2 detac hed houses, to vacant site. (s ite area 0.4ha)	10/12/1979	10/03/1980	R	11.40
H23/525/80/	Outline application to lay out access and erect 21 detac hed dwelling houses, to vacant site. (site area 1.22ha).	07/08/1980	06/10/1980	R	31.13

# 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 d	evelopment?			
Would development result in isolated development	nent?			
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	oundaries with existing	built up area)?	$\checkmark$	
Would development of the site effectively "rour	nd off" the settlement pa	ttern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	isting barrier between e	xisting urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:  Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging				
Would development of the site lead to physica	I connection of settleme	nts?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex development?	kisting barrier/boundary t	to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible boundar	у			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing	g urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countrysid	e?			
Does the site include local or national conserva-	ation designated areas?			
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are p	rotected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?		<b>✓</b>	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in	agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>.</u>			
The site does not perform an important role in	safeguarding the country	yside from encroa	chment	
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or o	other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	eter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:				
Development of the site would have no effect of	on the setting and specia	al character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				
Green Belt site. Development would partially redesignated proposed area of greenspace (N5) question G12.	round off the existing set on the existing UDP. S	ttlement. Part of the	ne site includes a ce section, page 37,	
Conformity with Core Strateg	ЭУ			
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Exter	nsion	Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Exter	nsion	Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Ext	ension 🔳	Mixed	
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension			
Development unrela	ated to existing develop	ment		
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:		ire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 V	Vest Leeds Gatewa	ay:	0.00

East Leeds

Leeds City Council Highways inc Maccessibility comment Meets Core Strategy standards except se  Access Comments Potential access off Highfield Garden for  Local network comment Potential cumulative impact with adjacen  Mitigation measure  50 dwelling max  Support?  Need t	Metro condary school up to 50 dwellings	Achievability:  Id other planning requirements  Rank (1-5) 4  Rank (1-5) 4  Rank (1-5) 4  Total score 12  Suitability for partial development:
Leeds City Council Highways inc Maccessibility comment Reets Core Strategy standards except se  Access Comments Potential access off Highfield Garden for  Local network comment Potential cumulative impact with adjacent  Mitigation measure  50 dwelling max  Support?  Need t	Metro condary school up to 50 dwellings t sites	Rank (1-5) 4  Rank (1-5) 4  Rank (1-5) 4  Total score
Accessibility comment Potential access off Highfield Garden for Cocal network comment Potential cumulative impact with adjacen Mitigation measure Go dwelling max  Support?  Need t	condary school  up to 50 dwellings  t sites  o combine with other sites:	4  Rank (1-5)  4  Rank (1-5)  4  Total scor
Access Comments Potential access off Highfield Garden for  Local network comment Potential cumulative impact with adjacen  Mitigation measure  50 dwelling max  Support?  Need t	up to 50 dwellings t sites c combine with other sites:	4  Rank (1-5)  4  Rank (1-5)  4  Total score
Access Comments Potential access off Highfield Garden for  Local network comment Potential cumulative impact with adjacen  Mitigation measure  50 dwelling max  Support?  Need t	up to 50 dwellings t sites c combine with other sites:	Rank (1-5) 4 Rank (1-5) 4 Total scor
Potential access off Highfield Garden for  Local network comment  Potential cumulative impact with adjacen  Mitigation measure  50 dwelling max  Support?  Need t	t sites	4 Rank (1-5) 4 Total score
Local network comment Potential cumulative impact with adjacen  Mitigation measure  50 dwelling max  Support?  Need t	t sites	Rank (1-5) 4 Total score
Potential cumulative impact with adjacen  Mitigation measure  50 dwelling max  Support?  Need t	o combine with other sites:	Total score
Potential cumulative impact with adjacen  Mitigation measure  50 dwelling max  Support?  Need t	o combine with other sites:	4 Total score
Mitigation measure 50 dwelling max  Support?  Need t	o combine with other sites:	Total score
Support?  Need t access		12
Support? Need to access		
es access		Suitability for partial development:
es access	not suitable for adjacent sites	
ighways Agency	not suitable for aujacent sites	
lighways Agency		
o objection		
letwork Rail :		
<u>siodiversity</u>		
lest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecolo	ogy Officer: Bou	ndary Amendment
upported with mitigation to ensure impact abitats are addressed. Adjacent area of strassland and valuable hedgerows - the bemi-improved grassland should have further.	semi-improved potanical value of the	
atural England:	l	
ducation		
rainage/Water/Flooding		
nvironment Agency Comments:	Environme	ent Agency Constraints:
orkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire	Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref:	1200A	Site Name:	Land of Highfield Drive/Hart Gildersome, LS27	thill Lane,
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herit	Council:			
	hire Archaeology	Service:		
English Her	ritage:			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site managed	be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
manageu		(1014)		
Would gyp		Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?	ive on the	(Text)		
Proximity t		Yes (Text)	No	
gypsies an	d travellers	(Text)		
	e of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme	ents	(Text)		
Canalysis	f A			
Conclusio	on of Asses	sment		
Conclusion su	<u> </u>			
			f the existing settlement. Part of the site in P. See also greenspace section, page 37,	
Site Capacity	(dwellings units):	76	Floorspace sq m (Non residentia	<b>al):</b> 0
Residential Co Green	onclusion:	Retail	l Conclusion: E	mployment Conclusion:

Morley North

Outer South West

# Site Details Northing: 429434 Area sq m: 14848.75 Ward Easting: 424993 Area Ha: 1.484875 HMCA:

#### 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: Poorly defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2377.46 Distance to bus stop (metres) 352.91 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 13226 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: Health and Safety Executive Hazard: 0.00 Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No Public Rights of Way: No Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# 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

**Planning History** 

# 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 d	evelopment?			
Would development result in isolated development	nent?		✓	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	oundaries with existing	g built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "rour	nd off" the settlement p	pattern?:	_	
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	isting barrier between	existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging				
Would development of the site lead to physical	I connection of settlem	ents?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex development?				
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but there is no defensible boundar	у			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existi	ng urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countryside	e?			
Does the site include local or national conserva	ation designated areas	s?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are	protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?		<b>✓</b>	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these i	n agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	L			
The site does not perform an important role in	safeguarding the coun	tryside from encroa	chment	
Preserve the setting and special character of	of historic towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?		other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	cter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:				
Development of the site would have no effect of	on the setting and snee	cial character of hist	toric features	
•	on the setting and spec	siai character of filst	ione reatures	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:				<b>-</b>
Green Belt site. Development would represen settlement, creating a precedent for further spr			ated to the existing	
Conformity with Core Strateg	ЗУ			
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Ext	ension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Ext	ension 🔳	Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement E	xtension	Mixed	
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension	on 🔳		
Development unrela	ated to existing develo	pment		
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gatew	ау:	0.00

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions				
vailability:	Suitability:	,	Achievability:	
ummary of Infrastruc	ture provider co	mments and otl	her planning req	uirements
_eeds City Council Highwa	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment  Meets Core Strategy standards	evcent secondary scho	ol		Rank (1-5
neets core strategy standards	except secondary scho	OI		4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
No highway frontage or suitable	e access			1
Local network comment				
Potential cumulative impact wit	h adiacent sites			
otomia odmaativo impaot int	r adjacom onco			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
50 dwelling max				9
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for parti	al development:
no				
<u>lighways Agency</u>				
No objection				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
Vest Yorkshire Ecology and L	.CC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Not supported (RED). No site-base are area of semi-improved grass the botanical value of the semi-iurther survey to confirm this.	land and valuable hedg	erows -		
latural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Orainage/Water/Flooding	•	Environment A	oney Constraints	
Environment Agency Commer	its:	Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
orkshire Water Comments:		Vorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatme	nt Works Commo
Ornomic Water Comments.		TOTASINIE WATER	TTASIC TTAICE FEATIFIC	III WOLKS COIIIIIE
.CC Flood Risk Management:				

# **Utilities**

Site Ref: 1200B	Site Name:	Land of Hight Gildersome, I	field Drive/Harth LS27	nill Lane,
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
ono i				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. Development we creating a precedent for further s			t, not well related to the	e existing settlement,
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 39	Floorspace s	sq m (Non residential	):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Em	ployment Conclusion:

#### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 429898
 Area sq m:
 115003.95
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 427933
 Area Ha:
 11.500395
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Wholesale distribution

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Office

Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring Use 3: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):575.23Distance to bus stop (metres)189.73Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID11021

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:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	0.4	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

# **Planning History**

Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
Outline application to layout access road and erect 2 war ehouse units and squash courts and changing rooms buil	12/01/1977	26/07/1978	А	18.22
Dust extraction machinery and silo to factory	18/10/1994	06/12/1994	Α	12.78
Laying out of access road and footpath and erection of 4 det ached light industrial and war ehouse units, each with 2 sto	03/02/1982	04/02/1982	Α	21.10
Outline application to layout access road with round about and erection of light in dustrial developmentwith ancil	23/12/1980	10/07/1981	Α	21.00
Detached, precast concrete gar age, to public house premi ses.	14/01/1977	14/03/1977	Α	18.79
Laying out of access roads and erection of 2 storey light industrial unit, with bridge link, offices, workshops	19/05/1981	10/07/1981	Α	20.97
Two non-illuminated individual letter wall signs, size of each 20m (65ft.8ins) x 1.2m (4ft), height above grou	13/03/1978	10/04/1978	Α	10.13
Change of use of warehouse (Class B8 Storage and distribution) to Indoor football (Class D2 Assembly and Leisure)	23/11/2011	30/04/2012	Α	10.15
Use of part of distribution wa rehouse service area as pa llet store, with landscaping.	04/07/1979	17/09/1979	А	10.13
	Outline application to layout access road and erect 2 war ehouse units and squash courts and changing rooms buil  Dust extraction machinery and silo to factory  Laying out of access road and footpath and erection of 4 det ached light industrial and war ehouse units, each with 2 sto  Outline application to layout access road with round about and erection of light in dustrial developmentwith ancil  Detached, precast concrete gar age, to public house premi ses.  Laying out of access roads and erection of 2 storey light industrial unit, with bridge link, offices, workshops  Two non-illuminated individual letter wall signs, size of each 20m (65ft.8ins) x 1.2m (4ft), height above grou  Change of use of warehouse (Class B8 Storage and distribution) to Indoor football (Class D2 Assembly and Leisure)  Use of part of distribution wa rehouse service area as pa llet store, with	Outline application to layout access road and erect 2 war ehouse units and squash courts and changing rooms buil  Dust extraction machinery and silo to factory  Laying out of access road and footpath and erection of 4 det ached light industrial and war ehouse units, each with 2 sto  Outline application to layout access road with round about and erection of light in dustrial developmentwith ancil  Detached, precast concrete gar age, to public house premi ses.  Laying out of access roads and erection of 2 storey light industrial unit, with bridge link, offices, workshops  Two non-illuminated individual letter wall signs, size of each 20m (65ft.8ins) x 1.2m (4ft), height above grou  Change of use of warehouse (Class B8 Storage and distribution) to Indoor football (Class D2 Assembly and Leisure)  Use of part of distribution wa rehouse service area as pa llet store, with	Outline application to layout access road and erect 2 war ehouse units and squash courts and changing rooms buil  Dust extraction machinery and silo to factory  Laying out of access road and footpath and erection of 4 det ached light industrial and war ehouse units, each with 2 sto  Outline application to layout access road with round about and erection of light in dustrial developmentwith ancil  Detached, precast concrete gar age, to public house premi ses.  Laying out of access roads and erection of 2 storey light industrial unit, with bridge link, offices, workshops  Two non-illuminated individual letter wall signs, size of each 20m (65ft.8ins) x 1.2m (4ft), height above grou  Change of use of warehouse (Class B8 Storage and distribution) to Indoor football (Class D2 Assembly and Leisure)  Use of part of distribution wa rehouse service area as pa llet store, with	Outline application to layout access road and erect 2 war ehouse units and squash courts and changing rooms buil  Dust extraction machinery and silo to factory  Laying out of access road and footpath and erection of 4 det ached light industrial and war ehouse units, each with 2 sto  Outline application to layout access road with round about and erection of light in dustrial development with ancil  Detached, precast concrete gar age, to public house premi ses.  Laying out of access roads and erection of 2 storey light industrial unit, with bridge link, offices, workshops  Two non-illuminated individual letter wall signs, size of each 20m (65ft.8ins) x 1.2m (4ft), height above grou  Change of use of warehouse (Class B8 Storage and distribution) to Indoor football (Class D2 Assembly and Leisure)  Use of part of distribution wa rehouse service area as pa llet store, with

11/04941/ADV	4 non-illuminated wall mounted banner signs and 2 non-illuminated free standing signs.	23/11/2011	10/05/2012	A	10.15
	4 non illuminated wall mounted banner signs and 2 non illuminated free standing signs				
123/340/81/	Laying out of access road and footpath and erection of 4, de tached light industrial and wa rehouse units, each with 2 sto	18/08/1981	05/10/1981	Α	25.15
3/16/95/FU	Alterations to lpg store to form petroleum store addition of roof vents and extension to form covered link and ramp	16/01/1995	07/04/1995	Α	12.88
123/30/84/	Determination under section 53 of the town and country planning act 1971, for the use of distribution warehouse	31/01/1984	22/06/1984	R	10.25
121/478/74/	Laying out and landscaping to industrial and wareh ousing development. (outline a pplication nos. mo 4504 an	23/12/1974	10/03/1975	А	56.24
121/208/77/	Two storey distribution wareho use, with covered loadi ng bay, and ancillary offices, conference room, first aid	03/05/1977	27/06/1977	А	11.01
123/738/75/	Single storey warehouse unit, including 2 storey officeblock, comprising 7 offices, machin e room, canteen, toilets, s	24/09/1975	13/10/1975	А	10.19
121/164/79/	Laying out of access roads, an d associated culverting and d rainage works and erection of detached block of 10warehouse	18/04/1979	22/05/1979	А	19.42
123/250/87/	Alterations, to form additiona I offices and extensions, to fo rm reception, entrance canopy, and conveyor link	12/08/1987	07/09/1987	Α	15.54

23/395/94/FU	Single storey extension and new fire escape and 2.1m high boundary	16/11/1994	06/02/1995	А	18.21
	fence to factory				

# 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 de	evelopment?		
Would development result in isolated development	nent?		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	oundaries with existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "roun	d off" the settlement pattern?:		
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	sting barrier between existing urban		
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 ex development?	isting barrier/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countryside	e?		
Does the site include local or national conserva	ation designated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultu	ıral land?	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion			
Preserve the setting and special character of	of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this charac	ter?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:			
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Openformality 111 Co. City			
Conformity with Core Strateg	ıy		
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield	_
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed	_
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension		_
Development unrela	ated to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	<i>ı</i> ay:	0.00

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Medium term (6-10 y	Suitability: LDF t	o determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructu	re provider con	nments and ot	her plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council Highway	s inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-
Meets all Core Strategy standards	except 15% secondary	y school		4
Access Comments				Rank (1-
Existing access points are adequa	ate for use			5
Local network comment				Rank (1-
Busy local network but site is in ex	kisting use			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				13
Support?	Need to combine wit	h other sites:	Suitability	y for partial development:
yes				
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in o	combination with other	sites. If site still inclu	uded at next si	ft assess as part of Dewsbur
Road cluster.				
Network Rail: Footbridge to replace nearby LC; (	Conoral asset protectio	n issues		
Biodiversity	serierai asset protectio	ii issues		
<u> Biodiversity</u> West Yorkshire Ecology and LC0	C Ecology Officer:	Roundary	Amendment	
Supported	J Loology Officer.	Boundary	Amendment	
Natural England:				
Education				
<del>_</del>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comments	:	Environment Ag	gency Constra	ints:
<u> </u>			<u> </u>	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Vorkobine Weter	r Woote Wets	Treatment Works Comme
TOTASHITE WATER COMMENTS:		i orksiille water	vasie wate	Treatment WORKS COMME
LCC Flood Risk Management:				

### <u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 1207	Site Name:	Millshaw Park Industrial Es Park Lane, Millshaw, LS11	tate, Millshaw
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Site	n Assassman	4	
	ASSESSITETT		
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	INO	
Experience of previous	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	1.10	mayoo
site?			
<del></del>	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	LN	
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
gypoios and navonors			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
	ı		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Nama II. alam a			
Conclusion summary:	aroa and it is sansid	ared that the cite chould be retained for for	turo amplayment use
ne site is within an employment	. area anu il is conside	ered that the site should be retained for fu	ште етпрюутнети use.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 334 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red Green

Site Ref: 1208 Site Name: White Rose Shopping Centre, Dewsbury Road, LS11

#### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 429124
 Area sq m:
 326274.71
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 428188
 Area Ha:
 32.627471
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Retail - Shops

Existing Use 2: Retail - Restaurants and Cafes

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Office

Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1241.64Distance to bus stop (metres)292.74Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID11121

SFRA Flood Zone:

1.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone:

1.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Environment Agency Flood Zone:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:

Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:

Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):

1.00

Agricultural Land Class:

Strategic Employment Buffer:

0.00

Conservation Areas

No

Listed Buildings:

Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	3.85	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

Site Ref: 1208 Site Name: White Rose Shopping Centre, Dewsbury Road, LS11

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
23/466/96/SI	Various illuminated and non illuminated signs to shopping complex	03/12/1996	14/02/1997	А	14.94
23/418/93/RE	Renewal of outline permission to erect shopping complex with cinema, garden centre and hotel with car parking	03/12/1993	16/09/1994	W	44.62
23/388/94/FU	Removal of condition no 12 of application no 87/23/00059/01 (highways improvements)	11/11/1994	22/12/1994	А	93.34
H23/60/87/	Outline application to layout accesses and erect shopp ing complex with 10 screen cin ema, garden centre and detach	27/02/1987	26/11/1990	W	93.34
23/294/94/FU	Works adjacent to millshaw beck and landscaping to shopping complex	02/09/1994	02/12/1994	Α	93.34
H23/177/90/	Laying out of access and sitin g of retail centre, with multi screen cinema, petrol station and garden centre with car p	18/04/1990	06/11/1990	Α	93.34
23/295/94/RM	Amendment to previous approval for shopping complex and food court with car parking, access and landscaping	02/09/1994	02/12/1994	Α	93.34
H23/10/74/	Two precast concrete show gara ges to nursery.	05/04/1974	24/06/1974	Α	14.83
23/465/96/FU	23 traffic control barriers to shopping centre car park	05/12/1996	22/01/1997	Α	14.94
06/04798/FU	Single storey rear extension to shop unit	07/08/2006	09/10/2006	Α	93.31
07/06600/ADV	4 internally illuminated free standing signs; 4 internally illuminated individual letter signs and 4 internally illuminated logo signs to shopping centre	22/10/2007	03/12/2007	A	15.62
H23/59/87/1	Renewal of outline application to layout accesses and erect shopping complex with 10 scre en cinema, garden centre and	01/08/1991	03/09/1991	А	93.34
H23/59/87/	Outline application to layout accesses and erect shopp ing complex with 10 screen cin ema, garden centre and detach	27/02/1987	30/01/1989	AP	93.34
23/126/94/RM	Shopping complex and food court with car parking, access and landscaping	27/04/1994	18/07/1994	Α	93.34
23/296/94/RM	Amendment to alignment of site perimeter road and additional car parking to shopping complex	02/09/1994	02/12/1994	А	93.34
0-23/35/97/MOD	New build shopping centre	28/10/1997	10/11/1997	M09	93.34
H23/174/81/	Outline application to erect i ndustrial and warehouse devel opment, to vacant site. (site area 14.32ha)	31/03/1981	12/01/1982	А	42.25
23/297/94/RM	Amendment to access to service area, car parking and landscaping to shopping complex	02/09/1994	02/12/1994	А	93.34

Site Ref: 1208 Site Name: White Rose Shopping Centre, Dewsbury

Road, LS11

ENQ/09/01727 Mezzanine floor for storage purposes 25/09/2009 05/10/2009 PD 14.69

Site Name: White Rose Shopping Centre, Dewsbury Site Ref: 1208

#### Road, LS11

# 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 of	levelopment?		
Would development result in isolated development	ment?		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	ooundaries with existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "round	nd off" the settlement pattern?:	_	
Do natural/physical features provide a good exarea and undeveloped land?	kisting barrier between existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:			
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging			
Would development of the site lead to physical	I connection of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good exdevelopment?	xisting barrier/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	ocroachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countrysid	e?		
Does the site include local or national conserv	ation designated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	es, hedgerows that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	rural land?	✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>1</u>		
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	cter?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:			
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Conformity with Core Strate	ЭУ		
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield	1
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed	1
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension		י
Development unrel	ated to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	ау:	0.00

Site Ref: 1208 Site Name: White Rose Shopping Centre, Dewsbury Road, LS11

East Leeds

Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
ummary of Infras	etructure provider c	omments and other planning requ	iromonte
diffiliary of fiffias	structure provider c	onlinents and other planning requ	inements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
	or health and 100% second	6 of the site meets core strategy standards for ary education	4
Access Comments			Rank (1-
Existing access arrangm	ents for the White Rose wou	ld be suitable for housing development	5
Local network commer	nt		Rank (1-5
Housing would be less in	tensive than the White Rose	Centre	5
Mitigation measure			Total sco
			14
Support?	Need to combine v	with other sites: Suitability for partia	l develonment:
yes	obvious links to adja		i de velopilient.
lighways Agency			
Potential for cumulative in Road cluster.	mpact in combination with oth	ner sites. If site still included at next sift assess as	part of Dewsbur
Network Rail :			
Footbridge to replace nea	arby LC; General asset protec	ction issues	
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
Education _			
Orainage/Water/Flood	ding		
Environment Agency Co	omments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Commo	ents:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 1208	Site Name:	Road, LS11	re, Dewsbury
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
Sypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
ravellers live on the site?	(Text)	·	
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Sypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
ravellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		

Site Ref: 1208 Site Name: White Rose Shopping Centre, Dewsbury Road, LS11

Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assess	sment			
Could site be effectively	Yes		No		Maybe
managed	(Text)				may 20
Would gypsies and	Yes	1	No		Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)				may a c
site?					
Proximity to housed	Yes		1	Vo	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)				
Experience of previous	Yes	1	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assess	ment			
Could site be effectively	Yes	1	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)				
Would gypsies and	Yes	1	No		Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)				
site?					
Proximity to housed	Yes		1	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)				
Experience of previous	Yes		No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)				
Conclusion of Asses	sment				
Conclusion cumments					
Conclusion summary:	0()				
In current retail use (White Rose	Centre				
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	:	175 <b>Floors</b>	oace sq	m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion:			Employment Conclusion:
Red		Red			Green

## **Site Details**

428395 333182.18 Northing: Area sq m: Ward Morley North 428222 Easting: Area Ha: 33.318218 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Storage

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture Neighbouring Use 2: Retail - Shops

Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage **~** Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1289.64 Distance to bus stop (metres) 282.19 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 4304 SFRA Flood Zone:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 1.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

1.00

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.94	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
23/128/96/MIN	Variation of conditions nos 2 and 18 of application no 23/296/93/fu (extension of coal extraction area)	15/04/1996	04/09/1996	А	64.97
H23/454/81/	Tipping of industrial refuse a nd demolition materials, to ex isting tip. (site area 1.49ha) . (county matter)	18/12/1981	23/02/1982	А	11.31
H23/614/79/	Change of use, involving alter ations and extension, of di sused barn to 1 bedroom flat.	31/07/1979	08/10/1979	R	50.48
H23/214/81/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to va cant site. (site area 23.07ha) .	31/03/1981	15/06/1981	R	52.34
H23/215/81/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to va cant site. (site area 17ha).	31/03/1981	15/06/1981	R	52.35
23/296/93/FU	Extraction of coal by opencast mining	16/08/1993	25/08/1995	Α	65.23
H23/102/77/	Tipping of industrial refuse a nd demolition materials, to fo rm enlarged tip. (site area 1. 8ha (4.4 acres)).	18/02/1977	18/07/1977	А	15.23
H23/326/81/	Laying out of access and tippi ng of controlled waste, with compound containing detached g arage and fuel store, off	04/08/1981	15/09/1981	Α	24.97

# 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?	$\checkmark$
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing	g built up area)?
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement p	pattern?: No
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between area and undeveloped land?	existing urban
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 settlem	ents?
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary development?	y to contain
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	ng urban area?
Does the site provide access to the countryside?	
Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas	s? $\Box$
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	protected, or
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	lacksquare
Does the site contain buildings?	n agricultural use?
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the coun	tryside from encroachment
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or feature?	other historical
If yes, could development preserve this character?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:	
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and spec	cial character of historic features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Not connected to urban area, would result in an isolated development but would reduce the green belt gap between Morley and Middleton.	nt. Contained to the east by the motorway
Conformity with Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Exte	Diowilleid 🔲
Major Settlement Major Settlement Exte	orderment
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement E.	Wilked
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension	
Development unrelated to existing develo	pment
Regeneration Priority Area:	Aire Vallev: 0.00
	Aire Valley: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	vvoor Loods Galeway.

East Leeds

HLAA C	onclusions					
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11-	+ years)
Summary	of Infrastruct	ure provide	er comments and	d other plann	ing require	ments
Leeds City	Council Highwa	ys inc Metro				
Accessibilit						Rank (1-5)
for primary e		secondary educ	0% of the site lies withi ation. None of the site I			4
Access Cor	nments					Rank (1-5)
	junction with Dewsl n sites 1275 and 132		pported - potential for le	eft in left out and lin	king	3
Local netwo	ork comment					Rank (1-5)
Large site is	likely to require son	ne off-site mitigat	ion works			4
Mitigation n	neasure					Total score
Needs to lin	k with site 1275 for a	access and provi	de crossing facilities on	Dewsbury Rd		11
Support?		Need to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitability	y for partial dev	elopment:
yes with miti	gation	must link with 1	275			
Highways A	Agency					
Potential for Road cluster		combination with	h other sites. If site still	included at next sit	ft assess as part	of Dewsbury
Network R	ail :					
Footbridge to	replace nearby LC;	General asset p	rotection issues			
<u>Biodiversit</u>	<del>-</del>					
West Yorksh Supported	nire Ecology and L	CC Ecology Offi	cer: Bour	dary Amendment		
Natural Engl	land:					
Education						
_	Vater/Flooding					
Environmen	t Agency Commen	ts:	Environme	nt Agency Constra	aints:	
Yorkshire W	ater Comments:		Yorkshire \	Vater Waste Water	r Treatment Wo	rks Comme
LCC Flood F	Risk Management:					

# <u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 1209	Site Name:	Cotton Mill (Site A) and Dewsbury Road LS11	Grove Farm (SiteB)
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Site	Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	F.:-	
Proximity to housed	Yes (Text)	No	
gypsies and travellers	,		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Conclusion of Asses	sment		

## Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site is isolated from the existing built area, and would only be viable with a large scale extension to the east of Morley. Development here would significantly reduce the Green Belt gap between Morley and Middleton.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 862 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red Not assessed Not assessed

## **Site Details**

 Northing:
 429552
 Area sq m:
 107421.45
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 427546
 Area Ha:
 10.742145
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

## 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 CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):543.38Distance to bus stop (metres)195.14Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID367SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	98.45	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:	5.34	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	8.23		
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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/231/83/	Tipping of demolition and exca vated material to adjac ent existing tip (site area 0. 29ha) (county ma	01/08/1983	04/10/1983	А	21.15
H23/511/88/	Outline application to layout access road and erect resid ential development to vacant I and. (site area	17/11/1988	06/02/1989	R	12.75
23/597/04/FU	1.8m high boundary fence to paddock	28/09/2004	07/12/2004	Α	10.32

# 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 of	levelopment?		
Would development result in isolated development	ment?		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	ooundaries with existing built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effectively "round	nd off" the settlement pattern?:	Yes	
Do natural/physical features provide a good exarea and undeveloped land?	kisting barrier between existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:			
High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging			
Would development of the site lead to physical	Il connection of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good exdevelopment?	xisting barrier/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
No merging but there is no defensible boundary	ry		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from er	ncroachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	n the site and the existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countrysic	le?		
Does the site include local or national conserv	ation designated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	es, hedgerows that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	tural land?	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>1</u>		
The site does not perform an important role in	safeguarding the countryside from encroa	achment	
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	cter?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:			
Development of the site would have no effect	on the setting and special character of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Development would round off settlement. No o	defined boundary to south which could res	ult in further sprawl.	
Conformity with Core Strate	ду		
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed	
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension		
Development unrel	ated to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay:	0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:	A	chievability:	
Summary of Infra	structure provider co	mments and oth	er planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council I	Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment	:			Rank (1-5)
100% Public Transport,	primary, 50% health, 0% secor	ndary, local services avai	lable	4
Access Comments			ı	Rank (1-5
Access onto Elland Roa	ad is difficult with no footways a	and constrained either sic	de of frontage	2
Local network comme	nt			Rank (1-5
Potential cumulative im	pact on Churwell Hill			3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Cannot link site to footw	ay network on Elland Rd			9
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
no				
Highways Agency Likely to require significa	int physical mitigation			
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecolog	y and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floo	ding			
Environment Agency C	omments:	Environment Age	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comm	nents:	Yorkshire Water \	Naste Water Treatment	Works Comme

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	<sup>,</sup> Service:		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment		
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	Ţ NO	, mayse
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
residential development to the we	est. Development would effe	ectively 'round off' devel	unded by the railway to the east and opment on Churwell Hill. Retention of in any detailed design. Highways
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 281	Floorspace sq m (Nor	n residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Concl	lusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not assessed	d	Not assessed

Site Ref: 1220A

Site Ref: 1220B Site Name: Land to south of Wood View, Churwell, LS27

# **Site Details**

Northing: 429256 Area sq m: 179752.33 Ward Morley North 427736 Easting: Area Ha: 17.975233 HMCA: Outer South West

## 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 887.26 Distance to bus stop (metres) 405.97

Nearest Railway Station Cottingley Bus Stop ID 11121

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: Yes

Agricultural Land Class:

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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 Site Ref: 1220B Site Name: Land to south of Wood View, Churwell, LS27

7SA

**Planning History** 

Site Ref: 1220B Site Name: Land to south of Wood View, Churwell, LS27

# 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 w	th existing built up area)?				
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the se	ttlement pattern?: N	0			
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 barrie development?	/boundary to contain				
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging but there is no defensible boundary					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachmen	:				
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 designate	ated areas?				
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerow significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s that are protected, or				
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	•				
Does the site contain buildings?	re these in agricultural use?				
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion					
The site performs an important role safeguarding countrysi	de from encroachment				
Preserve the setting and special character of historic to	owns				
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed feature?	ouilding or other historical				
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	efeatures			
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Isolated from urban area. Relates poorly to settlement and	would set precedent for further s	prawl.			
Conformity with Core Strategy					
Main Urban Area Main Urban	Area Extension	Brownfield			
Major Settlement Major Settle	ement Extension	Greenfield			
Smaller Settlement Smaller Set	tlement Extension	Mixed			
Villages/Rural Village/Rura	al Extension				
Development unrelated to exist	ng development				
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds: 0.0	0 Aire Valley:	0.00			
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.0	0 West Leeds Gateway:	0.00			

Site Ref: 1220B Site Name: Land to south of Wood View, Churwell, LS27

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrast	ructure provider co	omments and other planning rec	quirements
Leeds City Council Hig	ghways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
	rithin the Core Strategy standrices but 0% to health and	dards for public transport, 70% to primary secondary education.	3
Access Comments			Rank (1-
Access is via site1220A			1
Local network comment			Rank (1-
Potential cumulative impa	ct on Churwell Hill		3
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Cannot link site to footway	network on Elland Rd		7
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites: Suitability for part	ial development:
no			
Highways Agency			
ikely to require significant	physical mitigation		
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology a	and LCC Ecology Officer:	<b>Boundary Amendment</b>	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Floodi		Environment Agency Constraints	
Environment Agency Cor	mments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Commer	nts:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatme	ent Works Comme
_CC Flood Risk Managen	nent:		

		7S <i>A</i>	<b>\</b>		
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage					
Leeds City Council:					
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:				
English Heritage:					
					_
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assess	ment			
Could site be effectively	Yes		No	Maybe	Ī
managed	(Text)				
Would gypsies and	Yes		No	Maybe	1
travellers live on the	(Text)		<u>.                                    </u>		
site?					
Proximity to housed	Yes		No		-
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		110		1
				T	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)		No	Unknown	-
Circumpinents	(* 5***)				
					L
Conclusion of Asses	sment				
Conclusion summary:					_
Green Belt site. The site has bee Morley/Churwell and the White R					
ivioney/Chaiweii and the White K	ose Centre at	iu sei a precei	dentifor faither Gree	in ben spiawi.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)		471	Floorspace sq m	(Non residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conc	lusion:	Employment Conclusion:	
Red		Not assesse	d	Not assessed	

Site Name: Land to south of Wood View, Churwell, LS27

Site Ref: 1220B

## **Site Details**

Northing: 429496 Area sq m: 23301.64 Ward Morley North
Easting: 426506 Area Ha: 2.330164 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space

Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses: Vacant land
Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Nearest Railway Station

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1049.57 Distance to bus stop (metres) 473.24

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Cottingley

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Bus Stop ID

7744

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?: No Within

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/141/86/	Outline application to erect residential development to vacant agricultural land. (site area 9.31ha)	07/05/1986	16/03/1989	AP	89.27

# 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 d	evelopment?	
Would development result in isolated development		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b		
Would development of the site effectively "rour	nd off" the settlement pattern?:	
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	isting barrier between existing urban	
Overall sprawl conclusion:		
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging		
Would development of the site lead to physical	I connection of settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good exdevelopment?	sisting barrier/boundary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment	
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban area?	
Does the site provide access to the countrysid	e?	
Does the site include local or national conserv	ation designated areas?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural 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 feature?	area, listed building or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	cter?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Conformity with Core Strate	gy .	
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension	
·	ated to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:	A: W.	222
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay: 0.00

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine Achievability:	Medium term (6-10 years)
ummary of Infrastructure provid	er comments and other plann	ning requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
Just outside accessibility zone of 4 buses per ho	ur and does not meet secondary education	standard 3
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Only access is through heavily wooded area off ouside land boundary	Ibbetson Oval which acts as leisure route a	and is 2
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Potential cumulative impact on Churwell Hill		3
Mitigation measure		Total scor
may require mitigation on Churwell Hill		8
Support? Need to com	bine with other sites: Suitabilit	ty for partial development:
	ers would need to be limited	
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination w Road cluster.  Network Rail:	ith other sites. If site still included at next s	ift assess as part of Dewsbury
Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Of Supported	ficer: Boundary Amendment	t
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constr	aints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water	er Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		

		Oval and adjacent	to M621
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy Traveller Site	e Assessment	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
	L		
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	the site is set behind	existing residential developm	nent and is adjacent to an area of
woodland and recreation maintai	ned by Parks and Coા	untryside. No direct access.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 61	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	l Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red			

Site Name: Land at Churwell, Leeds, North of Ibbetson

Site Ref: 1229

Site Ref: 1258 Site Name: Land to rear of Westerton Road, tingley, WF3

## **Site Details**

Northing: 425440 Area sq m: 16049.92 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 429184 Area Ha: 1.604992 HMCA: Outer South West

## 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: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage ✓

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3469.04 Distance to bus stop (metres) 93.53

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 2976

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

Site Ref: 1258 Site Name: Land to rear of Westerton Road, tingley, WF3

**Planning History** 

Site Ref: 1258 Site Name: Land to rear of Westerton Road, tingley, WF3

## 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

# 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? **V** Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain

Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban

#### 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?	<b>✓</b>				
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:**

Strong links to existing settlement. Trees to south provide natural boundary which reduces potential for further sprawl.

# Conformity with Core Strategy

Main Urban Area		Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement		Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement		Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed	
Villages/Rural		Village/Rural Extension		
	Developme	nt unrelated to existing development		
Decemention Driesity	۸ ۳۵۵۰			

#### Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:	0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

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: 1258 Site Name: Land to rear of Westerton Road, tingley, WF3

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to	o determine Achievability: Long to	erm (11+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider con	nments and other planning re	quirements
	3	1
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		Dowle (4.5
Accessibility comment The site has access to 3 buses per hour and falls within t	he accessibility standards for primary	Rank (1-5
education and health, but not secondary education.	The accessionity standards for primary	4
Access Comments		Rank (1-5
Access achievable onto Westerton Road		5
Local network comment		Rank (1-5
Small development unlikely to impact on local network		5
Mitigation measure		Total scor
New footway along site frontage		14
Support? Need to combine with	h other sites: Suitability for part	tial development:
yes with mitigation		
Highways Agency		
n/a		
Network Rail :		
Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wild corridor function along the boundaries to link up with adja woodland and Ardley Reservoir Local Nature Area.		
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
<u> Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>	Foreign war August 2	
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatme	ent Works Comme
CC Flood Risk Management:	J L	

Site Ref: 1258	Site Name:	Land to rear of Westertor	Road, tingley, WF3
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeolog	y Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Sit	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively		No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	1 2 2 2	11111
site?			
<b>D</b> • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
gypoloc and navolicio			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	ssment		
Cross Polt site. The site has a	long road frontage on	d strong defensible boundary to south,	no rolaton wall to the existing
settlement and development wo			so relates well to the existing
Site Capacity (dwellings units	): 34	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Green	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

## **Site Details**

Northing: 423923 Area sq m: 569829.15 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428440 Area Ha: 56.982915 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest
Existing Use 3: Residential - Dwellings
Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: Energy producion and distriburion (pylons) on site

Site State: Mainly greenfield, part brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Significant Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):4435.96Distance to bus stop (metres)133.49Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID6624

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:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way:

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	1.00
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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
23/94/93/FU	Change of use of agricultural site to landscaping contractor erection of tractor shed and alterations to farm buildings	22/10/1992	07/09/1993	Α	96.53
H23/70/92/	Extraction of coal to agricult ural site.	25/02/1992	20/07/1992	Α	18.99
H23/227/91/	Extraction of coal and clay an d tipping of waste mater ial to constructed void space to agricultural site.	13/06/1991	14/01/1992	R	20.75

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

·	·						
Check the unrestricted sprawl of large buil	t 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+ I							
Would development of the site effectively "rou	nd off" the settlement pattern?:						
Do natural/physical features provide a good earea and undeveloped land?	xisting barrier between existing urban	✓					
Overall sprawl conclusion:							
High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl							
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging							
Would development of the site lead to physical	Il connection of settlements?						
Do natural/physical features provide a good e development?	xisting barrier/boundary to contain						
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:							
No merging but would significantly reduce the	green belt gap						
Assist in safeguarding countryside from er	ncroachment						
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban area?	<b>✓</b>					
Does the site provide access to the countrysic	•	<b>✓</b>					
Does the site include local or national conserv		<b>✓</b>					
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	•	<u>~</u>					
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricul	tural land?	<b>✓</b>					
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?	<u>✓</u>					
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion							
The site performs an important role safeguard	<del>-</del>						
	•						
Preserve the setting and special character							
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other historical	✓					
If yes, could development preserve this chara	cter?:						
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:							
Development of the site would have marginal	effect on the setting & special character of	historic features, which c					
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:							
The site is unrelated to the existing settlemen Green Belt in an area of strategic Green Belt i concerns re access							
Conformity with Core Strate							
Conformity with Core Strate	99						
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield					
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield					
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed					
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension						
Development unre	ated to existing development						
Regeneration Priority Area:							
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00				
Loade Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leads Catew	31.	0.00				

East Leeds

HLAA Conclus	sions						
Availability: Short term	n (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to dete	rmine	Achievability:	Long term (1	1+ years)
ummary of Infra	astructu	re provide	er comme	nts and o	other plann	ing require	ements
Leeds City Council	Highways	inc Metro					
Accessibility commen	nt						Rank (1-5
50% of the site accesse orimary education, does				area within t	he accessibility	zone to	2
Access Comments							Rank (1-5
Access achievable ont Road), plus priority jun	•		•	nals (to incor	paroate Haigh M	loor	4
Local network comm	ent						Rank (1-5
Development on this so	cale is likely	to cause som	e local conges	stion issues			3
Mitigation measure							Total scor
imporved bus services	, new footwa	ay along fronta	ge, siganliase	d access,			9
Support?	ı	Need to comb	ine with othe	r sites:	Suitability	/ for partial de	evelopment:
no						velopment wou ty imporvemen	
Highways Agency							
Potential for cumulative Road cluster.	impact in co	ombination wit	h other sites.	If site still inc	cluded at next sit	t assess as pa	rt of Dewsbury
Network Rail :							
Biodiversity							
West Yorkshire Ecolog	gy and LCC	Ecology Offi	cer:	Bounda	ry Amendment		
Not supported (RED). F Nature Area (LNA) is wi converted to arable it re should be allowed to be	itin the site, epresents an	and although ancient wood	ecently	excluded areas are per draw ensure h by protec enhance two wood east by p	ed with mitigation of and supported excluded and ting RM/1260. Mabitat connectiveting and enhand Haigh Hall Sprinded beck corridoroviding a minimable to consider.	with mitigation the boundary is itigation will still ity is achieved bing hedgerowing Wood LNA, ors along the so	if red hatched amended as Il be required t within the site s, to protect an to protect the outh west and
Natural England:				1.1.2.2.			
Education _							
Drainage/Water/Flo	<u>oding</u>						
Environment Agency (	Comments:		En	vironment A	Agency Constra	ints:	
Yorkshire Water Comi	ments:		Yo	rkshire Wat	er Waste Water	Treatment W	orks Comme

Site Ref: 1260	Site Name:	Land to north and Tingley, Wakefield	south of Batley Road, , WF3 1HA
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:		
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
_			
Gypsy Traveller Site	e Assessmen	<u>nt</u>	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site :			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. The site is unrel incursion into Green Belt in an ar concerns re accessibility.			ent would represent a significant e boundary with Kirklees. Highway
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 1282	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:

Site Ref: 1266 Site Name: Land at Wakefield Road Drighlington

## **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428245
 Area sq m:
 54951.89
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 423392
 Area Ha:
 5.495189
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

## 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: Retail - Restaurants and Cafes

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3575.30Distance to bus stop (metres)129.19Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID3755

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Environment Agency Flood Zone:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:

Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:

Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):

O.00

Agricultural Land Class:

O.00

Strategic Employment Buffer:

O.00

Conservation Areas

No

Listed Buildings:

No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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

# **Planning History**

Site Ref: 1266

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/604/79/	Tipping of waste materials, to existing tip, disused railw ay and agricultural site. (sit e area 9.4ha).	26/07/1979	17/03/1980	Α	99.67
H23/235/75/	Extension of existing permissi on to erect office block (prev ious application no mo 3566/b, expires 7th july 1975).	08/04/1975	07/07/1975	А	49.76
H23/515/89/	Outline application to lay out access and erect 2 indus trial and warehouse units with offices and with car park t	17/10/1989	18/12/1989	R	90.40
H23/497/77/	Regrading and levelling, of qu arry (site area 5.6ha (13.9 acres)).	19/07/1977	31/10/1977	Α	95.48
H23/99/86/1	Extension of temporary permiss ion for the tipping of waste materials to existing tip, di sused railway and agricultur	01/05/1987	26/04/1988	А	99.72
H23/2/79/	Tipping of waste materials to tip.	02/01/1979	07/07/1980	W	95.32
H23/99/86/	Amendment to previous applicat ion involving conti nuation of use, from 01.04.86, for tipping of waste mate	29/04/1986	30/06/1986	Α	99.92
H23/769/79/	Retention of existing office b lock to quarry.	21/09/1979	29/10/1979	А	95.69

Site Ref: 1266 Site Name: Land at Wakefield Road Drighlington

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:** Development would lead to the merging of Drighlington and Gildersome, contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belts to prevent coalescence of settlements. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 1266 Site Name: Land at Wakefield Road Drighlington

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (	11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider	comments and other planning requir	rements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5
The site has access to 3 buses per hour, 60% of the the site has access to health and secondary educated the site has access to health and secondary educated the site has access to health and secondary educated the site has access to 3 buses per hour, 60% of the site has access to 3 buses per hour, 60% of the site has access to 3 buses per hour, 60% of the site has access to 3 buses per hour, 60% of the site has access to 4 buses per hour, 60% of the site has access to 4 buses per hour, 60% of the site has access to 4 buses per hour, 60% of the site has access to 4 buses per hour, 60% of the site has access to 4 buses per hour, 60% of the site has access to 4 buses per hour, 60% of the site has access to 4 buses per hour, 60% of the site has access to 4 buses per hour, 60% of the site has access to 5 buses per hour, 60% of 5 buses per		3
Access Comments	,	Rank (1-5
Access achievable from Wakefield Road		5
Local network comment	· ·	Rank (1-5
Small scale development with limited impact on loc strategic road network	cal network - potential for cumulative imapct on	4
Mitigation measure		Total scor
full footway on Wakefield Road frontage		12
Ourse and Ourse and the complete	Only by Winner Comment and A	
	ne with other sites: Suitability for partial d	evelopment:
yes with mitigation		
Highways Agency		
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with Morley/Gildersome cluster	other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as pa	art of
Network Rail :		
Biodiversity_		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	er: Boundary Amendment	
Supported		
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment W	Vorks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:	1 1	

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 1266	Site Name:	Land at Wakefield R	Road Drighlington
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Cyncy Trovollor Site	Accocomon	4	
Gypsy _Traveller Site	# ASSESSIIIEII	ι	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site !			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	110	Olikilowii
Conclusion of Asses	emont		
Conclusion of Asses	Silient		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. Development wo Green Belts to prevent coalescer		ng of Drighlington and Gilderso	ome, contrary to one of the purposes of
,			
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 146	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red			

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 425814 Area sq m: 145299.29 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 430014 Area Ha: 14.529929 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture
Existing Use 2: Retail - Shops

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3814.97Distance to bus stop (metres)305.97Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID8484

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	90.07	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		

No

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
23/291/98/FU	Change of use of mill to storage and distribution	25/08/1998	21/10/1998	W	11.74
23/426/01/LI	Listed building application for boundary fence to front of mill	25/10/2001	22/01/2002	Α	14.77
23/70/02/FU	5m high cctv and lighting pole to side of mill	20/02/2002	16/04/2002	Α	14.77
H23/611/76/	Alterations and extension, to form compressor room, to mi II.	27/07/1976	27/09/1976	Α	11.22
H23/52/77/	Detached pre-fabricated office unit, to works.	31/01/1977	28/02/1977	Α	11.22
23/425/01/FU	2.85m high fence to front and 2.4m high fence to rear and side and 5m high cctv pole to front of mill	25/10/2001	22/01/2002	R	14.77

### 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 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:** Potential for limited further sprawl but beyond this is contained by road. Provides access to countryside. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development

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.

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

HLAA C	onclusions					
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Medium term	(6-10 years)
ummary	of Infrastruct	ure provide	er comments an	d other plann	ing require	ements
Leeds City	Council Highwa	ys inc Metro				
	y comment				i	Rank (1-5
			to west of site). 60% of th, but not secondary e		the	3
Access Co	mments				,	Rank (1-5
Located adj site 1032 ar		ised junction and	l access to large site no	ot ideal - best comin	g through	3
Local netw	ork comment				•	Rank (1-5
Located adj site 1032	acent to busy signal	ised junction and	access to large site no	ot ideal - best cominç	g through	3
Mitigation i	measure					Total scor
Too close to	junction					9
Support?		Need to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitability	/ / for partial dev	velopment:
no		combine with 1 access	032 and or 2155 for be		art of site better	-
Highways	Agency					
	cumulative impact ir	combination wit	h other sites. If site sti	II included at next sit	t assess as par	t of Dewsbury
Network R	ail :					
Biodiversi	ty					
West Yorks	hire Ecology and L	CC Ecology Offi	icer: Bou	ndary Amendment		
Unknown Im value.	pact - further botanio	cal surveys requi	red to confirm Site	assessment needed		
Natural Eng	land:					
<u>Education</u>						
	Vater/Flooding					
Environmen	t Agency Commen	ts:	Environme	ent Agency Constra	ints:	
Yorkshire W	later Comments:		Yorkshire '	Water Waste Water	Treatment Wo	orks Comme
LCC Flood I	Risk Management:					

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref:	1274	Site Name:	Land north of	f East Ardsley,	WF3
Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Re	scue Services:				
Built Herit	200				
Leeds City	_				
-	hire Archaeology	Service:			
English Her					
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
	be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed		(Text)			
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers l	ive on the	(Text)			
site?					
Proximity t	o housed	Yes		No	
	d travellers	(Text)		1 -	
Evnerience	e of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampme		(Text)	110		Officiowit
Conclusio	on of Asses	cmont			
Conclusio	JII UI ASSES	Sillelit			
Conclusion su	ummary:				
settlement forn	n, although the sca		mulatively with other		ered to round off the Highway concerns re
Site Capacity	(dwellings units):	326	Floorspace	sq m (Non residentia	al):
Residential Co	onclusion:	Retai	Conclusion:	Eı	mployment Conclusion:
Amber		Not as	ssessed	Ne	ot assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 427910 Area sq m: 34533.98 Ward Morley South
Easting: 428202 Area Ha: 3.453398 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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 CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1252.59Distance to bus stop (metres)140.65Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID7212

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# 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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/216/81/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to va cant site. (site area 6.07ha).	31/03/1981	15/06/1981	R	98.93
H23/440/75/	Outline application to erect o ne detached farm bungalowto gr azing land site. (site area 1. 64ha (4.05 acres)).	25/06/1975	01/09/1975	R	26.00
H23/214/81/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to va cant site. (site area 23.07ha).	31/03/1981	15/06/1981	R	99.60

### 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? **V** Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain 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:** Strong links to urban area. Fairly well contained, could only sprawl into site 1275B. Could partially round off settlement with neighbouring site 1279 to south. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development

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.

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

Gas:

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro  Accessibility comment All of the site has access to 4 buses per hour and lies within the accessibility zone for primary education and 50% of the site to secondary education but not to health. Access to local services  Access Comments Access From Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Local network comment Site may require some off-site mitigation works  Amitigation measure  Could provide access to adjacent sites  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Would be required to access adjacent sites.  Suitability for partial development:  would be required to access adjacent sites.  Suitability for partial development:  would be required to access adjacent sites.  Suitability for partial development:  Would be required to access adjacent sites.  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment	Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro  Accessibility comment All of the site has access to 4 buses per hour and lies within the accessibility zone for primary adducation and 50% of the site to secondary education but not to health. Access to local services  Access Comments Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees	·			
Access billity comment All of the site has access to 4 buses per hour and lies within the accessibility zone for primary adducation and 50% of the site to secondary education but not to health. Access to local services  Access Comments Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access for all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require to seal and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require to seal and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require to seal and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require to seal and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require to seal and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require to seal a	ummary of Infrastr	ucture provider co	omments and other planning requ	uirements
All of the site has access to 4 buses per hour and lies within the accessibility zone for primary education and 50% of the site to secondary education but not to health. Access to local services  Access Comments  Rank (1-4  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require wide in the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require wide in the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require wide in the loss of all trees	Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro		
Access Comments Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Bank (1-2  Access solution requires  Local provide access at a disciplination works  Access for all the loss of all trees on boundary  Bank (1-2  Access solution requires  Local provide access at a disciplination works  Access from Wide Lane would require works  Access solution requires  Local provide access at a disciplination works  A	Accessibility comment			Rank (1-
Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Local network comment Site may require some off-site mitigation works  Amitigation measure Could provide access to adjacent sites  122  Support? Need to combine with other sites: would be required to access adjacent sites. Suitability for partial development: with mitigation would be required to access adjacent sites. Suitability for partial development: well would be required to access adjacent sites. Suitability for partial development: well would be required to access adjacent sites. Suitability for partial development: well would be required to access adjacent sites. Suitability for partial development: well would be required to access adjacent sites. Suitability for partial development:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Forkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comment  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comment				4
Local network comment  Site may require some off-site mitigation works  4  Mitigation measure  Could provide access to adjacent sites  12  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency No objection  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Forkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Access Comments		'	Rank (1-
Site may require some off-site mitigation works  Mitigation measure  Could provide access to adjacent sites  12  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Would be required to access adjacent sites.  Suitability for partial development:  would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency  No objection  Network Rail:  Siddiversity  Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints:  Corkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Access from Wide Lane wo	ould require widening into si	ite and the loss of all trees on boundary	4
Mitigation measure  Could provide access to adjacent sites  12  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  would be required to access adjacent sites. Suitability for partial development:  would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency No objection Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Partial Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Partial Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Partial Ecology Officer:  Forwironment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Local network comment		'	Rank (1-
Mitigation measure  Could provide access to adjacent sites  12  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  yes with mitigation  would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency No objection Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Site may require some off-s	site mitigation works		1
Could provide access to adjacent sites    12				4
Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Yes with mitigation  Would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency No objection Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Mitigation measure			Total sco
Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency No objection Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Could provide access to ad	jacent sites		12
would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279    dighways Agency   No objection				1 4
sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279    Highways Agency   No objection	Support?	Need to combine w	rith other sites: Suitability for partia	I development:
Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Forkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	yes with mitigation	sites. Access solution	on requires	
Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Highways Agency			
Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	No objection			
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	Network Rail :			
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 Comments	Biodiversity			
Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme		nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Supported			
Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments				
Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Natural England:			
Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Education			
Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	<u> Laudation</u>			
Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme				
Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme			Environment Agency Constraints	
	Environment Agency Com	ments.	Environment Agency Constraints.	
_CC Flood Risk Management:	Yorkshire Water Comment	ts:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme
_CC Flood Risk Management:				
LCC Flood Risk Management:				
	<b>_CC Flood Risk Managem</b>	ent:		

Electric:		
Telecom:		
Fire and Rescue Services:		
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:	
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment	
Could site be effectively managed	Yes No (Text)	Maybe
Would gypsies and	Yes No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	, mayar
Proximity to housed		No
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	
Experience of previous	Yes No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	
Conclusion of Asses	sment	
Conclusion summary:		
and whilst extending beyond the	to the east of Morley and has been split into existing settlement, would still allow a green t gap between Morley and Middleton. If dev	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 90 Floorspace sq	q m (Non residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not assessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Land north of Wide Lane, Morley

Site Ref: 1275A

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 427935 Area sq m: 63517.70 Ward Morley South
Easting: 428407 Area Ha: 6.35177 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2: Other

Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses: Public House
Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1452.32Distance to bus stop (metres)178.60Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID516SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/549/80/	Alterations and extension, to form lounge, to rear of farm house.	20/08/1980	10/09/1980	А	26.82
H23/216/81/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to va cant site. (site area 6.07ha).	31/03/1981	15/06/1981	R	31.00
H23/440/75/	Outline application to erect o ne detached farm bungalowto gr azing land site. (site area 1. 64ha (4.05 acres)).	25/06/1975	01/09/1975	R	21.77
H23/214/81/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to va cant site. (site area 23.07ha) .	31/03/1981	15/06/1981	R	31.02

## 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 e	existing built up area)?				
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlen	ment pattern?: No				
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier bet area and undeveloped land?	ween existing urban				
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 se	ettlements?				
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/box development?	undary to contain				
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 the significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	at are protected, or				
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?					
Does the site contain buildings? ✓ Are t	hese in agricultural use?				
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion					
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the	e countryside from encroachment				
Preserve the setting and special character of historic town	s				
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed build feature?	ling or other historical				
If yes, could development preserve this character?:					
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:					
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and	d special character of historic features				
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Well contained by motorway, however, would reduce green bel	It separation between Morley and Middleton.				
Conformity with Core Strategy					
Main Urban Area Main Urban Are	ea Extension Brownfield				
Major Settlement Major Settlemen	nt Extension Greenfield 🔲				
Smaller Settlement					
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension					
Development unrelated to existing of	development				
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley: 0.00				
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway: 0.00				

East Leeds

Gas:

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro  Accessibility comment  Rank (1-  The site has 100% access to buses per hour and all of the site lies within the accessibility zone for primary education. Poor access to health and secondary education. Access to local services  Access Comments  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  4  Local network comment  Site may require some off-site mitigation works  Mitigation measure  Could provide access to adjacent sites  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  would be required to access adjacent sites. Access soulton requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency Network Rail:  Biodiversity  Next Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Finite Mater Treatment Works Comments  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Comments	Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro Accessibility comment The site has 100% access to buses per hour and all of the site lies within the accessibility zone for orimary education. Poor access to health and secondary education. Access to local services  Access Comments Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on	ummary of Infracti	ructura providor co	ammonts and other planning requi	iromonte
Access billity comment The site has 100% access to buses per hour and all of the site lies within the accessibility zone for primary education. Poor access to health and secondary education. Access to local services  Access Comments Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would	ullillary of lillrasti	ucture provider co	onnients and other planning requ	Irements
The site has 100% access to buses per hour and all of the site lies within the accessibility zone for primary education. Poor access to health and secondary education. Access to local services  Access Comments  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  4  Local network comment  Site may require some off-site mitigation works  Mitigation measure  Could provide access to adjacent sites  11  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  West with mitigation  Wetwork Rail:  Sidediversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Comments  Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Comments		hways inc Metro		
Access Comments Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require wide into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require wide into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Access from Wide Lane would require wide into site and the loss	•		also size the containing also seems to the containing and the containing also seems to the containing and th	Rank (1-
Access from Wide Lane would require widening into site and the loss of all trees on boundary  Local network comment Site may require some off-site mitigation works  Amik (1-  Mitigation measure Could provide access to adjacent sites  Total sc  11  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency No objection Network Rail: Siddiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints:  Corkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments				3
Local network comment  Site may require some off-site mitigation works  4  Mitigation measure  Could provide access to adjacent sites  11  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency No objection  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Access Comments			Rank (1-
Site may require some off-site mitigation works  Mitigation measure  Could provide access to adjacent sites  11  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Would be required to access adjacent sites. Suitability for partial development:  would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency  No objection  Network Rail:  Sidodiversity  Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Patural England:  Education  Environment Agency Constraints:  Corkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Access from Wide Lane wo	ould require widening into si	ite and the loss of all trees on boundary	4
Mitigation measure  Could provide access to adjacent sites  11  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  yes with mitigation  would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency No objection Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Local network comment		·	Rank (1-
Mitigation measure  Could provide access to adjacent sites  Int  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency No objection Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Site may require some off-s	site mitigation works		1
Could provide access to adjacent sites  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  yes with mitigation  would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency No objection Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments Works Comments  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments				4
Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  You with mitigation  Would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency No objection Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Mitigation measure			Total sco
Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279  Highways Agency No objection Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Forkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Could provide access to ad	ljacent sites		11
would be required to access adjacent sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279    dighways Agency   No objection				• •
sites. Access solution requires consideration of 3069 & 1279    Signature   Si	Support?	Need to combine w	rith other sites: Suitability for partial	development:
Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported  Natural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	yes with mitigation	sites. Access solution	on requires	
Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	Highways Agency			
Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	No objection			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Forkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Network Rail :			
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 Comments	Biodiversity			
Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments		nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Supported	<b>.</b> .		
Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments				
Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Natural England:			
Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Education			
Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	<u>Education</u>			
Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments				
Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme				
	Environment Agency Com	ments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
_CC Flood Risk Management:		ts:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:				
LCC Flood Risk Management:				
	<b>_CC Flood Risk Managem</b>	ent:		

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessi	ment		
Could site be effectively	Yes		No	Maybe
managed	(Text)			1 2
Would gypsies and	Yes		No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Site?				
Dravimity to have	Yes		No	
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	(Text)		INO	
gypoloo ana travolloro				
Experience of previous	Yes		No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)			·
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				•
Green Belt site. The site extends	s to the east of	Morley and has h	neen split into two sections	Site B is the western section
of site 1275 and provides importa				One B to the western essuen
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	:	166 <b>Fi</b> d	oorspace sq m (Non reside	ential): 0
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusi	on:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red		Not assessed		Not assessed

Site Name: Land north of Wide Lane, Morley

Site Ref: 1275B

Site Ref: 1279 Site Name: Owlers Farm Extension, Wide Lane, Morley

### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 427628
 Area sq m:
 34536.38
 Ward
 Morley South

 Easting:
 428268
 Area Ha:
 3.453638
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Utilities & Infrastructure - Post and Telecom

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1388.60Distance to bus stop (metres)156.80Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID4947

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:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.78	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.23	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

Site Ref: 1279 Site Name: Owlers Farm Extension , Wide Lane, Morley

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/193/91/	Outline application to layout access and erect 2 storeytelev ision centre and studios with car parking, landscapin	17/05/1991	19/02/1992	W	27.03

Site Ref: 1279 Site Name: Owlers Farm Extension , Wide Lane, Morley

## 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 exist	ing built up area)?				
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement	t pattern?: Pa	rtial			
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier betwee area and undeveloped land?	n existing urban				
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 settle	ments?				
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundadevelopment?	ary to contain				
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging of settlements					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment					
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the exist	sting urban area?				
Does the site provide access to the countryside?					
Does the site include local or national conservation designated are	as?				
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that a significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	re protected, or				
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	$\checkmark$				
Does the site contain buildings?	e in agricultural use?				
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion					
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the cou	untryside from encroachm	ent			
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns					
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building feature?	or other historical				
If yes, could development preserve this character?:					
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:					
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and sp	ecial character of historic	features			
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Would need to be developed alongside site to west to link to settler contained by highway network.	ment. Limited potential for	sprawl as the site is			
Conformity with Core Strategy					
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area E	xtension	Brownfield			
Major Settlement Major Settlement E	xtension	Greenfield			
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement	Extension	Mixed			
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extens	sion				
Development unrelated to existing deve	lopment				
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00			
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00			

Site Ref: 1279 Site Name: Owlers Farm Extension , Wide Lane, Morley

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusion	S			
Availability: Short term (0-5y	rs) Suitability: LDF to	determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastru	ıcture provider com	ments and o	ther planni	ng requirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-
Meets Core Strategy standard	ds with exception of health ar	nd local services		4
Access Comments				Rank (1-
Access from Wide Lane wou	ld require widening into site a	and the loss of all t	rees on boundar	4
Local network comment				Rank (1-
Site may require some off-sit	e mitigation works			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Could provide access to adja	cent sites			12
Support?	Need to combine with	other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
yes with mitigation	joint appraoch with 3069 1018 (inc access). Acc nrequires consideration	ess solution		
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact Morley/Gildersome cluster.	ct in combination with other s	ites. If site still inc	luded at next sift	assess as part of
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	d LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to p grassland/fen located to the s metres) through restricting pu species scrub/woodland buffe	outhern area (approx southe blic access and creating a na	rn 40		
Natural England:		ı		
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding	I			
Environment Agency Comm	ents:	Environment A	gency Constrai	nts:
Yorkshire Water Comments	:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	nt·			

Site Ref: 1279	Site Name:	Owlers Farn	n Extension ,	Wide Lane, Morley
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. This would need be connected to the urban area. to the north to round off the settle gap between the sites within the to the east.	The site extends to tement if both sites we	the east of Morley an ere brought forward for	d there is potentia or development. T	I for this site alongside 1275A his would still leave a green
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 116	Floorspace	sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:		<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Amber	Not a	ssessed		Not assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 428197 Area sq m: 5912.21 Ward Morley North
Easting: 426670 Area Ha: 0.591221 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3:

Natural Landscape:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 307.86 Distance to bus stop (metres) 48.69

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 3426

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Significant Tree Cover

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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:	98.21	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
23/69/02/FU	48 flats	19/02/2002	23/04/2002	Α	14.56
H23/222/84/	Outline application to erect w arehouse unit, with loadi ng facilities and with car par king and landscapingto existin	20/07/1984	08/03/1991	W	11.23
23/162/99/FU	44 flats	09/06/1999	27/11/2001	Α	14.56
H23/37/92/	Change of use of dwelling hous e to private hire car offic e.	23/01/1992	13/04/1992	Α	14.56
H23/12/91/	Outline application to erect r esidential development torecre ation ground site. (site area 0.49ha)	11/01/1991	26/06/1992	R	81.83

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: I	LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11	+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider	comments and other planning require	ments
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy standards		5
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Access from Station Rd - complicated by steep nate	ure of site	3
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Small site unlikely to impact on local network		5
Mitigation measure		Total score
		13
Support? Need to combine	e with other sites: Suitability for partial dev	elonment:
yes	o man onion onion	olopillo.iti
Highways Agency		
n/a		
	provements (including disabled access) General asset pr	otection
Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	er: Boundary Amendment	
Supported Supported	Doundary Americanient	
Natural England:	I I	
Education		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	<b>Environment Agency Constraints:</b>	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Wo	rks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		

## **Utilities**

Site Ref: 1280	Site Name:	Land at Station	on Road, Morley	y
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Cypey Traveller Sit	a Assassment			
Gypsy _Traveller Sit	e Assessment			
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
one.				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Canalysian symmeny				
Conclusion summary: The site is designated as N1 Gre	enspace on the existi	na LIDP - Loss of are	enspace would need t	to be considered through
the greenspace review. See gre	enspace section, page	e 37, question G13.	The site is in a dense	ly built up area, with
employment and residential uses	з абјасент.			
				_
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 21	Floorspace s	sq m (Non residentia	l):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Em	ployment Conclusion:
Red				

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 426963 Area sq m: 14375.22 Ward Morley South
Easting: 425350 Area Ha: 1.437522 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Existing Use 3: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Part greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

SFRA Flood Zone:

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Poorly defined

0.00

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad FrontageDistance to Rail Station (metres):1978.50Distance to bus stop (metres)104.30

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 1732

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?: No Within

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/200/82/	Outline application to erect i ndustrial and warehouse devel opment, to agricultural site. (site area 16.95ha)	02/07/1982	13/02/1984	W	99.92
12/01332/OT	Outline application for residential development	22/03/2012	28/03/2013	Α	86.82

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

SHLAA Conclusi	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infra	structure provider co	mments and ot	her planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council I				Dank (4 E
Accessibility comment Site has access to 2 bus	es per hour and good access to	o other services		Rank (1-5)
	, ,			3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Access would have to b	e through adjacent permission			4
Local network comme	nt			Rank (1-5
Small extension to exist	ing permission but potential for	cumulative impact		4
				-
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				11
Support?	Need to combine wit	th other sites:	Suitability for partial d	evelopment:
Yes				
Highways Agency				
Comment awaited				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecolog	y and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Natural England:				
<b>Education</b>				
Droines Mai - //Fl	din a			
<u>Drainage/Water/Floo</u> Environment Agency C		Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
			<u> </u>	
Yorkshire Water Comm	nents:	Yorkshire Water	· Waste Water Treatment V	Vorks Comme
100 51 45: 4				
LCC Flood Risk Manag	ement:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	1	, <b>,</b>
site?			
Provimity to housed	Yes	No	
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	(Text)	INO	
371			
Experience of previous	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Outline planning application for re	esidential developme	nt approved March 2013. Whe	en the plan is updated, this will become
a 'lime green' site.			
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 234		- vanidantiaN
		Floorspace sq m (No	
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green			

Site Name: Bruntcliffe Road Morley

Site Ref: 1281B

#### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428895
 Area sq m:
 206425.42
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 426961
 Area Ha:
 20.642542
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

#### 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: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):788.40Distance to bus stop (metres)213.92Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID3782

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	3.48	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	96.33	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?:

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/904/78/	Outline application to erect r esidential development tovacan t site. (site area	24/11/1978	08/01/1979	R	10.09
H23/138/90/	Outline application to erect r esidential development tovacan t agricultural site. (site a rea 2.86ha)	23/03/1990	04/06/1990	R	13.11

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

HLAA Conclusions					
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Medium term (6-	10 years)
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provider	comments and o	other plann	ing requirem	ents
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro				
Accessibility comment					Rank (1-5)
Mostly meets Core Strategy sta	ndards				4
Access Comments				l	Rank (1-5)
Access from Victoria Rd - prior widening into site required	ity junction or signal	Is depending on the num	ber of units to be	e served -	4
Local network comment					Rank (1-5)
Cumulative imapct with adjace	nt sites in busy loca	tion			3
					<u> </u>
Mitigation measure					Total score
signalised access other mitigat	ion works required				11
Support?	Need to combin	ne with other sites:	Suitabilit	y for partial devel	opment:
yes with mitigation		ss sits 1283, 3068 & 2164		y par mar a	
Highways Agency	<u> </u>				
Potential for cumulative impact Morley/Gildersome cluster.	in combination with	other sites. If site still inc	cluded at next si	ift assess as part of	f
Network Rail :					
<u>Biodiversity</u>					
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Office	er: Bounda	ry Amendment		
Supported					
Natural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
Drainage/Water/Flooding					
Environment Agency Comme	nts:	Environment A	Agency Constra	aints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Wat	er Waste Wate	r Treatment Work	s Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management					

Site Ref: 1	282	Site Name:	Lane Side Farm PAS M	orley
0				
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescu	ue Services:			
<b>Built Heritage</b>	<u>e</u>			
Leeds City Co	uncil:			
West Yorkshir	e Archaeology	Service:		
English Herita	ge:			
		_		
Gypsy _Ira	veller Site	Assessmen		
Could site be	effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed		(Text)		
Would gypsie		Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live	on the	(Text)		
Site?				
Proximity to	housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and		(Text)	,	
Experience o	f previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampment		(Text)	110	OTIKTOWIT
Conclusion	of Asses	sment		
Conclusion	OI ASSES	Silicit		
Conclusion sum				
			AS) on the existing UDP, not within vels from road to site. No Highway	
Site Capacity (dv	vellings units):	542	Floorspace sq m (Non res	sidential):
Residential Cond	clusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green		Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

# Site Details

Northing: 428769 Area sq m: 294524.40 Ward Morley North
Easting: 427404 Area Ha: 29.45244 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 794.80 Distance to bus stop (metres) 630

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 794.80 Distance to bus stop (metres) 630.58

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 10316

SFRA Flood Zone: 1.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# 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:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.32		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

No

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Yes

### 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? **V** 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 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 no effect on the setting and special character of historic features **Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:** Large site, would reduce green belt separation of settlements. Isolated from built up area, relates poorly. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development

Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

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

Aire Valley:

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

SHLAA Co	onclusions							
Availability: S	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to d	etermine	Ac	chievability: Long	term (11+	years)
Summary	of Infrastruct	ure provide	r comn	nents ar	nd oth	er planning re	equiren	nents
		•					•	
Leeds City (	Council Highwa	<u>ys inc Metro</u>						Rank (1-5)
80% of the site				c Transport,	100% o	f the site to primary		4
Access Com	ments						l	Rank (1-5)
	site has no access access but too mud				Hill is not	suitable). Relies or	n	2
Local networ	rk comment						'	Rank (1-5)
Potential cum	ulative impact on C	Churwell Hill						3
Mitigation me	easure							Total score
								9
Support?		Need to combi	ne with o	ther sites:		Suitability for pa	rtial deve	lopment:
no		no						
Highways A	<u>gency</u>							
Potential for cu Morley/Gilders		combination with	other site	es. If site st	ill include	ed at next sift asses	s as part o	of
Network Rai	<u>il :</u>							
Footbridge to r issues	replace nearby LC;	Morley Station In	nproveme	nts (includir	ng disabl	ed access) General	asset pro	tection
<b>Biodiversity</b>								
West Yorkshi	re Ecology and L0	C Ecology Offic	er:	Bou	ındary A	mendment		
Supported								
Natural Engla	nd:							
Education								
Drainage/Wa	ater/Flooding							
Environment	Agency Comment	s:	1	Environme	ent Ager	ncy Constraints:		
Yorkshire Wa	ter Comments:			Yorkshire	Water W	Vaste Water Treatn	nent Worl	ks Comme
. Jinoimo Wa								

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.

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref: 1283	Site Name:	Lane Side Fai	rm Extension IV	lioriey
<u>Utilities</u>				
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessmen	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			•
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Site :				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion comments				
Green Belt site. Site falls away s	toonly down to a rail	way cutting Highway	e concorne ro accore	Dovolopment would
represent a major incursion into t Green Belts in preventing coales	he Green Belt gap se	eparating Morley and I		
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 560	Floorspace s	sq m (Non residentia	I):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	En	nployment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	No	t assessed

### **Site Details**

Northing: 428315 Area sq m: 14177.09 Ward Morley South
Easting: 427598 Area Ha: 1.417709 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):666.74Distance to bus stop (metres)291.73Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID2207

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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?:	
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?:

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas	<b>;</b>	
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development	ent?	
Would development result in isolated development?		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundarie	s 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 bar	rier 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	on of settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing bar development?	rier/boundary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:		
No merging but there is no defensible boundary		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachm	ent	
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site a	and the existing urban area?	
Does the site provide access to the countryside?		$\checkmark$
Does the site include local or national conservation des	gnated areas?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedge significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	rows that are protected, or	
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 safeguard	ding the countryside from encroad	chment
Preserve the setting and special character of histori	c towns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, liste feature?	ed building or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this character?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Development of the site would have no effect on the set	ting and special character of histo	oric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Well related to urban area and would round off the settle create potential for further sprawl.	ement. No defensible boundary to	o east which could
Conformity with Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area Main Url	oan Area Extension	Brownfield
Major Settlement Major Se	ettlement Extension	Greenfield
Smaller Settlement Smaller	Settlement Extension	Mixed
Villages/Rural	Rural Extension	
Development unrelated to ex	isting development	
Regeneration Priority Area:		
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatewa	ay: 0.00

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

SHLAA Conclusions	;			
Availability:	Suitability:	А	chievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider com	ments and oth	er planning requiren	nents
Leeds City Council Highy	vays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			1	Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy standard	s with exception of health ar	nd local services		4
Access Comments			<u>'</u>	Rank (1-5)
Access available from Albert I	Orive			5
Local network comment			'	Rank (1-5)
Cumulative impact with other	sites			4
Mitigation measure				Total score
Cumulative impact may requir	e mitigation			13
Support?	Need to combine with	other sites:	Suitability for partial deve	lopment:
yes with mitigation	could cmine with adjace particular	ent sites - 1320 in		
Highways Agency No objection				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to pr corridor function provided by th LNA and the railway.				
Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comme	ents:	Environment Age	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water \	Waste Water Treatment Wor	ks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemen				

Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe	Ī
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe	
travellers live on the	(Text)		1 - 3 - 2	
site?				
Proximity to housed	Yes	No		-
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	INO		
<b></b>				
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown	-
encampments	(TOXI)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			ı
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. Site A is the wes residential area and development unlike site B.			site is well related to the existing has an existing defensible boundary,	_
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 44	Floorspace sq m (N	Non residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>	
Green	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed	

Site Name: Low Moor Farm Extension Albert Drive,

Morley

Site Ref: 1284A

### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428464
 Area sq m:
 115672.53
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 427845
 Area Ha:
 11.567253
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

### 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

### Site Detail

Nearest Railway Station

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 949.87 Distance to bus stop (metres) 514.61

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Morley

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Bus Stop ID

2207

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.59	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.41	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
23/296/93/FU	Extraction of coal by opencast mining	16/08/1993	25/08/1995	Α	28.51
H23/326/81/	Laying out of access and tippi ng of controlled waste, with compound containing detached g arage and fuel store, off	04/08/1981	15/09/1981	A	41.88
23/128/96/MIN	Variation of conditions nos 2 and 18 of application no 23/296/93/fu (extension of coal extraction area)	15/04/1996	04/09/1996	А	14.65

# 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 de	velopment?					
Would development result in isolated development	ent?	✓				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ bo						
Would development of the site effectively "round	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 exidevelopment?	sting barrier/boundary to contain					
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:						
No merging but would significantly reduce the g	reen belt gap					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from end	roachment					
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 conserva	tion designated areas?					
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	, hedgerows that are protected, or					
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultu	ral land?	✓				
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?					
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion						
The site performs an important role safeguardin	g countryside from encroachment					
Preserve the setting and special character of	f historic towns					
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation a feature?	rea, listed building or other historical					
If yes, could development preserve this charact	er?:					
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:						
Development of the site would have no effect or	n the setting and special character of hist	oric features				
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Not connected to urban area, relates poorly to s and Middleton.	settlement. Would reduce green belt sepa	aration between Morley				
Conformity with Core Strateg	у					
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield				
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield				
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed				
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension	_				
Development unrela	ted to existing development					
Regeneration Priority Area:						
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00				
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay: 0.00				

East Leeds

Gas:

<b>HLAA Conclusions</b>	<u> </u>			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider co	mments and of	ther planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Highy	vays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Site just outside acceptable wa	alking distances to most s	ervices		3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Access requires adjacent site	S			3
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Cumulative impact with other	sites			4
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Cumulative imapct may requir	e mitigation			10
Support?	Need to combine wi	th other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
yes with mitigation	could cmine with adja particular	cent sites - 1320 in		
Highways Agency No objection Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	y Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to properties or supported by the corridor function provided by the LNA and the railway.	otect and enhance the wil	Idlife		
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Commo		Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Site Ref:	1284B	Site Name:	Low Moor Farm Extension A Morley	lbert Drive,
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herita Leeds City ( West Yorks English Her	Council: hire Archaeology	Service:		
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessment	t .	
Could site managed	be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers li		(Text)	1.10	IMAYDO
Proximity to housed		Yes	No	
	d travellers	(Text)		
Experience encampme	e of previous ents	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessment	t	
Could site managed	be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gyp travellers li site?		Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Proximity t gypsies an	o housed d travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
Experience encampme	e of previous ents	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Conclusio	on of Asses	sment		

### Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Site B is the eastern part of the original SHLAA submission. Site B is unrelated to the existing settlement form and development would represent a major incursion into Green Belt, reducing the gap between Morley and Middleton.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

303

Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

0

Site Ref:	1284B	Site Name:	Low Moor Farm Extension Albert Drive,
			Morley

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed Not assessed

### **Site Details**

Northing: 427623 Area sq m: 38163.42 Ward Morley South
Easting: 428126 Area Ha: 3.816342 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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 CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1258.26Distance to bus stop (metres)156.27Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID8753

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	2.04	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	97.96	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 Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/160/82/	Outline application to lay out access roads and erect resid ential development to vacant a gricultural site. (sit	20/05/1982	13/09/1982	R	82.80
H23/168/80/	Change of use of rhubarb sheds , to form shop and stores	04/03/1980	28/04/1980	Α	81.27

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

SHLAA Conclusions							
Availability: Short term (0-5yr	rs) Suitability: L	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Medium term (6-10 years)			
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider	comments and o	ther plann	ing requirements			
Leeds City Council High	vays inc Metro						
Accessibility comment  Meets Core Strategy standard	s with exception of he	ealth and local services		Rank (1-5			
inioito outo ottatogy otaridara	o mar exception of the	and lood, colvided		4			
Access Comments				Rank (1-5			
Access available from Bedale	: Court for limited deve	elopment		4			
Local network comment				Rank (1-5			
Site may require some off-site	mitigation works			4			
				•			
Mitigation measure				Total sco			
				12			
Support?	Need to combin	e with other sites:	Suitability	/ for partial development:			
yes with mitigation	joint appraoch wit 1018 (inc access)	th 3069, 1279, 3120 & ).		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Highways Agency							
Potential for cumulative impact Morley/Gildersome cluster.	t in combination with o	other sites. If site still inc	luded at next sif	t assess as part of			
Network Rail :							
<u>Biodiversity</u>							
West Yorkshire Ecology and		1. 1	ry Amendment				
Supported with mitigation to procorridor function of the beck al hedgerows. A minimum 20 me	ong the southern bou	ndary and					
Natural England:							
<u>Education</u>							
Drainage/Water/Flooding							
Environment Agency Comm	Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:						
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme			
I CC Flood Risk Managemen	· <b>+-</b>						

Site Ref: 1285	Site Name:	Owlers Farm PAS	, Wide Lane, Morley
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Cyron Troveller Cit	. A	4	
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	ι	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	INO	Olkilowii
Conclusion of Asses	ement		
Conclusion of Asses	Silient		
Conclusion summary:			
The site is designated as Protect constraints.	ted Area of Search (P	AS) on the existing UDP, no	ot within the Green Belt. Good flat site, no
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 100	Floorspace sq m (I	Non residential):
Residential Conclusion:		I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green		ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 1319 Site Name: Land North of Albert Road, Morley

### **Site Details**

Northing: 428108 Area sq m: 25003.08 Ward Morley South
Easting: 427214 Area Ha: 2.500308 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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: Industry and business - Storage

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):249.83Distance to bus stop (metres)83.53Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID509

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	97.49	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?: Yes Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?: Yes

Site Type

Albert Road Morley (Morley Waste Traders)

Vehicle Dismantling and Scrap Metal

Site Ref: 1319 Site Name: Land North of Albert Road , Morley

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/123/76/	Use of vacant land for parking of trailers and stora ge of containers with 1.8m (6f t) high boundary fence.	17/02/1976	05/04/1976	R	44.82

Site Ref: 1319 Site Name: Land North of Albert Road, Morley

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 1319 Site Name: Land North of Albert Road , Morley

East Leeds

HLAA C	Conclusions					
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Medium term (6-10 y	rears)
ummary	of Infrastruct	ure provide	er comments and	d other plann	ing requiremen	ts
	y Council Highwa	ys inc Metro			_	
	ty comment Strategy standards				Rar	ık (1-5)
weets core	Strategy Standards					5
Access Co	mments				Rar	nk (1-5)
Access ava	ilable from Albert Dri	ve				5
Local netw	ork comment				Ran	nk (1-5)
Cumulative	impact with adjacent	sites				4
Mitigation	measure				Tota	al score
cumulative	imapct may require n	nitigation				14
Support?		Need to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitabilit	y for partial developm	ent:
yes with mit	tigation					
Highways	Agency					
	cumulative impact in ersome cluster.	combination wit	h other sites. If site still	included at next si	ft assess as part of	
Network R	<u>Rail :</u>					
<u>Biodiversi</u>	ty					
	hire Ecology and LO vith mitigation to prote			dary Amendment		
	Road Local Nature		the adjacent			
Natural Eng	ıland:					
<u>Education</u>						
	Water/Flooding					
Environmer	nt Agency Comment	ts:	Environme	nt Agency Constra	aints:	
Yorkshire V	Vater Comments:		Yorkshire V	Vater Waste Water	r Treatment Works Co	omme
LCC Flood	Risk Management:		I I			I

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 1319	Site Na	me: Land North of Albe	rt Road , Morley
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue S	ervices:		
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Counci	l:		
	chaeology Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Trave	ller Site Assess	ment	
Could site be eff		No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies a		No	Maybe
travellers live on site?	the (Text)		
Site:			
Proximity to hou	sed Yes	No	
gypsies and trav			
Experience of pr	evious Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		(5.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11.11
Conclusion of	Assessment		
Controlasion of	Assessment		
Conclusion summary			
the greenspace review		e section, page 37, question G14. Si	would need to be considered through te is bounded by residential
Site Capacity (dwelli	ngs units):	75 Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusi	on:	Retail Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Amber		Not assessed	Not assessed

### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428199
 Area sq m:
 72294.17
 Ward
 Morley South

 Easting:
 427888
 Area Ha:
 7.229417
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

### 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: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):928.12Distance to bus stop (metres)306.15Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID12777

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

No

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

### 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions	
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years
Summary of Infrastructure provider	r comments and other planning requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	
Accessibility comment	Rank (1
Meets Core Strategy standards with exception of lo	4
Access Comments	Rank (1
Main access achievable off Albert Lane & potential	al to link to adjacent sites 5
Local network comment	Rank (1
Cumulative impact with adjacent sites	4
	4
Mitigation measure	Total sc
Cumulative impact may require mitigation	13
Support? Need to combin	ne with other sites: Suitability for partial development:
yes with mitigation could combine wi	with adjacent sites
Highways Agency	
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with	other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of
Morley/Gildersome cluster.	
Network Rail :	
Biodiversity	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	cer: Boundary Amendment
Supported	
Natural England:	
<u>Education</u>	
Drainage/Water/Flooding	
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comm
LCC Flood Bick Management	
LCC Flood Risk Management:	

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 1320	Site Name:	Lower Moor Far	m PAS , Albert Drive, Morley
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeolog	y Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Sit	o Assassmon		
Gypsy Traveller Sil	e Assessilleli		
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	0
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		'
Conclusion of Asses	ssment		
Canalusian aummanu			
Conclusion summary:  The site is designated as Protection	ted Area of Search (F	PAS) on the existing LIDP	not within the Green Belt. The site has
good access to the highway, at			
Site Capacity (dwellings units	<b>)</b> : 190	Floorspace sq n	n (Non residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green			

### **Site Details**

Northing: 430301 Area sq m: 7737.36 Ward Beeston and Holbeck Easting: 429616 Area Ha: 0.773736 HMCA: Outer South West

### **Site Characteristics**

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2244.02Distance to bus stop (metres)77.88Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID9142

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H21/63/75/	Alterations and single storey printing and storage exten sion with compressor housing a nd cantilevered canopy to	06/02/1975	14/04/1975	Α	98.60
H21/156/83/	One non illuminated wall mount ed logo sign, size 1.45m x 1.2 0m, height above ground 5.95m (underside), one non illumi	04/08/1983	12/09/1983	Α	98.54
H21/120/82/	Alterations and extensions, to form trim extract room, and e nlarged factory area, with off ices, ventilation plant room	28/05/1982	26/07/1982	А	99.48
H21/52/89/	Alterations and addition of 2 flues to factory.	06/03/1989	30/03/1989	ND	97.97
H21/48/88/	Alterations and extension, to form fork lift trucks store , to works.	29/02/1988	18/04/1988	Α	98.88

**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	nt?		
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 barriarea and undeveloped land?	ier between existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:			
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging			
Would development of the site lead to physical connection	on of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barr development?	ier/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachme	ent		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site at	nd the existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countryside?			
Does the site include local or national conservation design	nated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerd significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	ows that are protected, or		
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 feature?	d building or other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:			
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
			7
Conformity with Core Strategy			
	an Area Extension	Brownfield	
,	tlement Extension	Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement Smaller S	Settlement Extension	Mixed	
Villages/Rural Village/Ru	ural Extension		
Development unrelated to exi	sting development		
Regeneration Priority Area:			
	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00
Leads Bradford Corridor:	000 West Leads Gatew	311.	0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusi	ons						
Availability: Medium ter	m (6-10 y	Suitability:	LDF to determ	ine ,	Achievability:	Long term	(11+ years)
Summary of Infra	structure	provide	er comment	s and otl	her plann	ing requi	rements
Leeds City Council H		ıc Metro					
Accessibility comment						i	Rank (1-5
Meets Core Strategy star	ndards						5
Access Comments						·	Rank (1-5
Access could be achieve	∍d						5
Local network comme	nt						Rank (1-5
Spare capacity in the loc	al network bu	ut some imp	pact likely				4
							4
Mitigation measure							Total sco
							14
Support?	Nee	∍d to comb	oine with other s	ites:	Suitabilit	y for partial o	development:
yes	no				n/a		
Highways Agency							
n/a							
Network Rail :							
<u>Biodiversity</u>							
West Yorkshire Ecology	y and LCC Ed	cology Offi	icer:	Boundary	Amendment		
Supported							
Natural England:							
<u>Education</u>							
Drainage/Water/Floo	ding						
Environment Agency Co			Envi	ronment Ag	ency Constra	aints:	
Yorkshire Water Comm	ents:		York	shire Water	Waste Wate	r Treatment \	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ement:						
<u>Jtilities</u>							

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Puilt Haritage			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	110	
		1	
Experience of previous	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
-	ting employment area and is consi	dered more appropriate fo	r employment use.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 28 <b>Floo</b>	rspace sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conclusion	1:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Red		Green

Site Name: 501 Dewsbury Road, LS11 5LL

Site Ref: 1325

# **Site Details**

Northing: 425250 Area sq m: 15145.06 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428494 Area Ha: 1.514506 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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 - Allotment and city farm

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3240.24 
Distance to bus stop (metres) 184.40

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 3329

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/664/78/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to ag ricultural site. (site area 2. 75ha (6.79 acres)).	11/08/1978	18/09/1978	R	98.69
H23/133/74/	Bay window to semi-detached ho use.	17/05/1974	02/07/1974	Α	55.21

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up a	reas	
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon develo	pment?	
Would development result in isolated development?		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundary)	aries with existing built up area)?	
Would development of the site effectively "round off"	the settlement pattern?:	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing area and undeveloped land?	barrier between existing urban	
Overall sprawl conclusion:		
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging		
Would development of the site lead to physical conn	ection of settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing development?	barrier/boundary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroad	chment	
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the s	ite 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, hed significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	dgerows that are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural la	ınd?	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion		
,		
Preserve the setting and special character of his	toric towns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, feature?	listed building or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this character?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Creenbert Assessment Continuation.		
Conformity with Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area Main	Urban Area Extension	Brownfield
Major Settlement Major	r Settlement Extension	Greenfield
Smaller Settlement Sma	ller Settlement Extension	Mixed
Villages/Rural Villag	ge/Rural Extension	
Development unrelated to	existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:		
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leads Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leads Catew	vav. 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:	,	Achievability:	
ummary of Infrast	ructure provider co	mments and otl	her planning requ	uirements
Leeds City Council Hig	ghways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-
	per hour. 100% of site with for secondary education, so		orimary education.	3
Access Comments				Rank (1-
Acceptable access throug	h developed part of site			5
Local network comment			·	Rank (1-
Small development - negli	gible local impact			5
				3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				13
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partia	I development:
yes				
Highways Agency				
Comment awaited				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Natural England:				
Education				
<u> Drainage/Water/Floodi</u> Environment Agency Cor		Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
	michio.			
		Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme
Yorkshire Water Commer	nts:			
Yorkshire Water Commer	nts:			
orkshire Water Commer CC Flood Risk Managen				

Site Ref:	1330B	Site Name:	Jude's Pond, Haigh I Ardsley, WF3 1EF	Moor Road, West		
Electric:						
Telecom:						
Fire and Res	scue Services:					
Built Herita	age_					
Leeds City (	Council:					
West Yorksl	hire Archaeology	Service:				
English Her	itage:					
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Ti	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t			
Could site	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe		
managed		(Text)	1.19	1110,000		
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No	Maybe		
travellers li		(Text)	<u> </u>			
Proximity to		Yes	No	No		
gypsies an	d travellers	(Text)				
	of previous	Yes	No	Unknown		
encampme	ents	(Text)				
Conclusio	on of Asses	emont				
		Silicit				
Conclusion su		t Cita Alban alamain				
hrough to site	existing settlemen  B and is part of the	t. Site A nas plannin ne same field. Resid	ng permission (snown as a lime ( ential development is considered	green site) which includes access d acceptable in principle.		
Site Capacity (	(dwellings units)	: 32	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential): 0		
Residential Co	onclusion:	Retail	l Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>		
Green						

# **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428040
 Area sq m:
 184121.71
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 422795
 Area Ha:
 18.412171
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

# 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 CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):4170.30Distance to bus stop (metres)463.32Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID8627

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

l			

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.70	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:	0.01		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

No

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/149/88/	Extension of permission for ex traction of coal by openc ast methods to existing openca st site. (previous	19/05/1988	18/07/1988	Α	63.37
H23/161/88/	Extraction of coal by opencast methods to grazing land.	21/04/1988	27/06/1988	А	17.93
23/102/93/DE	Agricultural determination to erect detached agricultural building	26/03/1993	08/07/1993	PD	34.29
H23/276/86/	Diversion of footpaths and ext raction of coal by openc ast mining and with landscapin g, to vacant and agricultur	03/10/1986	09/02/1987	Α	63.48

# 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 "rour	nd off" the settlement pattern?:	Yes			
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	isting barrier between existing urban				
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl					
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging					
Would development of the site lead to physica	connection of settlements?				
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex development?	isting barrier/boundary to contain	✓			
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging of settlements					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment				
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban area?				
Does the site provide access to the countrysid	e?	<b>✓</b>			
Does the site include local or national conserva-	ation designated areas?				
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are protected, or				
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural 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 encroa	chment			
Preserve the setting and special character of	of historic towns				
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other historical				
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	ter?:				
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:					
Development of the site would have no effect of	on the setting and special character of hist	oric features			
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Green Belt site. Development would round off which acts as a defensible boundary.	the settlement up to the A650 and be conf	tained by the major road			
Conformity with Core Strateg	Jy				
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield			
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield			
Smaller Settlement					
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension				
Development unrela	ated to existing development				
Regeneration Priority Area:		•			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00 av: 0.00			
LOOGE Brogtord Corridor:	(1 (I)) West Leads (20tows	av. 0.00			

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LE	OF to determine Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider c	comments and other plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
No Public Transport or other local services		1
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Access is only available via Southfield Farm on Field substandard in width to accommodate the level of de		peing 3
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Potential issues at the junction with the A650		4
Mitigation measure		Total score
none identified to overcome site deficiencies - level o service or local services	of development unlikely to support new	bus 8
Support? Need to combine	with other sites: Suitability	y for partial development:
no		
Highways Agency		
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with oth Morley/Gildersome cluster.	her sites. If site still included at next sit	t assess as part of
Network Rail :		
Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported		
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
Drainage/Water/Flooding	Fundament Assessed O	·into
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constra	unts:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref:	1332	Site Name:	Penfields Adwaltor	n Drighlington
000				
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herit	age			
Leeds City	Council:			
	hire Archaeology	Service:		
English Her	ritage:			
O T	harrallan Cita		4	
Gypsy _I	raveller Site	e Assessmen	τ	
	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed		(Text)		
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers I site?	ive on the	(Text)		
Site?				
Proximity t	to housed	Yes	No	
	d travellers	(Text)		
Evnerience	e of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme		(Text)	INO	Olikilowii
Conclusion	on of Asses	ement		
Conclusio	UII UI ASSES	Silient		
Conclusion s	<u> </u>			
			lement up to the A650 and be r accessibility and limited acc	contained by the major road which acts ess provision.
	, 5		•	·
Site Capacity	(dwellings units):	: 414	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential C	onclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber				, ,

# Site Details

 Northing:
 428920
 Area sq m:
 143454.03
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 423195
 Area Ha:
 14.345403
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

# 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: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3856.02 
Distance to bus stop (metres) 375.63

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 3020

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	95.09	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	4.91	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/438/78/	Demolition of existing house, and erection of new detac hed house, comprising lounge, hall, 3 bedrooms, 2 bathroom	01/06/1978	30/10/1978	Α	91.31

#### 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? **V** 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 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:** The site is unrelated to the existing settlement. Development of the site would be an isolated island and create unrestricted sprawl into the Green Belt and a precedent for further sprawl. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine Achievability: Long term	(11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider	comments and other planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
20% of the site has access to 4 buses per hour, 40° remaining 40% of the site had 0 buses per hour. The ducation, 100% of the site has access to health.		2
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Access is very poor onto Wakefield Rd - too narrov	w, very limited visibility	1
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites		4
Mitigation measure		Total scor
none identified to overcome site deficiencies - leve service or local services	el of development unlikely to support new bus	7
Support? Need to combin	ne with other sites: Suitability for partial	development:
no		
Highways Agency		
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with Morley/Gildersome cluster.	other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as	part of
Network Rail :		
Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	er: Boundary Amendment	
Supported		
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:	1 1	

# <u>Utilities</u>

Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessm	nent		
Could site be effectively	Yes		No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	·		a) 20
Would gypsies and	Yes		No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			mayac
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		1110	
Experience of previous	Yes		No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
	L			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. The site is unrel	ated to the exist	ing settlement. Dev	velopment of the site would be	pe an isolated island and
create unrestricted sprawl into the				
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 3	321 Floor	space sq m (Non residenti	al):
Residential Conclusion:	F	Retail Conclusion	: Е	mployment Conclusion:
Red				

Site Name: Pitty Close Farm, Drighlington, BD11

Site Ref: 1334

# **Site Details**

Northing: 425357 Area sq m: 20441.16 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428275 Area Ha: 2.044116 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Significant Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3045.46Distance to bus stop (metres)129.51Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID7501

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/527/78/	outline application to erect residential development to ag ricultural site (total site ar ea 5 acres).	03/07/1978	18/09/1978	R	97.53

# 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? Are these in agricultural use? Does the site contain buildings? 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area:

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.

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions						
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs	S) Suitability:	LDF to determin	e Achie	evability:	Medium tern	n (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provide	r comments	and other	planni	ng requir	ements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro					
Accessibility comment						Rank (1-5
50% of the site within the acces accessibility zone for education			00% of the site v	within the		3
Access Comments						Rank (1-5
Access achievable onto Weste	erton Road					5
Local network comment						Rank (1-5
Potential cumulative impact wi	th nearby sites					4
Mitigation measure						Total sco
						12
Support?	Need to combi	ne with other si	tes: S	Suitability	for partial de	evelopment:
yes						
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact Roadcluster.	in combination with	n other sites. If si	te still included a	at next sif	t assess as pa	art of dewsbury
Network Rail :						
Biodiversity						
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Offic	cer:	Boundary Ame	endment		
Supported						
Natural England:						
<u>Education</u>						
Drainage/Water/Flooding						
Environment Agency Comme	nts:	Enviro	onment Agency	Constra	ints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorks	hire Water Was	ste Water	Treatment W	orks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management	:					

**Utilities** 

Site Ref: 1336	Site Name:	Land at Westerton Ro	ad, west Ardsley
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	ι Service:		
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Site	e Assessmer	nt	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	140	Waybe
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site ?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	110	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
	1		
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Site	e Assessmer	nt	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Mould evening and	Vac	No	Mayba
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	INU	Maybe
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	140	Officiowit
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	tlement and resident	tial development is considered acce	ptable in principle.
one to main the existing set		acrosopment to constacted acce	Prazio ili prinicipio.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):	75 Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green		

Site Ref: 1336

Site Name: Land at Westerton Road, West Ardsley

# **Site Details**

Northing: 429314 Area sq m: 5699.50 Ward Morley North
Easting: 423094 Area Ha: 0.56995 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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

Other uses: Equestrian

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):4054.43Distance to bus stop (metres)249.08Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID392SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Protected Playing Pitch - N6:

# 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		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

0.00

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/395/91/	Outline application to erect f ive detached houses to vacan t site. (site area 0.36h a)	09/10/1991	17/12/1991	R	59.03
H23/447/88/	Change of use of coach house, to dwelling house.	15/11/1988	31/05/1989	Α	99.97

## 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: 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. The site is well contained by existing housing and road frontages and is effectively an infill site. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:

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.

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusio	ns			
Availability: Short term (0	0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infras	tructure provide	r comments and	other plannin	g requirements
Leeds City Council Hi	ghways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Meets Core Strategy stand	lards with exception of e	education		4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Access schievable from C	old Lane with some wide	ening and provision of ne	ew footways	4
Local network comment	t			Rank (1-5)
Small development unlike	ly to impact on local net	work		4
Mitigation measure				Total scor
widening of Old lane and	provision of new footway	ys		
				12
Support?	Need to combi	ne with other sites:	Suitability f	or partial development:
yes with mitigation	best combined v access improvm	with 1077 to achieve nents		
Highways Agency				
n/a				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Offic	er: Bound	dary Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Flood	<u> </u>			
Environment Agency Cor		Environmen	t Agency Constrain	ts:
Yorkshire Water Comme	nts:	Yorkshire W	ater Waste Water T	reatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manager	nent:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Site Ref: 1344	Site Name:	Westfield Farm Drighlingto	n, BD11
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Cympy Trovellor City	Accessmen	4	
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	τ	
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managed	(TOXI)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes (Text)	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
encampments	(TOXI)		
Conclusion of Asses			
Conclusion of Asses	Sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. The site is well of	contained by existing	housing and road frontages and is effective	vely an infill site.
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 17	Floorspace sq m (Non resident	ial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	imployment Conclusion:
Green			

Site Ref: 2036 Site Name: Rod Mills Lane, High Street, Morley

# **Site Details**

 Northing:
 427368
 Area sq m:
 18415.15
 Ward
 Morley South

 Easting:
 426699
 Area Ha:
 1.841515
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

# Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant & Derelict - Vacant building

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Office

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage 

☑

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 785.27 Distance to bus stop (metres) 90.44

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 1907

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: Morley

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasYesAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# UDP Designation

One and all NOO (0/)	0.00	Lishan Craan Carridar, NO (0/).	0.00
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:	1.00
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 Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

# **Planning History**

Site Ref: 2036

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
12/02066/FU	Extension to industrial building	09/05/2012	13/07/2012	AP	34.65
H23/58/92/	Laying out of roads and sewers to residential devel opment.	10/02/1992	23/04/1992	Α	18.93
H23/87/87/	Laying out of access and erect ion of a 3 storey office block, with 17 car parking spaces a nd landscaping, to vacant sit	20/03/1987	07/09/1987	Α	10.96
H23/597/89/	Alterations, including new sta ircase and to form kitch en, offices, toilets and staff room and extensionsto form li	06/12/1989	08/05/1990	Α	88.00
23/15/99/FU	Change of use of offices to dwelling house	19/01/1999	13/04/1999	Α	16.40
H23/446/90/	Laying out of access roads, an d erection of one, two- store y office building, three, 3-st orey office buildings,	02/11/1990	04/06/1991	Α	98.81
H23/146/88/	Detached stone garden store, t o rear of offices.	20/04/1988	17/10/1988	R	10.94
H23/598/89/	Listed building application to demolish part of stable block and carry out alterations, in cluding new staircase	06/12/1989	08/05/1990	Α	88.00
23/170/94/FU	2 single storey extensions to works	27/05/1994	16/09/1994	Α	13.02
H23/92/75/	Single storey wholesale and re tail tyre, battery and exhau st storage, fitting and repair depot, including fitting ar	11/02/1975	14/04/1975	R	11.71
23/234/99/FU	Change of use of offices to restaurant with hotel rooms over	27/07/1999	08/05/2000	Α	11.99
23/387/97/FU	First floor side extension to works	28/11/1997	03/06/1998	Α	16.40
H23/54/75/	Amendment to previous applicat ion foralterations, toformnew f olding doors to existing tin s tore and extension to form en	29/01/1975	17/03/1975	Α	87.13

Site Ref: 2036 Site Name: Rod Mills Lane, High Street, Morley

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 2036 Site Name: Rod Mills Lane, High Street, Morley

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

SHLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: LDF to	determine Achievat	oility: Medium term (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider com	ments and other pl	anning requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy standards		5
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Access not achievable from Fountain St. Potential off High issues	St by side of flat complex	car parking 3
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Smallish development with minimal impact		4
		-
Mitigation measure		Total scor
Access from High Street only		12
Support? Need to combine with a	other sites: Suit	ability for partial development:
yes with mitigation		
Highways Agency		
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sit Gildersome cluster.	es. If site still included at n	ext sift assess as part of Morley /
Network Rail :		
Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amend	ment
Supported		
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Co	enstraints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste	Water Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		

Site Ref:	2036	Site Name:	Rod Mills Lane, High Stre	et, Morley
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herit Leeds City	<del></del> _			
West Yorks	hire Archaeology	Service:		
English He	ritage:			
Gypsy _I	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed		(Text)		
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers l	ive on the	(Text)	<u> </u>	· · · ·
site?				
Proximity t	to housed	Yes	No	
	nd travellers	(Text)	110	
Fun aniana		Vac	Na	I linke acces
encampme	e of previous ents	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
<u> </u>				
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment		
Conclusion s	ummary:			
Site within the	urban area. Heav	ily treed. Existing mill	which we would seek to retain. Conve	rsion potential.
Site Capacity	(dwellings units)	: 66	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential C	onclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber		Red		Red

# **Site Details**

Northing: 431007 Area sq m: 116863.34 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 426844 Area Ha: 11.686334 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Utilities & Infrastructure - Cemeteries and Crematoria

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1081.25 Distance to bus stop (metres) 320.44

Nearest Railway Station Cottingley Bus Stop ID 4472

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	97.06	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 Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

No

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Yes

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H24/2/81/	Continuation of tipping, with restoration on completionto wo odland and agricultural use, to existing tipping site. (thi	06/01/1981	02/02/1981	A	98.69
H24/432/76/	Tipping & filling, to former m ineral excavation site. site area 15.05ha(37.17acres)).	10/06/1976	18/04/1977	W	97.66

## 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? **V** 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 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 of the site would lead to unrestricted urban sprawl. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:

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.

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

No frontage to adopted highway  Local network comment  Congestion on Outer Ring Road and M621  3  Mittgation measure  Needs other sites to come through with mitigation on local and strategic highway network  5  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  No  Need to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible  Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Dewsbur Acad cluster.  Network Rail: General asset protection issues Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this ormer quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland, there are saidly careful and in the north-east comer and this forms part of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential e-eds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 373 and 2114).  Natural England:  Education  Environment Agency Constraints:  Environment Agency Constraints:	availability.	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determi	ine $\mu$	Achievability:	Long term	(11+ years)
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro  Accessibility comment  Poor accessibility all round  Access Comments  No frontage to adopted highway  Local network comment  Congestion on Outer Ring Road and M621  Mitigation measure  Needs other sites to come through with mitigation on local and strategic highway network  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  No  Need to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible  Possible  Highways Agency  Ottonaid lor currulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Dewsbur Acceded Lightway is amended as per drawin face is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this former quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland. There is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms and to in miportant wildlife corridor along the railway (potential ceds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 337 and 2114).  Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are reducted and the boundary is amended as per drawin RMI/2078. Mitigation will site required to ensure addition to the state of t	ummarv	of Infrastruct	ture provide	ar comment	s and otl	oer nlann	na reau	iromonts
Access Comments No frontage to adopted highway  Access Comments  Access Comments No frontage to adopted highway  Access Comments  Rank (1-4  3  Mitigation measure Needs other sites to come through with mitigation on local and strategic highway network  Support? Need to combine with other sites: No led to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible  Access Comments  Access Comments  Rank (1-4  3  Mitigation measure Needs other sites to come through with mitigation on local and strategic highway network  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Need to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible  Access Comments  Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: Possible  Access Comments  Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: Possible  Access Comments  Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: Possible  Boundary Amendment Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are concluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing Mazer Amendment Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are suculed and the boundary is amended as per drawing Mazer Amendment Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are suculed and the boundary is amended as per drawing Mazer Habitation and the supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are suculed and the boundary is amended as per drawing Mazer Habitation and the supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are suculed and the boundary is amended as per drawing Mazer Habitation and the supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are suculed and the boundary is amended as per drawing Mazer Habitation and the supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are suculed and the boundary is amended as per drawing Mazer Habitation and the supported with mitigatio	diffillal y	or initiastruc	idic provide	or comment	s and on	ici piailii	ing requ	irements
Access Comments No frontage to adopted highway  Local network comment Congestion on Outer Ring Road and M621  Mitigation measure Needs other sites to come through with mitigation on local and strategic highway network  Support? Need to combine with other sites: No Need to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible  Metwork Rail: Detwork Yerkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this forms and of an important wildlife control and my the railway (potential eeds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 37 and 2114).  Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing and of an important wildlife control and my the railway (potential eeds Habitats are protected and enhanced i.e. 20 metre buffer around the east, south and west boundaries to protect the woodland. Needs to be assessed against Local Wildlife Sites criteria.  Detainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:			ys inc Metro					
Access Comments No frontage to adopted highway  Local network comment Congestion on Outer Ring Road and M621  3  Mitigation measure Needs other sites to come through with mitigation on local and strategic highway network  5  Support? Need to combine with other sites: No Need to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114 Possible  Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Dewsbur Road cluster.  Network Rail: Seneral asset protection issues Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this owner quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland. There is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms and of an important wildlife cordior along the railway (potential exeds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 37 and 2114).  Matural England: Education  Environment Agency Constraints:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Environment Agency Constraints:							ı	Rank (1-
No frontage to adopted highway  Local network comment Congestion on Outer Ring Road and M621  3  Mitigation measure Needs other sites to come through with mitigation on local and strategic highway network  5  Support? Need to combine with other sites: No Need to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible  Heed to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Fossible  Supports  No Need to combine with other sites: Network Rail: Seneral asset protection issues Biodiversity Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this orm quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland, here is addict grassland in the north-east corner and this forms and of an important wildfile corridor along the railway (potential exects Habitat Network or Local Wildfile Site together with site 373 and 2114).  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing adjacent habitats are protected and enhanced i.e. 20 micro and the east, south and west boundaries to protect the woodland. Needs to be assessed against Local Wildlife Sites criteria.  Seducation  Porainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	oor access	sibility all round						1
Local network comment  Congestion on Outer Ring Road and M621  Mitigation measure  Needs other sites to come through with mitigation on local and strategic highway network  5  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Need to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible  Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Dewsbur Road cluster.  Network Rail: Seneral asset protection issues  Biodiversity  Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this ormer quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland. There is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms and of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential seeds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 37 and 2114).  Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing fixed to ensure adjacent habitats are protected and enhanced i.e. 20 meters buffer around the east, south and west boundaries to protect the woodland. Needs to be assessed against Local Wildlife Sites criteria.  Burironment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:  Environment Agency Constraints:	Access Co	mments						Rank (1-
Mitigation measure  Needs other sites to come through with mitigation on local and strategic highway network  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Need to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible  Red to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible  Red to combine with other sites:  Need to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible  Red to combine with other sites:  Network Rail:  General asset protection issues  Righways Agency  Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Dewsburd data clusters.  Network Rail:  General asset protection issues  Righways Agency  Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this forms and of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential seeds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms and of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential seeds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site is 37 and 2114).  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/2078. Mitigation will still be required to ensure a signature and the seast, south and west boundaries to protect the woodland. Needs to be assessed against Local Wildlife Sites criteria.  Seducation  Porainage/Water/Flooding  Environment Agency Constraints:	No frontage	e to adopted highway	1					1
Mitigation measure  Needs other sites to come through with mitigation on local and strategic highway network  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Need to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible  Flighways Agency  Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Dewsbur Acad cluster.  Network Rail:  General asset protection issues  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this ormer quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland. There is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms and of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential each slabitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 337 and 2114).  Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/2078. Mitigation will still be required to ensure a capacity of the size of the woodland. Needs to be assessed against Local Wildlife Sites criteria.  Natural England:  Education  Environment Agency Constraints:  Environment Agency Constraints:	Local netw	ork comment					I.	Rank (1-5
Needs other sites to come through with mitigation on local and strategic highway network  5  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  No  Need to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible  Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Dewsbur Road cluster.  Network Rail: Beneral asset protection issues Biodiversity  Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this orms part of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential ceeds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 37 and 2114).  Satural England:  Education  Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	Congestion	on Outer Ring Road	and M621					2
Needs other sites to come through with mitigation on local and strategic highway network  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  Possible    Possible								3
No Need to combine with other sites: Need to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible  Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Dewsbur Road cluster.  Network Rail: General asset protection issues  Biodiversity Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this ormer quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland. There is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms and of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential 237 and 2114).  Natural England:  Education  Prainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	Mitigation i	measure						Total sco
No Need to combine with 2078, 3057, 2114  Possible    Highways Agency	Needs other	r sites to come throu	igh with mitigation	n on local and str	ategic highw	ay network		5
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Dewsbur Road cluster.  Network Rail: General asset protection issues  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this ormer quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland. There is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms part of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential leeds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site is 37 and 2114).  Batural England:  Education  Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	0						I	.11
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Dewsbur Road cluster.    Network Rail :	Support?		Need to comb	ine with other s	ites:	Suitability	for partial	aevelopment:
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Dewsbur Road cluster.  Network Rail: General asset protection issues  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this former quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland. There is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms hart of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential leeds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 37 and 2114).  Satural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:							for partial	development:
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Dewsbur Road cluster.  Network Rail: General asset protection issues  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this former quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland. There is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms part of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential leeds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 337 and 2114).  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:							for partial	development:
Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this ormer quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland. There is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms part of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential eeds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 337 and 2114).  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/2078. Mitigation will still be required to ensure adjacent habitats are protected and enhanced i.e. 20 metre buffer around the east, south and west boundaries to protect the woodland. Needs to be assessed against Local Wildlife Sites criteria.  Environment Agency Constraints:  Environment Agency Constraints:	No	Agency					for partial	development:
Mest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this ormer quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland. There is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms part of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential e.eds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 637 and 2114).  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawin RM/2078. Mitigation will still be required to ensure adjacent habitats are protected and enhanced i.e. 20 metre buffer around the east, south and west boundaries to protect the woodland. Needs to be assessed against Local Wildlife Sites criteria.  Environment Agency Constraints:	No Highways Potential for	cumulative impact ir	Need to combine	ne with 2078, 305	57, 2114	Possible	<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this cormer quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland. There is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms part of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential needs Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 337 and 2114).  Matural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/2078. Mitigation will still be required to ensure adjacent habitats are protected and enhanced i.e. 20 metre buffer around the east, south and west boundaries to protect the woodland. Needs to be assessed against Local Wildlife Sites criteria.  Environment Agency Constraints:	No  Highways  Potential for  Road cluster	cumulative impact ir	Need to combine	ne with 2078, 305	57, 2114	Possible	<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	
Not supported (RED). No site-specific designations but this ormer quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland. There is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms part of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential Leeds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 637 and 2114).  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	No  Highways  Potential for  Road cluster  Network R	cumulative impact in	Need to combine	ne with 2078, 305	57, 2114	Possible	<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	
ormer quarry has been restored to grassland and woodland. There is acidic grassland in the north-east corner and this forms part of an important wildlife corridor along the railway (potential eeds Habitat Network or Local Wildlife Site together with site 337 and 2114).  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	Highways Potential for Road cluster Network R General asse	cumulative impact in ail:	Need to combine	ne with 2078, 305	57, 2114	Possible	<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	
Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	Highways Potential for Road cluster Network R General asse	cumulative impact in r.  **Eail :  et protection issues  **Example	Need to combination with	ne with 2078, 305	57, 2114	Possible  ded at next sif	<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	
	Highways Potential for Road cluster Network R General asse Biodiversit West Yorksl Not supporte former quarr There is acid part of an im Leeds Habita	cumulative impact in f.  (ail: et protection issues  (by) hire Ecology and Leed (RED). No site-sp y has been restored dic grassland in the reportant wildlife corricat Network or Local	Need to combination with combination with ecific designation to grassland and north-east corner dor along the rails	th other sites. If sites it woodland, and this forms way (potential	Boundary Supported excluded at RM/2078. Nadjacent hametre buffe boundaries	Possible  ded at next sife at the boundary of the boundary of the boundary of the found the foun	t assess as  if Red hatc  iry is amend still be requil tected and e east, south a woodland. I	part of Dewsburg hed areas are ed as per drawir red to ensure shanced i.e. 20 nd west Needs to be
Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	Highways Potential for Road cluster Network R General asse Biodiversit West Yorks Not supporte former quarr There is acid part of an im Leeds Habits	cumulative impact in f.  Itali:  et protection issues  Ity  hire Ecology and L  ed (RED). No site-sp  y has been restored dic grassland in the r  portant wildlife corrie at Network or Local 14.	Need to combination with combination with ecific designation to grassland and north-east corner dor along the rails	th other sites. If sites it woodland, and this forms way (potential	Boundary Supported excluded at RM/2078. Nadjacent hametre buffe boundaries	Possible  ded at next sife at the boundary of the boundary of the boundary of the found the foun	t assess as  if Red hatc  iry is amend still be requil tected and e east, south a woodland. I	part of Dewsburg hed areas are ed as per drawir red to ensure shanced i.e. 20 nd west Needs to be
Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	Highways Potential for Road cluster Network R General asse Biodiversit West Yorks! West Yorks! There is acid part of an im Leeds Habita 337 and 211	cumulative impact in f.  ail: et protection issues  ty hire Ecology and Led (RED). No site-sp y has been restored dic grassland in the r portant wildlife corricat Network or Local v 4).	Need to combination with combination with ecific designation to grassland and north-east corner dor along the rails	th other sites. If sites it woodland, and this forms way (potential	Boundary Supported excluded at RM/2078. Nadjacent hametre buffe boundaries	Possible  ded at next sife at the boundary of the boundary of the boundary of the found the foun	t assess as  if Red hatc  iry is amend still be requil tected and e east, south a woodland. I	part of Dewsburg hed areas are ed as per drawir red to ensure shanced i.e. 20 nd west Needs to be
	Highways Potential for Road cluster Network R General asse Biodiversit West Yorks Not supporte former quarr There is acid part of an im Leeds Habita 337 and 211 Natural Eng	cumulative impact in f.  ail: et protection issues  ty hire Ecology and Led (RED). No site-sp y has been restored dic grassland in the r portant wildlife corricat Network or Local v 4).	Need to combination with combination with ecific designation to grassland and north-east corner dor along the rails	th other sites. If sites it woodland, and this forms way (potential	Boundary Supported excluded at RM/2078. Nadjacent hametre buffe boundaries	Possible  Amendment with mitigatior nd the bounda ditigation will sibitats are pro	t assess as  if Red hatc  iry is amend still be requil tected and e east, south a woodland. I	part of Dewsbur hed areas are ed as per drawir red to ensure enhanced i.e. 20 nd west Needs to be
Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Highways Potential for Road cluster Network R General asse Biodiversit West Yorksl Not supporte former quarr There is acid part of an im Leeds Habita 337 and 211 Natural Eng	cumulative impact in f.  (ail: et protection issues  (by) hire Ecology and Leed (RED). No site-sp y has been restored dic grassland in the reportant wildlife corrient Network or Local (4).	Need to combination with combination with ecific designation to grassland and north-east corner dor along the rails	th other sites. If sites it woodland, and this forms way (potential	Boundary Supported excluded at RM/2078. Nadjacent hametre buffe boundaries	Possible  Amendment with mitigatior nd the bounda ditigation will sibitats are pro	t assess as  if Red hatc  iry is amend still be requil tected and e east, south a woodland. I	part of Dewsbur hed areas are ed as per drawir red to ensure enhanced i.e. 20 nd west Needs to be
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Highways Potential for Road cluster Network R General asse Biodiversit West Yorks Not supporte former quarr There is acid part of an im Leeds Habits 337 and 211 Natural Eng Education Drainage/V	cumulative impact in f.  ail: et protection issues  ty hire Ecology and L ed (RED). No site-sp y has been restored dic grassland in the r portant wildlife corrie at Network or Local v 4).  yland:	Need to combination with a combination with ecific designation to grassland and north-east corner dor along the rails Wildlife Site toget	icer:  In s but this of woodland, and this forms way (potential ther with site	Boundary Supported excluded at RM/2078. Nadjacent hametre buffe boundaries assessed a	Possible  Amendment with mitigation and the bounda Mitigation will sibitats are pro r around the e to protect the gainst Local \	t assess as  if Red hatc ry is amend still be requirected and e east, south a woodland. I Vildlife Sites	part of Dewsbur hed areas are ed as per drawir red to ensure enhanced i.e. 20 nd west Needs to be
	Highways Potential for Road cluster Network R General asse Biodiversit West Yorks Not supporte former quarr There is acid part of an im Leeds Habits 337 and 211 Natural Eng Education Drainage/V	cumulative impact in f.  ail: et protection issues  ty hire Ecology and L ed (RED). No site-sp y has been restored dic grassland in the r portant wildlife corrie at Network or Local v 4).  yland:	Need to combination with a combination with ecific designation to grassland and north-east corner dor along the rails Wildlife Site toget	icer:  In s but this of woodland, and this forms way (potential ther with site	Boundary Supported excluded at RM/2078. Nadjacent hametre buffe boundaries assessed a	Possible  Amendment with mitigation and the bounda Mitigation will sibitats are pro r around the e to protect the gainst Local \	t assess as  if Red hatc ry is amend still be requirected and e east, south a woodland. I Vildlife Sites	part of Dewsbur hed areas are ed as per drawir red to ensure enhanced i.e. 20 nd west Needs to be

LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:				
<u>Utilities</u>					
Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage					
Leeds City Council:					
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:				
English Heritage:					
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessi	ment			
Could site be effectively	Yes		No		Maybe
managed	(Text)				
Would gypsies and	Yes		No		Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)				1 3
site?					
Proximity to housed	Yes			No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			140	
F			NI-		I Halin arms
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)		No		Unknown
Conclusion of Asses	sment				
Conclusion summary:					
Green Belt site. Development po			3, 3056,	4029 and 1171B	dependent on the necessary
infrastructure and link road from \	Wnitenali Road	to Gelderd Road.			
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	:	307 Floor	space s	sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion	:		Employment Conclusion:
Amber					

Site Name: North of Gelderd Road, Wortley, LS12

**Site Ref: 2078** 

# **Site Details**

Northing: 428833 Area sq m: 82374.94 Ward Middleton Park Easting: 428523 Area Ha: 8.237494 HMCA: Outer South West

#### **Site Characteristics**

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3: Retail - Shops
Other uses: Listed Building

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1681.74Distance to bus stop (metres)92.81Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID246

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:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasYesAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	97.51	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/461/81/	Laying out of access and of co ncrete and earth dam to form balancing lake with landscapin g to vacant agricultur	31/12/1981	26/01/1982	Α	15.04
H21/321/81/	Laying out of access and const ruction of concrete and earth dam, to form balancing lake, with landscaping, tovacant agr	16/12/1981	04/01/1982	W	14.84

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large bui	It up areas		
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon	development?	✓	
Would development result in isolated develop	oment?	✓	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+	boundaries with existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "rou	und off" the settlement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good e area and undeveloped land?	existing barrier between existing urban	✓	
Overall sprawl conclusion:			
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging	9		
Would development of the site lead to physic	al connection of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good edvelopment?	existing barrier/boundary to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
No merging but would significantly reduce the	e green belt gap		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from e	encroachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	en the site and the existing urban area?	$\checkmark$	
Does the site provide access to the countrysi	de?	✓	
Does the site include local or national conser	vation designated areas?	✓	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tresignificant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	ees, hedgerows that are protected, or	✓	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricu	iltural land?	✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	on		
The site performs an important role safeguare	<del>_</del>		
Preserve the setting and special character			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	n area, listed building or other historical	✓	
If yes, could development preserve this chara	acter?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:			
Development of the site would have a signific	cant effect on the setting and special charac	cter of historic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Isolated site that doesn't connect to urban are road and railway line which reduces potential		ts but is contained by	
Conformity with Core Strate	egy		-
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed	
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension		
Development unre	elated to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	av:	0.00

East Leeds

SHLAA C	conclusions						
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to d	etermine	Achievability:	Long term (	11+ years)
Summary	of Infrastructu	re provide	er comn	nents ar	d other plann	ing requi	rements
Leeds City	/ Council Highways	s inc Metro					
Accessibili	y comment						Rank (1-5)
	access to 4 buses per ervices - improvements					ary and	4
Access Co	mments						Rank (1-5)
	e potential for a left in le o the southern White F			ry Road to	the north of the site	and a	4
Local netw	ork comment					'	Rank (1-5)
Congested	local network and mitig	ation may be i	required				2
							3
Mitigation	measure						Total score
Pedestrian	access measures to co	orss Dewsbury	Road				11
Support?		Need to comb	ine with o	ther sites:	Suitabilit	y for partial o	levelopment:
yes with mit	igation						
<u>Highways</u>	Agency						
Potential for Road cluster	cumulative impact in c	ombination wit	h other site	es. If site st	ill included at next s	ift assess as p	art of Dewsbury
Network R	ail: et protection issues						
	•						
Biodiversi	<del></del>	`		Davi			
Not supporte together with corridor fund Network). No	hire Ecology and LCC ed (RED). Acidic grassl a scrub and tree cover tion along the railway ( eeds to be considered ogical and Geological I	and covers mo and providing a potential Leed against Local \	ost of this s a wildlife s Habitat Wildlife Site	ite, Pote	ndary Amendment		be assessed.
Natural Eng	land:						
Education							
Drainage/\	Vater/Flooding						
Environmer	nt Agency Comments	:		Environme	ent Agency Constr	aints:	
Yorkshire V	/ater Comments:			Yorkshire	Water Waste Wate	r Treatment V	Vorks Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref: 2095	Site Name:	Stank Hall Barn, Beeste	on, LS11
Utilities Gas: Electric: Telecom: Fire and Rescue Services: Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	ited and is identified a	area status covers much of the site. as green infrastructure in the Core S I to the existing settlement form.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 72	Floorspace sq m (Non res	sidential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

# **Site Details**

Northing: 427721 Area sq m: 59153.43 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428836 Area Ha: 5.915343 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1911.00Distance to bus stop (metres)258.19Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID11306SFRA Flood Zone:1.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 1.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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

# Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built	ilt up areas		
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon	development?		
Would development result in isolated develop	oment?	✓	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+	boundaries with existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "ro	und off" the settlement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	existing barrier between existing urban	✓	
Overall sprawl conclusion:			
High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging	g		
Would development of the site lead to physic	al connection of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?	existing barrier/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
No merging but would significantly reduce the	e green belt gap		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from e	encroachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	en the site and the existing urban area?	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site provide access to the countrys	ide?	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site include local or national conser	· ·		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tre significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	ees, hedgerows that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricu	ıltural land?	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>on</u>		
The site performs an important role safeguar	ding countryside from encroachment		
Preserve the setting and special character	r of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservatio feature?	n area, listed building or other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this chara-	acter?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:			
Development of the site would have no effect	t on the setting and special character of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Isolated site set between Morley and Middlet the settlements.	on. Potential for further sprawl and would re	educe the gap between	
Conformity with Core Strate	egy		
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed	
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension		
·	elated to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:	0.00		0.00
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	rov:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay.	0.00

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions						
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDI	F to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ years)					
Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements						
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro						
Accessibility comment	Rank (1-5					
The site has access to 4 buses per hour, 80% of the si 45% to primary and secondary education	ite to employment, 40% to primary health and 4					
Access Comments						
Access via an exisitng access onto Dewsbury Road	5					
Local network comment	Rank (1-5					
Spare capacity but cumulative issues	4					
Mitigation measure	Total sco					
	13					
Support? Need to combine w	with other sites: Suitability for partial development:					
yes						
Highways Agency						
Network Rail :						
Biodiversity						
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment					
Not supported (RED). No site-based designations but the Phase 1 Habitat map shows this site as Lowland acid gwhich may be UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority habit Mill Beck runs along the west side of the site and may water Voles. This site needs assessing before a decisitaken to allocate it. It may meet Local Wildlife Site crite	grassland tat quality. support ion is					
would probably form part of the Leeds Habitat Network						
Natural England:						
<u>Education</u>						
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u> Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:					
Zimioni Agono, Comments.						
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme					

Site Ref: 2096	Site Name:	west wood Road, Midd	lleton, LS10
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:		
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Site	e Assessment	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		

# **Conclusion of Assessment**

Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site, between Morley and Middleton. Separated from the urban area with no connections to either settlement (Morley or Middleton). The land is steeply sloping. Release of the site would represent an island of development in the Green Belt gap between Morley and Middleton, totally unrelated to the existing settlement.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 103 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red Not assessed Not assessed

# **Site Details**

 Northing:
 427071
 Area sq m:
 12082.84
 Ward
 Middleton Park

 Easting:
 429716
 Area Ha:
 1.208284
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

# 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 CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2939.88Distance to bus stop (metres)111.83Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID5297

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.94	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

# 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: 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 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:** Strong links to urban area. Would round off settlement. No defensible boundary to south which may lead to further sprawl. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area:

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.

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provider c	omments and other planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Meets accessibility criteria			4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Only vehicular access seems teast would be vital	o be from Thorpe Gartl	h. Pedestrian and cycle links to the north and	4
Local network comment		·	Rank (1-5
Small development - negligible	local impact		
			4
Mitigation measure		l	Total sco
			12
Support?	Need to combine v	with other sites: Suitability for partial	development:
yes			
Highways Agency			
Likely to require significant phys	sical mitigation		
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	<b>Boundary Amendment</b>	
Supported			
Natural England:			
raturur England.			
<b>Education</b>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comme	nts:	<b>Environment Agency Constraints:</b>	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management	:		
<u>Utilities</u>			

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy Traveller Site			
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
manageu	(12.1.)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. Original SHLAA Development of this site would co			well to the existing residential area.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 38	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Green	Not a	assessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Sissons Farm, Middleton, LS10

Site Ref: 2098A

# **Site Details**

Northing: 427436 Area sq m: 267934.82 Middleton Park Ward 429206 Easting: Area Ha: 26.793482 HMCA: Outer South West

# Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Residential - Dwellings Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Natural Landscape:

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Existing well defined

Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2339.12 Distance to bus stop (metres) 377.76 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 4379

Significant Tree Cover

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.98	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:	12.65	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)

No

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

No

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

_	·	•	
Check the unrestricted sprawl of large buil	t up areas	_	
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon of	development?	<u> </u>	
Would development result in isolated develop	ment?	<b>✓</b>	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+	boundaries with existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "rou	nd off" the settlement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good e area and undeveloped land?	xisting barrier between existing urban	<b>V</b>	
Overall sprawl conclusion:			
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging			
Would development of the site lead to physical	al connection of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good e development?	xisting barrier/boundary to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
No merging but would significantly reduce the	green belt gap		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from e	ncroachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	n the site and the existing urban area?	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site provide access to the countrysic	•	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site include local or national conserv			
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	· ·	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricul	tural land?	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?	<u>~</u>	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	ū		
The site performs an important role safeguard	_		
	•		
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this chara	cter?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:			
Development of the site would have no effect	on the setting and special character of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Majority of site isolated from main urban area potential for further sprawl. However, site wou settlements.			
Conformity with Coro Strata	av.		
Conformity with Core Strate	97		
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed	
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension		
Development unre	lated to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00
Loade Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leads Catew	(3)/.	0.00

East Leeds

Availability:	Suitability:	۸۵	hievability:	
Summary of Infras	tructure provider com	ments and other	er planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Does not meet all accessi	bility criteria			3
Access Comments			'	Rank (1-5)
Only vehicular access se east would be vital	ems to be from Thorpe Lane. P	edestrain and cycle lin	ks to the north and	3
Local network commen	t		, i	Rank (1-5)
Development of this size	is likely to require mitigation on	local network		4
Mitigation measure				Total score
				10
Support?	Need to combine with	other sites:	Suitability for partial of	development:
yes with mitigation			MUST confirm ped / cy north and west	cle links to east,
Highways Agency Likely to require significan	nt physical mitigation			
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
		Boundary A	mendment	
West Yorkshire Ecology Not supported (RED). No Phase 1 Habitat map show which may be UK Biodive Mill Beck runs along the w Water Voles. This site new taken to allocate it. It may	site-based designations but the ws this site as Lowland acid grassity Action Plan priority habitate exest side of the site and may supeds assessing before a decision meet Local Wildlife Site criteria of the Leeds Habitat Network.	1990 Supported wi excluded and quality. as per drawir port required to ei is within the site	th mitigation if Red hatch d the boundary is substar ng RM/2098. Mitigation w nsure hedgerows and wo e, and adjacent habitats	ntially amended rill still be noded areas
West Yorkshire Ecology Not supported (RED). No Phase 1 Habitat map show which may be UK Biodive Mill Beck runs along the w Water Voles. This site new taken to allocate it. It may	site-based designations but the ws this site as Lowland acid gras rsity Action Plan priority habitat west side of the site and may supeds assessing before a decision meet Local Wildlife Site criteria	1990 Supported wi excluded and quality. as per drawir port required to ei is within the site	I the boundary is substar ng RM/2098. Mitigation w nsure hedgerows and wo	ntially amended rill still be noded areas
West Yorkshire Ecology Not supported (RED). No Phase 1 Habitat map show which may be UK Biodive Mill Beck runs along the w Water Voles. This site nee taken to allocate it. It may would probably form part	site-based designations but the ws this site as Lowland acid gras rsity Action Plan priority habitat west side of the site and may supeds assessing before a decision meet Local Wildlife Site criteria	1990 Supported wi excluded and quality. as per drawir port required to ei is within the site	I the boundary is substar ng RM/2098. Mitigation w nsure hedgerows and wo	ntially amended rill still be noded areas
West Yorkshire Ecology Not supported (RED). No Phase 1 Habitat map show which may be UK Biodive Mill Beck runs along the w Water Voles. This site new taken to allocate it. It may would probably form part of Natural England:	site-based designations but the ws this site as Lowland acid gras rsity Action Plan priority habitat west side of the site and may supeds assessing before a decision meet Local Wildlife Site criteria	1990 Supported wi excluded and quality. as per drawir port required to ei is within the site	I the boundary is substar ng RM/2098. Mitigation w nsure hedgerows and wo	ntially amended rill still be noded areas
West Yorkshire Ecology Not supported (RED). No Phase 1 Habitat map show which may be UK Biodive Mill Beck runs along the w Water Voles. This site new taken to allocate it. It may would probably form part of Natural England:	site-based designations but the ws this site as Lowland acid grassity Action Plan priority habitat vest side of the site and may supeds assessing before a decision meet Local Wildlife Site criteria of the Leeds Habitat Network.	1990 Supported wi excluded and quality. as per drawir port required to ei is within the site	I the boundary is substar ng RM/2098. Mitigation w nsure hedgerows and wo	ntially amended rill still be noded areas
West Yorkshire Ecology Not supported (RED). No Phase 1 Habitat map show which may be UK Biodive Mill Beck runs along the w Water Voles. This site nee taken to allocate it. It may would probably form part of Natural England:  Education	site-based designations but the ws this site as Lowland acid gras rsity Action Plan priority habitat of vest side of the site and may suppeds assessing before a decision meet Local Wildlife Site criteria of the Leeds Habitat Network.	1990 Supported wi excluded and quality. as per drawir port required to ei is within the site	I the boundary is substaring RM/2098. Mitigation was ure hedgerows and words, and adjacent habitats and adjacent habitats.	ntially amended rill still be noded areas

Site Ref:	2098B	Site Name:	Sissons	Farm	, Middleton, L	_S10
LCC Flood	Risk Management	t:				
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:						
Electric:						
Telecom:						
Fire and Re	scue Services:					
Built Herita	age					
Leeds City (	Council:					
West Yorks	hire Archaeology	Service:				
English Her	itage:					
Current T	novellen Cite		4			
Gypsy _I	raveller Site	e Assessmen	τ			
	be effectively	Yes		No		Maybe
managed		(Text)				
Would gyp		Yes		No		Maybe
travellers li	ive on the	(Text)				
Site?						
Proximity t	o housed	Yes			No	
gypsies an	d travellers	(Text)				
Experience	e of previous	Yes		No		Unknown
encampme		(Text)				•
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment				
Conclusion su	ımmary:					
						part is situated between the
existing and dis	sused rallway emb	ankments, making d	evelopment ve	егу аппсі	JIT.	
Site Capacity	(dwellings units):	703	Floor	space s	q m (Non resident	ial):
Residential Co	onclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion	:	E	Employment Conclusion:
Red			ssessed			Not assessed

# **Site Details**

Northing: 427182 Area sq m: 70080.69 Ward Middleton Park Easting: 429504 Area Ha: 7.008069 HMCA: Outer South West

# 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 CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2702.38Distance to bus stop (metres)256.56Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID12840SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.88	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:	0.14	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

# 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 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:** Site links well to settlement. Provides access to countryside and may put pressure on limited amount of further sprawl. However, this would only be marginal as railway tracks to the west provide a defensible boundary. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:

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.

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions	s			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider comr	nents and o	ther planning req	uirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment	avitavia			Rank (1-5)
does not meet all accessibility	chiena			3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
only vehicular access seems be vital	to be from Thorpe Lane. Pec	I / cycle links to th	e north and east would	3
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
development of this size is like	ely to require mitigation on loc	cal network		4
Mitigation measure				Total scor
				10
				10
Support?	Need to combine with o	other sites:	Suitability for partic	al development:
yes with mitigation			MUST confirm ped /	cycle links to east,
			north and west	
Highways Agency				
Likely to require significant phy	ysical mitigation			
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and		11	y Amendment	
Not supported (RED). Includes LNA together with important wadjacent to ancient woodland of Wood.	ildlife corridor within the site a	e e excluded as per dra required t	d with mitigation if Red ha and the boundary is subs awing RM/2098. Mitigation to ensure hedgerows and	tantially amended n will still be wooded areas
		enhanced	site, and adjacent habita d.	is are protected an
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comme		Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water Treatme	nt 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.

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref: 2098C	Site Name:	Sissons Fa	rm, Middleton, L	S10
Utilities Gas: Electric: Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:	CCI VICC.			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Proximity to housed	Yes (Text)		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes (Text)	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. Original SHLAA settlement than B. It is identified	submission split into for housing on the d	Site C is situat raft Belle Isle and I	ed between A and B and Middleton Neighbourhoo	relates better to the d Framework.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 184	Floorspac	ce sq m (Non residentia	ıl):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	Er	mployment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	ssessed	No	ot assessed

# **Site Details**

Northing: 426876 Area sq m: 31094.57 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428420 Area Ha: 3.109457 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

# Land Use

Existing Use 1: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3:

Natural Landscape:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1905.69 Distance to bus stop (metres) 309.98

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 8422

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Significant Tree Cover

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	98.32	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	1.68	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		

No

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/320/82/	Landscaping, gate and boundary fence to former refuse tip. (this item is also notice unde r regulation 4(1) ofthe town a	19/10/1982	15/11/1982	Α	86.54

# Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

chica and chicago spiral of large same up arous			
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	n existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settle	ement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier barea and undeveloped land?	etween existing urban		
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	f settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/b development?	ooundary to contain		
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	ne existing urban area?	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site provide access to the countryside?			
Does the site include local or national conservation designate			
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	that are protected, or	✓	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?		✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	e these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion			
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding to	he countryside from encroach	nment	
Preserve the setting and special character of historic too	vns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed bu feature?	ilding or other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this character?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:			
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting a	and special character of histor	ric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Isolated site that does not link to the urban area. High potent separation of settlements.	ial for further sprawl to east w	hich reduce	
Conformity with Core Strategy			
Main Urban Area Main Urban A	Area Extension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement Major Settlen	nent Extension	Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settle	ement Extension	Mixed	
Villages/Rural Village/Rural	Extension		
Development unrelated to existing	g development		
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00
Leads Bradford Corridor: 0.00	WAST LADGE LISTON	r·	1 1 1 1 1 1

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions						
Availability: Short term (0-5yr	rs) Suitability:	LDF to det	termine	Achievabilit	y: Long to	erm (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastru	cture provide	er comm	ents and c	other plan	ning re	quirements
Leeds City Council Highy	ways inc Metro					
Accessibility comment						Rank (1-5)
Good public transport but site	severed from local	facilities by i	motorway			2
Access Comments						Rank (1-5)
Poor access opportunity from	A653					2
Local network comment						Rank (1-5)
Spare capacity but cumulative	sissues					4
Mitigation measure						Total scor
						8
Support?	Need to comb	ine with oth	ner sites:	Suitabi	lity for par	tial development:
110						
Highways Agency						
Potential for cumulative impac Road cluster	t in combination wit	h other sites	. If site still inc	cluded at next	sift assess	as part of Dewsbury
Network Rail :						
Biodiversity						
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Offi	icer:	Bounda	ry Amendme	nt	
Not supported (RED). No site- an area of Lowland mixed dec Biodiversity Action Plan priority woodland would not fit with the	iduous woodland a y habitat. Removal e objective of increa	UK of this area on sing the	of			
woodland cover in Leeds as se Natural England:	et out in the draft co	ore strategy.				
<u>Education</u>						
Drainage/Water/Flooding						
Environment Agency Commo			Environment A	Agency Cons	traints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:			orkshire Wat	er Waste Wa	ter Treatm	ent Works Comme

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref: 2099	Site Name:	Dunningley Hill, Tir	ngley, WF3
Utilities Gas: Electric: Telecom: Fire and Rescue Services Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeole English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller S	ite Assessmen	it	
Could site be effective	ly Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		Maybo
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	INU	liviaybe
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers			
Experience of previous encampments	(Text)	No	Unknown
Conclusion of Ass	essment		
Conclusion summary:			
existing UDP and the motorwa	ay. Release of the site v	would result in an isolated islar	ed Area of Search (PAS) site on the and of development, unrelated to the accessibility and poor access options.
Site Capacity (dwellings uni	its): 82	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	assessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 2100B Site Name: Playing Fields Throstle Lane, Middleton, LS10

# **Site Details**

Northing: 427263 Area sq m: 22732.60 Ward Middleton Park Easting: 430211 Area Ha: 2.27326 HMCA: Outer South West

# Site Characteristics

# Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3354.40Distance to bus stop (metres)88.37Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID3877

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	92.82	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

Site Ref: 2100B Site Name: Playing Fields Throstle Lane, Middleton, LS10

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H21/175/81/	Laying out of childrens play a rea with footpath and kicka bout area and with landscaping to public open space and	17/06/1981	03/08/1981	A	91.77

Site Ref: 2100B Site Name: Playing Fields Throstle Lane, Middleton, LS10

# 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: 0.00

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.

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Site Ref: 2100B Site Name: Playing Fields Throstle Lane, Middleton, LS10

East Leeds

Gas:

variability: Suitability: Achievability:  ummary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning re- eeds City Council Highways inc Metro accessibility comment accessibility  Access Comments Good access options  Access Comments  Good access options  Access Comment  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for par access  Inghways Agency  Comment awaited  Seletwork Rail:  Indiciversity  Fest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment  Support: Boundary Amendment  Access Comments  Support: Suitability for par access Comments  Suitability for par access Comments  Support: Suit	
eeds City Council Highways inc Metro accessibility comment access Comments Good access options  Access Comments Good access options  Access Comment Spare local capacity  Mitigation measure  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for par ares  Suitability for par access  Sui	
Access Comments Good access options  Access Comments Good access options  Cocal network comment Spare local capacity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Indipersity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Indipersity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Indipersity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Indipersity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Indipersity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Indipersity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Indipersity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Indipersity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Indipersity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Indipersity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Indipersity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Indipersity  Mitigation measure  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Support Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Support Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Support Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Support Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Support Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Support Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Support Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Support Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for pares  Support Need to combine with other sites: Suitab	quirements
Access Comments Good access options  Local network comment Spare local capacity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for parties  Indighways Agency Comment awaited  Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for parties  Indighways Agency Comment awaited  Neet Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment  Indighways Agency  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for parties  Indighways Agency  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for parties  Indighways Agency  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for parties  Indighways Agency  Mitigation measure  Support? Suitability for parties	Donk (4. b
Access Comments Good access options  Local network comment Spare local capacity  Mitigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for par  res  Lighways Agency  omment awaited letwork Rail:  Liodiversity  Mest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment  atural England:  ducation  Mainage/Water/Flooding  nvironment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	Rank (1-5
Cocal network comment  Spare local capacity  Writigation measure  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for par local capacity  Wres Support Suitability for par local capacity  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for par local capacity  Wres Suitability for par local capacity  Wrest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment  Wrainage/Water/Flooding  Normalized Suitability for par local capacity  Wreat Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment  Wrainage/Water/Flooding  Normalized Suitability for par local capacity  Writing Suitability for par local capacity  Wreat Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment  Wrainage/Water/Flooding  Normalized Suitability for par local capacity  Writing Suitability for par local	4
Cocal network comment Spare local capacity  Writigation measure  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for parties  Suitability for parti	Rank (1-5
Mitigation measure  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for par  Ves  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for par  Ves  Suitability for par  Suitability for par  Ves  Suitability for par  Suitability for par  Suitability for par  Suitability for par  Ves  Suitability for par  S	4
Mitigation measure  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for par  Ves  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for par  Ves  Suitability for par  Suitability for par  Ves  Suitability for par  Suitability for par  Suitability for par  Suitability for par  Ves  Suitability for par  S	D1- (4.4
Mitigation measure  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for par  Yes  Suitability for par  Suitability for par  Yes  Suitability for par  Yes  Suitability for par  Suitability for par  Suitability for par  Yes  Suitability for par  Suitability for p	Rank (1-5
Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for par  Ves	5
lighways Agency omment awaited letwork Rail: liodiversity //est Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment atural England: ducation  Vrainage/Water/Flooding nvironment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	Total sco
lighways Agency omment awaited letwork Rail: liodiversity //est Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment atural England: ducation  Vrainage/Water/Flooding nvironment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	13
lighways Agency omment awaited letwork Rail: liodiversity //est Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment atural England: ducation  Vrainage/Water/Flooding nvironment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	tial development:
lighways Agency omment awaited letwork Rail: liodiversity //est Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment atural England: ducation  trainage/Water/Flooding nvironment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	iai developilierit.
Interpretation in the image of	
ducation  Prainage/Water/Flooding nvironment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	
Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  atural England:  ducation  Vrainage/Water/Flooding nvironment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	
Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  atural England:  ducation  Vrainage/Water/Flooding nvironment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	
atural England:  ducation  Prainage/Water/Flooding Invironment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	
ducation  Prainage/Water/Flooding nvironment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	
ducation  Prainage/Water/Flooding nvironment Agency Comments:  Environment Agency Constraints:	
Prainage/Water/Flooding nvironment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	
nvironment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	
nvironment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	
nvironment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	
Orkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatm	
Orkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatm	
Sind-ind trate. Sommend.	ent Works Comme
CC Flood Risk Management:	
<u>tilities</u>	

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	/ Service:		
English Heritage:	, oci vioc.		
Liigiisii Heritage.			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Sit	e Assessmer	nt	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	-	, ,
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	110	iviaybe
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Everyiones of provious	Vaa	No	Linksons
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
onoumpmonto			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
			UDP. As it is in a fairly densely built up See also greenspace section, page 37,
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	): 125	Floorspace sq m (N	lon residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	ail Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not a	assessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Playing Fields Throstle Lane, Middleton, LS10

Site Ref: 2100B

# **Site Details**

Northing: 426951 Area sq m: 118446.45 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 432865 Area Ha: 11.844645 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 3: Other

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: Local Nature Area on part of site

Site State: Greenfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 4490.38 Distance to bus stop (metres) 259.94 Nearest Railway Station Woodlesford Bus Stop ID 8437 SFRA Flood Zone: 1.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 1.00 Agricultural Land Class: 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

The site is a mix of disused land, agriculture and a Local Nature Area. Historically a railway ran through the site along the western boundary. The remains of this line split the site, by changing the levels on the western side. Access comes from the southern boundary which has a road frontage, however, the site dips down from here and is not ideal. The Local Nature Area is set to the north.

# **UDP** Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	72.07	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:	11.48	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H22/216/80/	Landscaping including reclamat ion, of derelict railw ay line, and shale heap. (this item	30/05/1980	07/07/1980	Α	47.33
H22/148/79/	Landscaping including reclamat ion, of derelict railway line, quarry and shale heap. (this item is also notice und	06/04/1979	21/11/1979	W	61.52

# 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 settlem	nents?					
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary development?	y to contain					
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 existi	ng urban area?					
Does the site provide access to the countryside?	$\checkmark$					
Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas	s? <b>✓</b>					
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	protected, or					
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	$\checkmark$					
Does the site contain buildings?	in agricultural use?					
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion						
The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from er	ncroachment					
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns						
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or feature?	r other historical					
If yes, could development preserve this character?:						
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:						
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and spec	cial character of historic features					
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Development of the site would cross the disused railway line that run strong defensible boundary that if breached could result in a high pot						
Conformity with Core Strategy						
Comornity with core strategy						
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Exte	biowilleid _					
Major Settlement Major Settlement Exte	Greenhold					
Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed						
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension						
Development unrelated to existing develo	ppment					
Regeneration Priority Area:	A:	200				
Inner South Leeds: 0.00		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 com	nments and other planning requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	
Accessibility comment	Rank (1-5)
The site has access to 4 buses per hour. All of the site me employment, primary & secondary education, 15% of the s	
Access Comments	Rank (1-5)
visibility looks poor onto Leeds Road due to limited site from the state of the sta	rontage 2
Local network comment	Rank (1-5)
cumulative issues	4
Mitigation measure	Total score
Major works required possibly new signaled junction	10
Support? Need to combine with	other sites: Suitability for partial development:
yes with mitigation	
Highways Agency n/a Network Rail: Biodiversity	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment
Not supported (RED). Includes part of Rothwell Pastures L and some naturally regenerating habitats.	Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per drawing RM/2104. Mitigation will still be required to ensure adjacent habitats and the wildlife corridor function of the disused railway are protected and enhanced.
Natural England:	
Education	
Drainage/Water/Flooding	
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:
The vast majority of this site is in flood zone 1 (low risk). The area immediately adjacent to West beck is classified as flood zone 3 and should be avoided. Any site specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must investigate the small unnamed watercourse that flows along the eastern boundary as a source of flood risk. The development layout plan must be amended accordingly.	FZ 2 & 3
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Site Ref: 2104 Site Name: Leeds Road Lofthouse, WF3 Surface water sewer runs along the western boundary Lemonroyd 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 Yes No Maybe (Text) managed Would gypsies and No Yes Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? Yes Proximity to housed No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown encampments (Text) Gypsy \_Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively No Yes Maybe managed (Text) Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? Proximity to housed Yes No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown encampments (Text)

# **Conclusion of Assessment**

# Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Development of the site would cross the disused railway line that runs along the western boundary. This is a strong defensible boundary that if breached could result in a high potential for further sprawl into the Green Belt. There is a Local Nature Area in the northern section. The southern section is also reserved for a potential new school site in the existing UDP. We are consulting Education on all sites and any comments received will be considered before making final decisions on sites.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 297 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red Not assessed Not assessed

# **Site Details**

Northing: 425437 Area sq m: 18046.53 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 429582 Area Ha: 1.804653 HMCA: Outer South West

# Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Agriculture

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Vacant & Derelict - Vacant building

Neighbouring Use 2: Community Services

Neighbouring Use 3: Agriculture

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

# Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3738.79 Distance to bus stop (metres) 213.86

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 1751

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	99.96		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/94/89/	Use of agricultural land as pl aying fields. (this item is also notice under reg ulation 4(1) of the town and c	28/02/1989	08/11/1990	W	64.97
H23/656/78/	Alterations to form new emerge ncy exit to hostel. (this item is also notice under reg ulation 4 (1) of thetown and c	09/08/1978	18/09/1978	A	32.09

# 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	of settlements?						
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/development?	/boundary to contain						
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	•						
Does the site provide access to the countryside?	$\checkmark$						
Does the site include local or national conservation designate	ted areas?						
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s that are protected, or						
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	$\checkmark$						
Does the site contain buildings?	re 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 to	wns						
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed be feature?	uilding or other historical						
If yes, could development preserve this character?:							
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:							
Development of the site would have marginal effect on the s	setting & special character of historic features, which c						
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:							
Strong links to settlement but there is no defensible bounda	ry which could result in further sprawl.						
Conformity with Core Strategy							
Main Urban Area Main Urban	Area Extension Brownfield						
Major Settlement Major Settler	ment Extension Greenfield						
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement	lement Extension Mixed						
Villages/Rural Village/Rural	I Extension						
Development unrelated to existing	ng development						
Regeneration Priority Area:							
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	) Aire Valley:	0.00					
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	) West Leeds Gateway:	0.00					

East Leeds

Gas:

The site has access to 3 buses per hour, no education and 80% of the site falls within the core strategy standards for health.  Access Comments  Site appears to be landlocked. Narrow access through health centre or via unnamed road leading to training centre  Local network comment  Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites	
Accessibility comment The site has access to 3 buses per hour, no education and 80% of the site falls within the core strategy standards for health.  Access Comments Site appears to be landlocked. Narrow access through health centre or via unnamed road leading to training centre  Local network comment Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites  Mitigation measure None identified to overcome site deficiencies - level of development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development  Access Comments Ra  Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites  Mitigation measure None identified to overcome site deficiencies - level of development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development  Activork Rail :  Biodiversity Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment  Supported  Latural England:  Calinage/Water/Flooding	rs)
Accessibility comment The site has access to 3 buses per hour, no education and 80% of the site falls within the core strategy standards for health.  Access Comments Ra  Site appears to be landlocked. Narrow access through health centre or via unnamed road leading to training centre  Local network comment Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites  Mitigation measure None identified to overcome site deficiencies - level of development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development  Idighways Agency  Valetwork Rail:  Biodiversity Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment  Bupported  Dirainage/Water/Flooding	nts
The site has access to 3 buses per hour, no education and 80% of the site falls within the core strategy standards for health.  Access Comments  Site appears to be landlocked. Narrow access through health centre or via unnamed road leading to training centre  Local network comment  Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites  Mitigation measure  None identified to overcome site deficiencies - level of development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development and development a	
Access Comments  Site appears to be landlocked. Narrow access through health centre or via unnamed road leading to training centre  Local network comment Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites  Mitigation measure None identified to overcome site deficiencies - level of development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development  Action Rail:  Siddiversity Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Jatural England:  Education	nk (1-
Site appears to be landlocked. Narrow access through health centre or via unnamed road leading to training centre  Local network comment Ra Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites  Mitigation measure To None identified to overcome site deficiencies - level of development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development and development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus services or local services  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus services or local s	3
Local network comment  Ra  Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites  Mitigation measure  None identified to overcome site deficiencies - level of development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development  Mitighways Agency  Agetwork Rail:  Siodiversity  Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Matural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	nk (1-
Mitigation measure  None identified to overcome site deficiencies - level of development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus services or local services  Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus services or local services  Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus services or local services  Support?  Boundary Amendment supported  Supported  Drainage/Water/Flooding	2
Mitigation measure  None identified to overcome site deficiencies - level of development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus services  Suitability for partial development development unlikely to support new bus services  Suitability for partial development d	nk (1-
None identified to overcome site deficiencies - level of development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development unlikely to support new bus service or local services  Suitability for partial development development unlikely to support new bus services or local services  Suitability for partial development development unlikely to support new bus services or local services  Suitability for partial development	4
Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development  Highways Agency  Age	tal sco
Alighways Agency  //a  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Drainage/Water/Flooding	9
Highways Agency  I/a  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Idatural England:  Education  Orainage/Water/Flooding	nent:
Network Rail:  Biodiversity Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Intural England:  Education  Orainage/Water/Flooding	
Network Rail:  Biodiversity Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Boundary Amendment  Supported  Iditural England:  Education  Orainage/Water/Flooding	
Biodiversity  Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Jatural England:  Education  Orainage/Water/Flooding	
Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Jatural England:  Education  Orainage/Water/Flooding	
Supported  Satural England:  Education  Orainage/Water/Flooding	
latural England: Education  Orainage/Water/Flooding	
Education  Orainage/Water/Flooding	
Drainage/Water/Flooding	
Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:  Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works C	omme
.CC Flood Risk Management:	
Jtilities .	

Site Ref: 2105	Site Name:	WF3	ning Centre, Tingley,			
Electric:						
Telecom:						
Fire and Rescue Services:						
Built Heritage						
Leeds City Council:						
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:					
English Heritage:						
o T II O'	_					
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t				
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe			
managed	(Text)					
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe			
travellers live on the	(Text)	1112	11111/1111			
site?						
Drawinsity to have a	Vac	Nia				
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No				
gypolos and navonolo	,					
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown			
encampments	(Text)					
Conclusion of Assessment						
Conclusion summary:						
Green Belt site, well related to the existing settlement and would make a good extension, linking with new development proposals for the vacant care home. Whilst the site could be developed without significant harm to the Green Belt it is currently designated in the existing UDP as N6 - Protected Playing Pitch. It hasn't been used a playing pitch for some considerable time, but an assessment needs to be undertaken to establish whether it is indeed surplus before any allocation. See also greenspace section, page 38, question G16. Highways concerns re access.						
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 49	Floorspace sq m (Non res	idential):			
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:			
Amber	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed			

# **Site Details**

Northing: 430734 Area sq m: 19156.52 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 426915 Area Ha: 1.915652 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest
Existing Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Existing Use 3: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 1 Utilities & Infrastructure - Cemeteries and Crematoria

Neighbouring Use 2: Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 812.57 Distance to bus stop (metres) 143.73

Nearest Railway Station Cottingley Bus Stop ID 1901

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	91.62	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 With

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H24/513/80/	Tipping of waste materials, to land fill site. (site area 1.15ha). (this item is also no tice under regulation	02/10/1980	27/10/1980	Α	97.63
H24/310/85/	Alterations and extension, to form offices, reception, cloak room and toilet, with office o ver, to works.	18/12/1985	27/01/1986	Α	19.28

# 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 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 well related to the existing settlement, with no defensible boundary. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area:

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.

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions					
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Su	iitability: LDF t	to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+	years)
Summary of Infrastructure p	rovider cor	mments and	other planni	ing requirer	nents
Leeds City Council Highways inc	Metro				
Accessibility comment				1	Rank (1-5)
Good for rail accessibility, very poor for	everything else				2
Access Comments					Rank (1-5)
Site 3057 required but site 3057 not sup	ported				2
Local network comment				'	Rank (1-5)
Congestion on Outer Ring Road and M	621				3
Mitigation measure					Total score
Needs other sites to come through with	mitigation on loc	cal and strategic hi	ghway network		7
Support? Need	to combine wit	h other sites:	Suitability	for partial deve	elopment:
No	to combine with	3057	Possible d	ue to rail accessl	bility
Highways Agency					
Potential for cumulative impact in combine Road cluster.	nation with other	sites. If site still in	cluded at next sif	t assess as part	of Dewsbury
Network Rail :					
<u>Biodiversity</u>					
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Eco	logy Officer:	Bounda	ary Amendment		
Not supported (RED). No site-specific de whole area has naturally regenerated int woodland (potential Leeds Habitatat Net Wildlife Site together with site 2078 and	o scrub/young work or part of L		assessment agair	nst Local Wildlife	Sites criteria.
Natural England:		' -			
<b>Education</b>					
Drainage/Water/Flooding					
Environment Agency Comments:		Environment	Agency Constra	ints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Wa	ter Waste Water	Treatment Wor	ks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:					

Site Ref: 2114	Site Name:	Gelderd R	oad, W	ortley, LS12	
<u>Utilities</u>					
Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage					
Leeds City Council:					
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:				
English Heritage:					
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment	t			
Could site be effectively	Yes	N	lo		Maybe
managed	(Text)				
Would gypsies and	Yes	N	lo		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)				
Site:					
Proximity to housed	Yes		No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)				
Experience of previous	Yes	N	lo		Unknown
encampments	(Text)				
Conclusion of Asses	sment				
Conclusion summary:					
Green Belt site, not well related to	o the existing settleme	ent, with no defe	nsible bou	ndary. Highway	concerns re accessibility
and access.					
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 60	Floorsp	ace sq m (	Non residential)	:
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:		Em	oloyment Conclusion:
Red					

# Site Details

Northing:	428975	Area sq m:	92426.20	Ward	Morley North
Easting:	422826	Area Ha:	9.24262	HMCA:	Outer South West

# 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: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 4229.01 Distance to bus stop (metres) 267.04

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 11413

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.04	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?:	
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 1

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/128/76/	Outline application to erect d etached bungalow, to vacan t site.	17/02/1976	07/06/1976	R	16.09

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) on the existing UDP Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to	o determine Achievability: Medium term	(6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider com	nments and other planning require	ements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		D1-(4.5)
Accessibility comment  Meets Core Strategy standards with exception of schools	(primary approx 1km, secondary 3km)	Rank (1-5)
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
No access to adopted highway - relies on site 3003, how	ever this is unsuitable for large development	1
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites		4
Mitigation measure		Total score
none identified to overcome site deficiencies - level of de service or local services	velopment unlikely to support new bus	8
Support? Need to combine with	n other sites: Suitability for partial de	velopment:
no		
Highways Agency		
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with other s Morley/Gildersome cluster.	sites. If site still included at next sift assess as pa	rt of
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 W	orks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:	I	

Site Ref: 2124	Site Na	ame: Spring G	ardens Drighlingto	on
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Servi	ices:			
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archa	eology Service:			
English Heritage:				
O T	. 0:1 - 4			
Gypsy _Travelle	r Site Assess	sment		
Could site be effect		1	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	1	No	Maybe
travellers live on the		-		
site?				
Proximity to house	d Yes		No	
gypsies and travelle			INO	
Experience of previ	ious Yes (Text)	1	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of A	ssessment			
Conclusion summary:				
			ting UDP, not within the G	reen Belt. Development of
the site is dependent on a	icnieving access via	adjoining site 3003.		
Site Capacity (dwellings	s units):	208 Floors	pace sq m (Non residenti	al):
Residential Conclusion:	:	Retail Conclusion:	E	mployment Conclusion:
Amber				

# **Site Details**

Northing: 429758 Area sq m: 29842.43 Ward Morley North
Easting: 426947 Area Ha: 2.984243 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Allotment and city farm

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 537.39 
Distance to bus stop (metres) 345.93

Nearest Railway Station Cottingley Bus Stop ID 7701

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	98.61	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

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:** Designated as Protected Area of Search (PAS) on the existing UDP Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

SHLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: N	Medium term (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastructure provide	r comments an	d other plannin	g requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment  Meets Core Strategy standards with exception of s	secondary school		Rank (1-5)
weets core strategy standards with exception of s	secondary scrioor		4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Single point of access available off Daffil Grove, a	adequate for less than	100 dwellings	4
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Potential cumulative impact on Churwell Hill			3
Mitigation measure			Total score
may require mitigation on Churwell Hill			11
No. 144 combi		Outral Wise C	
Support? Need to combine yes with mitigation	ne with other sites:	Suitability fo	or partial development:
yee marmagaaen			
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with Road cluster.  Network Rail:	n other sites. If site stil	Il included at next sift a	ssess as part of Dewsbury
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	er: Bour	ndary Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environme	nt Agency Constrain	ts:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire \	Water Waste Water T	reatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Biok Management			
LCC Flood Risk Management:			

Con				
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessme	ent		
Could site be effectively	Yes	N	0	Maybe
managed	(Text)	,		1
		1 -		T
Would gypsies and	Yes	N	0	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
OILO :				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		1	
Experience of previous	Yes	N	0	Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
	L			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
- Control Circles	Jillont			
Conclusion summary:				
The site is designated as Protect acceptable in principle for housin		(PAS) on the existi	ing UDP, not within the Gre	een Belt. Considered
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 77	Floorsp	ace sq m (Non residentia	l):
Residential Conclusion:	Re	tail Conclusion:	En	nployment Conclusion:
Green				

Site Name: Manor House Farm, Churwell

Site Ref: 2125

Site Ref: 2127 Site Name: Tingley Station

# **Site Details**

Northing: 426699 Area sq m: 431451.22 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428705 Area Ha: 43.145122 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Transport - Vehicle Storage

Existing Use 3: Other

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3: Office

Other uses: Nursery on site

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2238.67Distance to bus stop (metres)568.09Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID7311

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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?:	
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

Site Ref: 2127 Site Name: Tingley Station

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/274/90/	Outline application to layout access road and erect busin ess, light industrial and ware house units and hotel, to	28/06/1990	28/06/1990	AP	91.17
H23/244/82/	Laying out of motor cycle trai ning centre and cyclo trial ing park, to vacant site. (sit e area 4.65ha). h.s.(a2).	30/07/1982	13/06/1983	A	10.42
H23/244/82/1	Extension of temporary permiss ion to layout motor cycle training centre and cycle tri aling park, vacant sit	25/05/1984	02/07/1984	Α	10.37
H23/133/81/	Tipping of waste materials, to disused railway cutti ngs. (site area 6.23ha).	20/03/1981	15/11/1983	Α	15.93

**Site Ref: 2127** Site Name: Tingley Station

# 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: 0.00

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.

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Site Ref: 2127 Site Name: Tingley Station

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions	
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to	o determine Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)
summary of Infrastructure provider com	nments and other planning requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	
Accessibility comment	Rank (1-
Good Public Transport to western part of site but severed	from local facilities by motorway 3
Access Comments	Rank (1-
Existing access to A653, with potential from Thorpe Lane	4
Local network comment	Rank (1-
Spare capacity but cumulative issues	4
Mitigation measure	Total sco
must improve linkages to adjacent settlements	11
Support? Need to combine with	n other sites: Suitability for partial development:
Road cluster	sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of Dewsbur
Network Rail :  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment
Supported with mitigation to ensure the disused railway th runs through the site is retained and enhanced for its gras and scrub habitats (and providing a buffer of 20 metres on sides of the railway), and a buffer of 20 metres is retained around the existing woodland area in the west (and plante native shrubs and small trees).	esland in both
Natural England:	
<u>Education</u>	
Drainage/Water/Flooding	
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme

Site Ref: 2127	7	Site Name:	Tingley Station		
LCC Flood Risk Ma	anagement:	:			
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Se	ervices:				
Built Heritage					
Leeds City Council					
West Yorkshire Ard	chaeology \$	Service:			
English Heritage:					
Gypsy _Travel	lor Sito	Assassman	•		
		Assessmen			
Could site be effe	ectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe	_
managed		(TEXI)			
Would gypsies a		Yes	No	Maybe	
travellers live on site?	the	(Text)			
Site:					
Proximity to hou	sed	Yes	No		
gypsies and trav	ellers	(Text)			
Experience of pro	evious	Yes	No	Unknown	-
encampments	<u>-</u>	(Text)			
Conclusion of	Assess	sment			
Conclusion summary	<b>/</b> :				
located between three	settlements	s (Morley, Tingley an		ot within the Green Belt. The site is by the Green Belt and motorway. This flat with a road frontage.	
Site Capacity (dwelling	ngs units):	1133	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):	0
Residential Conclusion	on:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:	:
Amber		Not as	ssessed	Not assessed	

# **Site Details**

Northing: 425753 Area sq m: 38147.99 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 430383 Area Ha: 3.814799 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture Existing Use 2: Office

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):4150.54Distance to bus stop (metres)203.38Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID6786

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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?:	
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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/141/79/	Alterations and extension, to form additional garage, to wo rks.	26/02/1979	02/04/1979	Α	16.03
H23/198/90/	Alterations, and part two stor ey and first and second floor extensions, to form offices, kitchen, toilets andenlarged s	27/04/1990	23/07/1990	Α	20.53
H23/119/90/	Fifteen detached prefabricated office units, 2 detachedprefa bricated canteen units, detach ed prefabricated showroom u	04/04/1990	04/06/1990	A	20.51

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

Availabilitary Object (2007) Contabilitary LDE to determine	
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to determine Achievability: Medium ter	m (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	
Accessibility comment	Rank (1-5
The site has access to 2 buses per hour, 100% of the site falls within the core strategy standards for	3
primary education and health, no secondary education	3
Access Comments	Rank (1-5
Limited frontage to Moor Knoll Lane which could accommodate small development access	4
Local network comment	Rank (1-5
Small development unlikely to impact on local network	4
	4
Mitigation measure	Total scor
Widened footways, ped links to adjacent sites	11
Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial of	levelopment:
yes	
Highways Agency	
n/a	
Network Rail :	
Biodiversity	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment	
Supported	
Natural England:	
<u>Education</u>	
Drainage/Water/Flooding	
Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment V	Vorks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:	
<u>Utilities</u>	

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessmen	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe	
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe	
travellers live on the	(Text)			
site?				
Dunyimity to have a	Vaa		NI	
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)		No	
gypoles and travellers				
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown	l
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
The site is designated as Protect	ed Area of Search (P	AS) on the existing UD	P, not within the Green Belt. No	Highways
issues raised.				
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 48	Floorspace so	q m (Non residential):	
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	l Conclusion:	Employment C	conclusion:
Green		ssessed	Not assessed	

Site Name: New Lane East Ardsley

Site Ref: 2128

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 425975 Area sq m: 109515.98 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 430096 Area Ha: 10.951598 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3788.25Distance to bus stop (metres)213.27Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID7560

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

- 1			

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.69	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/136/81/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to tw o agricultural sites. (site ar eas 1.6ha and 0.7ha)	20/03/1981	18/05/1981	R	15.31

#### 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:** Well contained to the north. Strong links to settlement if developed with site to south (1274). Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development

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.

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: LDF	F to determine	Achievability: Long term	(11+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider co	omments and ot	her planning requ	irements
_eeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
3 buses per hour on western edge with majority 2buses strategy standards for primary education and 70% to h			3
Access Comments		Ţ	Rank (1-5
Access achievable onto Common Lane			4
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites			4
Mitigation measure			Total sco
full footway req on Common lane frontage			11
Support? Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
yes		western part of site be accessibility	tter for
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact in combination with othe Road cluster.  Network Rail:	er sites. If site still inclu	ded at next sift assess as	part of Dewsbur
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported	Boundary	Amendment	
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			

Site Ref: 2155	Site Name:	<b>South of Ardsley Common</b>	
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Δssessmen	<del>f</del>	
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managoa			
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. Development of		n with adjacent site 1274 could be conside	
settlement form, although the sca accessibility and access provisio		umulatively with other sites would be large sites for acceptable access.	. Highway concerns re
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 246	Floorspace sq m (Non residenti	al):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	mployment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	ssessed	lot assessed

Site Ref: 2159 Site Name: Craven Park, Whitehall Road, Farnley

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 431076 Area sq m: 217243.31 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 425697 Area Ha: 21.724331 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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 

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1964.12 
Distance to bus stop (metres) 327.23

Nearest Railway Station Cottingley Bus Stop ID 1023

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Isolated greenfield site with agricultural use. No road frontage.

## **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?:

Site Ref: 2159 Site Name: Craven Park, Whitehall Road, Farnley

**Planning History** 

**Site Ref: 2159** Site Name: Craven Park, Whitehall Road, Farnley

#### 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? **V** 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 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 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:** Isolated site that relates poorly to the built up area. Development would reduce separation between settlements. High potential for further sprawl. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00

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.

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Site Ref: 2159 Site Name: Craven Park, Whitehall Road, Farnley

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Unknown	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: Long to	erm (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provide	er comments and	l other planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council Highwa	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Good accessibility for employme education	ent and health but	t very poor accessibility f	or secondary and primary	3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Site 1171 required for access				3
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Congestion on Outer Ring Roa	d and M621			3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Singalisation of access junction	and Ring Road r	oundabout, poss mitigat	ion for M621	9
Support?	Need to comb	oine with other sites:	Suitability for par	tial development:
Partial Yes - with mitigation	Combine with	1171	Yes	
and combine with 1171				
Highways Agency				
n/a				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and L	-CC Ecology Offi	icer: Bound	dary Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<b>Education</b>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Commer	nts:	Environmen	t Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire W	/ater Waste Water Treatm	ent Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:				
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:		
Telecom:		
Fire and Rescue Services:		
Built Heritage		
Leeds City Council:		
West Yorkshire Archaeology Service:		
English Heritage:		

Site Ref: 2159

Site Name: Craven Park, Whitehall Road, Farnley

Site Ref: 2159 Site Name: Craven Park, Whitehall Road, Farnley

# Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highwa	ys inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Good				5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
No direct access, would need sit	te 1177A			1
				· ·
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
A58 congestion				3
Mitigation measure				Total score
combine with 1171A				9
				9
Support?	Need to combine with	other sites:	Suitability for partic	al development:
no	1171A			
Highways Agency				
n/a				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and LC	CC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	mendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Flooding	<b>.</b>	Environment Age	ney Constraints:	
Environment Agency Comment	.5.	Liviloiment Agei	icy constraints.	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water V	Vaste Water Treatme	nt Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:				
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				

## **Built Heritage**

West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: **English Heritage:** Gypsy \_Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively Yes No Maybe managed (Text) Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? Proximity to housed No Yes gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown (Text) encampments **Conclusion of Assessment** Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. Isolated site unconnected to the built up area. Development would affect the Green Belt gap between Farnley and the urban area. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 570 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): **Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:** Not assessed Not assessed

Site Name: Craven Park, Whitehall Road, Farnley

Site Ref: 2159

**Leeds City Council:** 

#### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428967
 Area sq m:
 95726.45
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 427671
 Area Ha:
 9.572645
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

#### 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage 

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1113.45 
Distance to bus stop (metres) 622.93

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 11121

SFRA Flood Zone: 1.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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?:	
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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/966/78/	Detached 3 bedroom, bungalow, with attached double garag e, to agricultural site. (outline a	19/12/1978	09/02/1979	Α	29.02

# Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built	up areas	
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon of	levelopment?	
Would development result in isolated development	ment?	$\checkmark$
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	ooundaries with existing built up area)?	
Would development of the site effectively "round	nd off" the settlement pattern?:	No
Do natural/physical features provide a good exarea and undeveloped land?	isting barrier between existing urban	
Overall sprawl conclusion:		
High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl		
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging		
Would development of the site lead to physical	I connection of settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good exdevelopment?	xisting barrier/boundary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:		
No merging but would significantly reduce the	green belt gap	
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment	
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban area?	✓
Does the site provide access to the countrysid	e?	✓
Does the site include local or national conserv	ation designated areas?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	es, hedgerows that are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?	✓
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?	✓
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>.</u>	
The site performs an important role safeguard	ng countryside from encroachment	
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic towns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	eter?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Development of the site would have no effect	on the setting and special character of his	toric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Site relates poorly to settlement. Contained to and south. Would reduce green belt separatio		further sprawl to north
Conformity with Core Strate	ay .	
Main Lirban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	
Main Urban Area  Major Settlement	Maior Octilore and Federation	Brownfield
0		Greenfield
Villa and a /Downst		Mixed
Regeneration Priority Area:	ated to existing development	
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	
	5.55 <u>20040</u> Outon	,

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: LI	.DF to determine Achievability: Long term (	11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider of	comments and other planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
10% of the site falls within the core strategy standard 5% to health and 0% to secondary education	ds for public transport, 90% to primary education,	2
Access Comments	·	Rank (1-5)
Landlocked - site has no access to adopted highway site 1282 for access but too much development off s		2
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Cumulative impact		3
Mitigation measure		Total scor
		7
	e with other sites: Suitability for partial d	levelopment:
no		
Highways Agency		
	ther sites. If site still included at next sift assess as p	art of Dewsbury
Network Rail:		
Footbridge to replace nearby LC; General asset prote	ection issues	
<u>Biodiversity</u>		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer	r: Boundary Amendment	
Supported		
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	<b>Environment Agency Constraints:</b>	
Variabile Water Comments	Vollabina Water Water Transmit V	Nauka Camara
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment V	vorks comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 2164	Site Name:	Broad Oaks Farm, Churwell	
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
o T !! O'	•		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site:			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	,	
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	is isolated and unrel	ated to the existing settlement. Developme	ent would represent a
	en Belt gap between	Morley and Middleton, setting a precedent f	
riighway concerns to access the	access to adopted t	iigiiway.	
0: 0 : (1 !!! :: (2)	054		n
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 251	Floorspace sq m (Non residentia	ii):
Residential Conclusion:			nployment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed No	ot assessed

#### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428421
 Area sq m:
 12048.13
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 424163
 Area Ha:
 1.204813
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Wholesale distribution

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale
Other uses: Neighbouring outdoor sport facility (cricket pitch)

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2819.54 Distance to bus stop (metres) 73.91

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 10597

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:16.86Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	97.89	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
12/04255/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 7, 10, 15, 16 and 17 of Planning Application 11/03006/FU	05/10/2012		PCO	18.99
H23/385/74/	Outline application to erect o ne detached bungalow to va cant site.	28/08/1974	13/01/1975	R	25.99
07/07504/FU	Laying out of 8 car parking spaces and erection of 2 polytunnels to form nursery to vacant grass land	30/11/2007	18/02/2008	А	91.53
11/03006/FU	Change of use of and sub-division of barn and workshop to form 3 industrial starter units (B1 use)	15/07/2011	24/02/2012	А	18.99
11/00800/EXT	Extension of Time of application 07/07504/FU for laying out of 8 car parking spaces and erection of 2 polytunnels to form nursery to vacant grass land	25/02/2011	24/02/2012	W	91.53
23/226/03/CLU	Certificate of lawfulness for use as storage and distribution	16/04/2003	11/06/2003	R	97.02

#### 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 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:** The site is relatively small and adjoins residential development to the east and south, with a cricket ground to the north, so is relatively well contained and would have relatively limited impact on the Green Belt. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development

Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

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

Aire Valley:

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA C	conclusions				
vailability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
ummary	of Infrastruct	ure provide	er comments an	d other planni	ing requirements
	/ Council Highwa	ys inc Metro			Donk // /
	t <b>y comment</b> Strategy standards v	vith exception of	local services		Rank (1-5
					4
Access Co	mments				Rank (1-
Access can	only be achieved in	conjunction with	site 3004		3
Local netw	ork comment				Rank (1-5
Potential cu	imulative impact with	adjacent sites			4
Mitigation	measure				Total sco
must be sin	gle allocation with sit	e 3004			11
Support?		Need to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
yes			allocation with site 300		
Highways	Agency				
n/a					
Network R	ail :				
<u>Biodiversi</u>	<u>ty</u>				
West Yorks	hire Ecology and L0	CC Ecology Offi	cer: Bour	ndary Amendment	
Supported					
Natural Eng	land:				
Education					
	<u>Water/Flooding</u> nt Agency Comment	is:	Environme	nt Agency Constra	ints:
				<u> </u>	
Yorkshire W	Vater Comments:		Yorkshire '	Water Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
_CC Flood	Risk Management:				
<u>Jtilities</u>					

Site Ref: 3000	Site Name:	Land r/o 1-24	a Street Lane,	Gildersome
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
<b>5 11 11 1</b>				
Built Heritage  Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:	CCI VICC.			
gg				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	1 -		, <b>y</b>
site?				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		INO	
				1
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No		Unknown
encampments	(TOXI)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. The site is relati	vely small and adjoin	ing residential develo	pment to the east and	south, with a cricket
ground to the north, so is relative comprehensive development alo				
·		·	•	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 32	Floorspace s	sq m (Non residentia	ıl):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Er	nployment Conclusion:
Amber	. Cottai	23		

Site Ref: 3003 Site Name: Spring Gardens, Drighlington, Bradford, BD11

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 428831 Area sq m: 15262.97 Ward Morley North 422711 Easting: Area Ha: 1.526297 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses: Neighbouring place of worship and shops

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 4315.18 Distance to bus stop (metres) 106.86 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 11413 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Site Ref: 3003

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/233/84/	Outline application to erect d etached bungalow to agric ultural land.	03/08/1984	12/11/1984	А	87.75
H23/357/84/	4 bedroom detached bungalow wi th attached double garageto ag ricultural land. (outline a	17/12/1984	27/02/1985	Α	97.62
H23/320/85/	Laying out of access road and erection of 4 bedroom detac hed bungalow, with attached do uble garage, to vacant sit	25/10/1985	29/05/1986	Α	98.33
23/564/04/FU	Laying out of access and erection of 44 dwelling houses	28/09/2004	24/12/2004	W	95.82
23/107/96/OT	Outline application to layout access and erect 4 detached dwelling houses	01/04/1996	30/08/1996	R	69.25
H23/256/82/	Outline application to erect d etached house to vacant site. (site area 0.09ha)	18/08/1982	21/10/1985	W	10.70
H23/414/88/	Laying out of access and erect ion of detached stable block , to nursery garden and dwelli ng house.	19/09/1988	06/02/1989	Α	97.15
23/182/99/FU	37 houses and 9 flats	18/06/1999	02/01/2003	W	96.99
23/408/05/FU	Laying out of access and erection of 42 dwelling houses and detached 2 storey community centre	26/08/2005	03/01/2006	R	98.63

Site Ref: 3003 Site Name: Spring Gardens, Drighlington, Bradford, BD11

## 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area:

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.

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

Site Ref: 3003 Site Name: Spring Gardens, Drighlington, Bradford, BD11

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

SHLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDI	F to determine Achievability: Medium to	erm (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider co	omments and other planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment	ndary achaola	Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy standards with exception of secon	nuary scrious	4
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
No access to be taken from Spring Gardens. Access close to Wakefield Road	achievable for less than 50 unts off King St	4
Local network comment	·	Rank (1-5)
Small development unlikely to impact on local network	K	4
Mitigation measure		Total score
mitigation inleasure mitigation unlikely for site on own but may be required	if linked with adjacent sites	
	,	12
Support? Need to combine w	vith other sites: Suitability for partial	development:
yes		
Highways Agency		
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with oth Morley/Gildersome cluster.	er sites. If site still included at next sift assess as	part of
Network Rail :		
Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported		
Natural England:		
Education		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	<b>Environment Agency Constraints:</b>	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
. S. C.	. OTROLLIE TRACE TRACE TRACE TRACE	
LCC Flood Risk Management:		

Site Ref: 3003	Site Name:	Spring Garde	ns, Drighlingto	n, Bradford, BD11
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:	. 0			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			mayoo
Wayld synains and	Voc	No		Moviba
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
site?				
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)		No	
gyporoc and marchers				
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Site within existing settlement. F			principle. Adjoining s	ite 2124 would require
access through site 3003 to achie	eve access to highwa	iy.		
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 48	Floorspace s	sq m (Non residential	l):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Em	ployment Conclusion:
Green				

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 428040 Area sq m: 37077.40 Ward Morley North
Easting: 424381 Area Ha: 3.70774 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2584.68Distance to bus stop (metres)64.36Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID7561

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:82.36Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

#### **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:		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 Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

# Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
10/04597/OT	Outline application to layout access road and erect light industry, general industry and warehouse development (Use Classes Class B1c, B2 and B8), a 90 bed hotel and pub/restaurant, with car parking	08/10/2010		PCO	88.76
23/360/03/RE	Renewal of outline permission to erect office development	18/06/2003	10/09/2007	Α	100.00
23/265/01/FU	Variation of condition no 6 of application no 23/308/99/re (highways work)	09/07/2001	18/09/2001	Α	89.98
23/308/99/RE	Renewal of outline permission to erect office development	13/10/1999	18/07/2000	Α	99.65
23/95/94/DN	Determination for demolition of detached dwelling and outbuildings	31/03/1994	16/05/1994	Α	63.22
23/410/00/FU	Variation of condition no 22 of application no 23/308/99/re (gross office floorspace)	14/11/2000	21/02/2001	Α	89.98
23/2/95/OT	Outline application to erect office development	23/12/1994	27/02/1997	Α	100.00
23/398/00/FU	Variation of condition no 6 of planning permission 23/308/99 (highway works)	02/11/2000	08/06/2001	R	89.98
PREAPP/09/00038		29/06/2009	01/09/2009	PRECAG	100.00

# 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	n?:
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing	ng 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 codevelopment?	ontain
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:	
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment	
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urb	pan 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 protection significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	cted, or
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	<b>✓</b>
Does the site contain buildings?	cultural 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 feature?	historical
If yes, could development preserve this character?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion.	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Conformity with Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield
Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension	
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement Extensi	on Mixed
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension	
Development unrelated to existing development	t 🔳
Regeneration Priority Area:	
Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire V	/alley: 0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West	Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Medium term (6-10 years)
ummary of Infrastructure provide	r comments and ot	her plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment  Meets Core Strategy standards with exception of I	local services		Rank (1-5)
mode of the changy standards man exception of the	oodi ool videe		4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Access achievable onto the A650 - likely to require	re a signlised junction		4
Local matricely assumes at			Danie (4.5)
Local network comment  May require some local junction interventions			Rank (1-5)
may require some local junction interventions			4
Mitigation measure	_		Total score
signalised access and potential junction imporver	nents		12
Support? Need to combi	ine with other sites:	Suitabilit	y for partial development:
yes with mitigation			
Highways Agency			
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with Morley/Gildersome cluster.	n other sites. It site still inclu	lded at next si	int assess as part of
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	cer: Boundary	Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Ag	ency Constra	aints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water	r Waste Wate	r Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			

# <u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 3007 Site Name: Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road, Gildersome, Leeds, LS27					
Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	<b>Assessmen</b>	t			
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe		
managed	(Text)				
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe		
travellers live on the site?	(Text)				
Proximity to housed	Yes	No			
gypsies and travellers	(Text)				
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown		
encampments	(Text)				
Conclusion of Asses	sment				
Conclusion summary:					
		rell related to the motorway and partiall n existing allocation and adjacent uses			
Site Capacity (dwellings units): 97 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):					
Residential Conclusion: Re		il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:		

Site Ref: 3056 Site Name: Wood Lane (land south of), Farnley, LS12 6

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 431117 Area sq m: 217767.78 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 426408 Area Ha: 21.776778 HMCA: Outer South West

## 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: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage 
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1431.87 Distance to bus stop (metres) 561.39

Nearest Railway Station Cottingley Bus Stop ID 2617

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	96.94	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)

No

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

No

Site Ref: 3056 Site Name: Wood Lane (land south of), Farnley, LS12 6

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H24/78/77/	Levelling of farm land by tipp ing to rear of works.	22/02/1977	08/08/1977	Α	23.42

Site Ref: 3056 Site Name: Wood Lane (land south of), Farnley, LS12 6

#### 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 with potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl unless linked to delivery of adjoining sites 1171B, 2078 and 4029. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development

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.

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Inner South Leeds:

Site Ref: 3056 Site Name: Wood Lane (land south of), Farnley, LS12 6

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions	<b>3</b>			
Availability: Unknown	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: Long	term (11+ years)
summary of Infrastru	cture provide	r comments and	other planning r	equirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Good accessibility for health a education	nd primary educatio	on, very poor access to e	mployment and seconda	ry 2
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
No frontage to adopted highw	<i>i</i> ay			
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Congestion on Outer Ring Ro	oad and M621			3
Midiration magazine				Total age
Mitigation measure  Access to site needed throug	h adjoining sites with	h mitigation on local and	stratogic highway notwo	Total sco
Access to site needed throug	n adjoining sites with	n miligation on local and	strategic nigriway netwo	6
Support?	Need to combi	ine with other sites:	Suitability for pa	artial development:
No	Need to combin 2114,2159,117	ne with 2078, 3057, 1	Possible	
<u>Highways Agency</u> n/a Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Offic	cer: Bound	lary Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding	<u> </u>			
Environment Agency Comm	ents:	Environment	t Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	:	Yorkshire W	ater Waste Water Treat	ment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	 nt:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Site Ref:	3056	Site Name:	Wood Lar	ne (laı	nd south o	of), Farnley, LS12 6
Electric:						
Telecom:						
Fire and Res	cue Services:					
Built Herita	ine					
Leeds City C						
West Yorksh	nire Archaeology	Service:				
English Heri	tage:					
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Tr	aveller Site	e Assessme	nt			
	oe effectively	Yes	N	No		Maybe
managed		(Text)				
Would gyps		Yes	N	No		Maybe
travellers liv	ve on the	(Text)				
Site:						
Proximity to	o housed	Yes		١	No	
gypsies and	d travellers	(Text)				
Experience	of previous	Yes	N	No		Unknown
encampme		(Text)	<u>,                                      </u>			
Conclusio	n of Asses	sment				
Conclusion su	mmary:					
		tential through linki	ng of sites 2078,	3056 40	29 and 1171B	dependent on the necessary
infrastructure ar	nd link road from	Whitehall Road to C	Selderd Road.			
Site Canacity (	dwellings units)	275	Floorer	nace su	m (Non resid	lential):
			-	ouoc oq	III (ITOII TOSIG	
Residential Co	nciusion:	Ret	ail Conclusion:			Employment Conclusion:
31						

## **Site Details**

Northing: 430679 Area sq m: 74657.55 Ward Farnley and Wortley
Easting: 426652 Area Ha: 7.465755 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Existing Use 3: Utilities & Infrastructure - Cemeteries and Crematoria

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Other uses: Utilities & Infrastructure - Cemeteries and crematoria

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape:Significant Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):952.55Distance to bus stop (metres)282.72Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID8042

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:YesConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

- 1			

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.68	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?: Yes

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H24/54/83/	Laying out of cemetery to agri cultural site. (site area 2.98ha)	18/02/1983	14/03/1983	А	26.28

# 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 existir	g 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 settler	nents?						
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundardevelopment?	y to contain						
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 exist	ing urban area?						
Does the site provide access to the countryside?							
Does the site include local or national conservation designated area	s?						
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	protected, or						
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	<b>✓</b>						
Does the site contain buildings?	in agricultural use?						
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion							
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the cou	ntryside from encroachme	nt					
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns							
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building of feature?	r other historical						
If yes, could development preserve this character?:							
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:							
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and spe	cial character of historic fe	eatures					
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:							
Green Belt site. The site is not well related to the existing settlemer urban sprawl in an isolated location, behind existing employment us	•	create unrestricted					
Conformity with Core Strategy							
Main Urban Area	tension	Brownfield					
Major Settlement Major Settlement Ex	tension	Greenfield					
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement E	Extension	Mixed					
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extens	on 🔳						
Development unrelated to existing development	ppment						
Regeneration Priority Area:							
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00					
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00					

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusio	าร			
Availability: Unknown	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrasti	ructure provider	comments ar	nd other planni	ing requirements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			5
Accessibility comment	-11-114			Rank (1-5)
Half site good for rail access	sibility, very poor for eve	rytning eise		2
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Good frontage with Geldero	d Road			5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Congestion on Outer Ring	Road and M621			3
				3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Signgalisation of access jui	nction and Ring Road si	ignals, possible miti	gation for M621	10
Support?	Need to combin	ne with other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
No			Possible d	ue to rail accessibility
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative imp Morley/Gildersome cluster.  Network Rail:	act in combination with	other sites. If site s	till included at next sif	it assess as part of
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Office	er: Bo	undary Amendment	
Not supported (RED). No sit of mature woodland, UK Bio Habitat, within the site.	e-specific designations diversity Action Plan Pr	riority exc RM imp and woo	luded and boundary a /3057. Mitigation will a acts on adjacent woo I habitat enhancemen odland area to the you	amended as per drawing still be required to ensure dland habitat are addressed, t carried out to connect the ung woodland to the north-
Natural England:		eas	t (Hill Top Cemetery).	•
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floodir	<u>1g</u>			
Environment Agency Com		Environm	ent Agency Constra	ints:
Yorkshire Water Commen	ts:	Yorkshire	Water Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme

Site Ref: 3057	Site Name:		rings, Gelderd Morley, LS27 7	Road,
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:			
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	INO		Iviayoc
site?				
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)		No	
gypsies and travellers	(TOXI)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:  Green Belt site. The site is not w	rell related to the exis	ting settlement and d	evelopment would cre	ate unrestricted urban
sprawl in an isolated location, bel				
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 196	Floorspace	sq m (Non residentia	1):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	l Conclusion:	En	nployment Conclusion:
Red				- <del>-</del>

## **Site Details**

Northing:	430221	Area sq m:	211813.48	Ward	Morley North
Easting:	426031	Area Ha:	21.181348	HMCA:	Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Storage

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: Gypsy and traveller site
Site State: Part greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage□Distance to Rail Station (metres):1362.14Distance to bus stop (metres)291.17Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID10230

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:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## 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?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes
Site		Site Type	
St. Bernard's Mill Gildersome recent pp		General Waste Management Sites	

....

# 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)	p 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 cordevelopment?	tain 🗌						
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 urba	n 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 protect significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	ed, or						
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	$\checkmark$						
Does the site contain buildings?	ıltural 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 feature?	istorical						
If yes, could development preserve this character?:							
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:							
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special cha	racter of historic featu	ıres					
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:							
The site is not well related to the existing settlement and development would an isolated location, to the west of existing employment uses and a gypsy a Belt incursion.							
Conformity with Core Strategy							
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension		Brownfield					
Major Settlement Extension		Greenfield					
Smaller Settlement Extension	n 🔳	Mixed					
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension							
Development unrelated to existing development							
Regeneration Priority Area:							
Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Va	•	0.00					
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West L	eeds Gateway:	0.00					

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Unknown Suitability: LDF	to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11-	years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider cor	mments and ot	her plann	ing requirer	ments
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
The site does not meet any of the Core Strategy standar	ds with just 2 buses p	er hour		1
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Ghost island r't lane exists with adequate visibilities - lar	ge development may	require signals	5	4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Development of this scale on the A62 is likely to create could not be mitigated without the need for third party la		ng Road juncti	on which	2
Mitigation measure				Total score
Unlikely to be achievable without 3rd party land				7
Support? Need to combine wit	th other sites:	Suitability	/ for partial deve	elopment:
no				
Highways Agency  Network Rail:				
Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Roundary	Amendment		
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wilk corridor function of the beck along the southern boundary leaving a 20 metre buffer from the beck. A pond to the not east corner that should be retained and enhanced.	dlife y - by	Amendment		
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Ag	ency Constra	ints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water	· Waste Water	Treatment Wor	ks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:				

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 3058	Site Name:	Cottingley Springs and a north and west	djoining land to
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Site	e Assessment	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	110	mayoo
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	140	Iviaybc
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	110	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	INU	OTIKITOWIT
·			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	140	Iviaybe
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	INU	iviaybe
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	1110	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	<u> </u>	
	<u> </u>		

## **Conclusion of Assessment**

#### Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site is not well related to the existing settlement and development would create unrestricted urban sprawl in an isolated location, to the west of existing employment uses and a gypsy and traveller site. Development would represent a significant incursion into Green Belt. Highways concerns re impact on A62/A6120 junction.

Site Ref: 3059 Site Name: Hill Top Cemetery off Gelderd Road, Wortley, LS12 6DJ

## **Site Details**

Northing: 430307 Area sq m: 68656.11 Ward Farnley and Wortley
Easting: 426803 Area Ha: 6.865611 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Utilities & Infrastructure - Cemeteries and Crematoria

Existing Use 2: Agriculture

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Utilities & Infrastructure - Cemeteries and Crematoria

Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Other uses:

Site State: greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):627.46Distance to bus stop (metres)119.39Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID8042

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:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	94.23	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

Site Ref: 3059 Site Name: Hill Top Cemetery off Gelderd Road, Wortley, LS12 6DJ

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H24/228/81/	Erection of 1.22m high chain I ink fence to cemetery.	05/06/1981	21/09/1981	W	66.45

Site Ref: 3059 Site Name: Hill Top Cemetery off Gelderd Road, Wortley,

# 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?	$\checkmark$	
Would development result in isolated development?	$\checkmark$	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing	ng 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 area and undeveloped land?	n existing urban	
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 settler	ments?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/bounda development?	ary to contain	
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 exis	sting urban area?	
Does the site provide access to the countryside?		
Does the site include local or national conservation designated area	as?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	e protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	$\checkmark$	
Does the site contain buildings?	e in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion		
The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from o	encroachment	
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building of feature?	or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this character?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Development of the site would have a significant effect on the setting	ng and special character of historic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
The majority of the site is part of a cemetery. Redevelopment for re site, not related to existing residential development. Highways cond		
Conformity with Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Ex	Diowillield	
Major Settlement Major Settlement Ex		
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement	. Ivilxed	
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extens		
Development unrelated to existing devel	lopment	
Regeneration Priority Area:	Airo Valloy	0.00
Inner South Leeds: 0.00  Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	,	0.00
Leeus Biauloiu Comuoi. 0.00	vvost Locus Gatoway.	

Site Ref: 3059 Site Name: Hill Top Cemetery off Gelderd Road, Wortley, LS12 6DJ

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions						
Availability: Unknown Sui	itability: [	LDF to determin	e Achie	evability:	Long term	(11+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure p	rovider	comments	and other	planni	ng requi	rements
_eeds City Council Highways inc	<u>Metro</u>					
Accessibility comment						Rank (1-5
The site is within 800m of Cottingley Rail New footways on the A62 would be requi		t the route is po	or. Other stand	ards are r	not met.	2
Access Comments						Rank (1-
Space exists to implement a right turn la	ine					4
Local network comment						Rank (1-5
Cumulative impact issues with other dev	elopment o	on A62				3
Mitigation measure						Total sco
New footway along site frontage. Work	at A62/A61	20 junction likel	y to require 3rd	party land	t	9
Support? Need	to combin	e with other si	es:	Suitability	for partial	development:
no						
lighways Agency						
Potential for cumulative impact in combin Road cluster.	ation with o	other sites. If si	e still included	at next sif	t assess as p	part of Dewsbur
Network Rail :						
<u> Biodiversity</u>						
Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecol	ogy Office	er:	Boundary Ame	endment		
Supported with mitigation to protect and ecorridor function of the beck along the sole eaving a 20 metre buffer from the beck a sof scrub and trees between the beck and	uthern bou and retainin	ndary - by g the areas				
Natural England:	the motors	iay.				
<u>Education</u>						
Orainage/Water/Flooding						
Environment Agency Comments:		Enviro	nment Agency	/ Constra	ints:	
orkshire Water Comments:		Yorks	nire Water Was	ste 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.

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref: 3059	Site Name:	Hill Top Cemetery off Geld LS12 6DJ	derd Road, Wortley,
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		

# **Conclusion of Assessment**

Conclusion summary:

Site Ref: 3059 Site Name: Hill Top Cemetery off Gelderd Road, Wortley, LS12 6DJ

Green Belt site. The majority of the site is part of a cemetery. Redevelopment for residential use here would represent an island site, not related to existing residential development. Highways concerns re cumulative impact on A62.

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

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red Not assessed Not assessed

## **Site Details**

Northing: 429656 Area sq m: 1197731.83 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 425809 Area Ha: 119.773183 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

## Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Residential - Hotels, boarding and guest houses

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings
Other uses: Gypsy and traveller site

Site State: Predominantly greenfield with limited brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1628.80Distance to bus stop (metres)223.31Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID6630

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:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:6.96Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Sloping and undulating site

## **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	97.52	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?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes
Site		Site Type	
St. Bernard's Mill Gildersome recent pp		General Waste Management Sites	

# 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 be	ouilt up area)?						
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement patterns	tern?: 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 settlement	its?						
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to development?	o contain						
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?	lacksquare						
Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?	$\checkmark$						
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are prosignificant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	otected, or						
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	$\checkmark$						
Does the site contain buildings?  Are these in a	agricultural use?						
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion							
The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encre	roachment						
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns							
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or oth feature?	her historical						
If yes, could development preserve this character?:							
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:							
Development of the site would have marginal effect on the setting & spe	ecial character of historic features, which c						
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:							
The site is a major incursion into Green Belt. Development would signifi between Gildersome, New Farnley and Lower Wortley. Preventing coal purposes of Green belt.							
Conformity with Core Strategy							
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extens	sion Brownfield						
Major Settlement Major Settlement Extens							
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement Exte							
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension							
Development unrelated to existing developm	nent						
Regeneration Priority Area:	_						
Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Air	re Valley: 0.00						
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 We	est Leeds Gateway: 0.00						

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Unknown Suitability	y: LDF to deter	mine Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provi	der commer	nts and other plannir	ng requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	<u>0</u>		Doub (4.5
Accessibility comment  Small parts of the site meet Core Strategy stan	 ndards. The A62 I	nas 2 buses per hour. Signific	Rank (1-5
parts of the site are cut off from direct walking i			2
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Access achievable from numerous location on limit reductions and new footways	A62 - signals ma	y be required together with sp	peed 4
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Development of this scale on the A62 is likely junction which could not be mitigated without t			ad 1
Mitigation measure			Total scor
Unlikely to be achievable without 3rd party lan-	d		7
Support?  Need to cor  No  Highways Agency  Potential for cumulative impact in combination of Morley/Gildersome cluster.  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Control of Morley (RED). No site-specific designates the correction of the	Officer:	a substantia acceptable i local networ	assess as part of
water courses in the north and north-west of the Farnley Wood Beck, and associated semi-imprand scrub. Also Clubbed Oaks and Dean Wood Area to the south, and disused railway to the notate to the south.	e site including oved grasslands d Local Nature	excluded and boundary an RM/3060 (1 and 2). Mitigatensure impacts on adjacer and habitat connectivity deexisting and new hedgerovers.	nended as per drawings tion will still be required to not habitats are addressed, esigned into the layout using ws and tree belts to connect the to the woodland. Where her zones to be created
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Env	vironment Agency Constrair	nts:
Yorkshire Water Comments:		rkshire Water Waste Water 1	Frantmont Works Commo

Site Ref: 3060	Site Name:		d Farm and Cricket Hill, some, Morley, LS27 7LX
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:		
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy ₋Traveller Site	Assassman	<b>.</b>	
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Illaliayeu	(TOM)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
encampinents	(TON)		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		

# **Conclusion of Assessment**

#### Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site is a major incursion into Green Belt. Development would significantly reduce the Green Belt gap between Gildersome, New Farnley and Lower Wortley. Preventing coalescence of settlements is one of the purposes of Green belt. Highways concerns re cumulative impact on the A62 and A62/ A6120 junction.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 3144 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red

Site Ref: 3061 Site Name: Cricket Hill Brow, Gelderd Road, Gildersome, Morley, LS27 7LS

## **Site Details**

Northing: 429375 Area sq m: 23532.70 Ward Morley North
Easting: 425095 Area Ha: 2.35327 HMCA: Outer South West

## 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: Equestrian
Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

SFRA Flood Zone:

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Poorly defined

0.00

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2259.61 Distance to bus stop (metres) 327.02

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 4326

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:8.30Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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?:

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

No

Site Ref: 3061 Site Name: Cricket Hill Brow, Gelderd Road, Gildersome,

Morley, LS27 7LS

Site Ref: 3061 Site Name: Cricket Hill Brow, Gelderd Road, Gildersome, Morley, LS27 7LS

# 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?	$\checkmark$	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with exi	isting built up area)?	
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settleme	ent pattern?: No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier betwee area and undeveloped land?	een existing urban	
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 set	ttlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundevelopment?	ndary to contain	
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 e.	existing urban area?	
Does the site provide access to the countryside?		
Does the site include local or national conservation designated a	areas?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site contain buildings?	ese in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion		
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the control of the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the control of the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the control of the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the control of the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the control of the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the control of the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the control of the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the control of the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the control of the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the control of the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the control of the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the site does not perform an important role of the site does not perform an important ro	countryside from encroachment	
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed buildin feature?	ng or other historical	
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 would not be well related to the existing settlement sprawl.	form and could set a precedent for further	
Conformity with Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area	Extension Brownfield	
Major Settlement Major Settlement	Extension Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlemen	ent Extension Mixed	
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Exte	ension	
Development unrelated to existing de-	evelopment	
Regeneration Priority Area:		
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley: 0.00	1
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway: 0.00	j

Site Ref: 3061 Site Name: Cricket Hill Brow, Gelderd Road, Gildersome, Morley, LS27 7LS

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Unknown Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider	comments and	other plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy standards except secondary s	school		4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Access via Hawthorn Close not acceptable - too n junction with Branch End	arrow and long, no foot	ways and issues a	<sup>at</sup> 1
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Issues of increased movements at junction with br	anch End and cumulativ	ve impacts	2
Mitigation measure			Total score
			7
Support? Need to combin	ne with other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
no			
Highways Agency			
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with Morley/Gildersome cluster.	other sites. If site still in	ncluded at next sif	t assess as part of
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Offic	er: Bound	ary Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
Education			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment	Agency Constra	ints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wa	ater Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			

<u>Utilities</u>

		Morley, LS27 7LS	
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
Gypsy Traveller Site	e Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	140	Maybe
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	1	
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	-	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	INU	OTIKHOWH
•			
0 1 1 6 6			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. Development wifurther sprawl. Unacceptable site		d to the existing settlement for	m and could set a precedent for
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 62	Floorspace sq m (Nor	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:

Site Name: Cricket Hill Brow, Gelderd Road, Gildersome,

Site Ref: 3061

## **Site Details**

Northing: 429486 Area sq m: 9496.16 Ward Morley North
Easting: 424810 Area Ha: 0.949616 HMCA: Outer South West

## 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:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2558.90 Distance to bus stop (metres) 388.18

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 13226

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.81	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

# 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 exis	ting built up area)?	
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlemen	it pattern?: No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between	en 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 settle	ements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/bound development?	ary to contain	
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 exi	sting urban area?	
Does the site provide access to the countryside?		
Does the site include local or national conservation designated are	eas?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that a significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	re protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	e in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion		
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the co	untryside from encroachment	
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building feature?	or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this character?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and sp	pecial character of historic feat	ures
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
The site is not well related to the existing built up area and is in an boundaries and development could set a precedent for further unr		g defensible
Conformity with Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area E	extension	Brownfield
Major Settlement Major Settlement E	extension	Greenfield
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement	Extension	Mixed
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Exter	nsion	_
Development unrelated to existing deve	elopment	
Regeneration Priority Area:		
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Unknown Suitability: LDF	to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider co	mments and o	ther plann	ing requirements
eeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-
Meets Core Strategy standards except secondary scho	ol		4
Access Comments			Rank (1-
Effectively landlocked			1
Local network comment			Rank (1-
Potential cumulative impact with adjacent sites			4
			-
Mitigation measure			Total sco
			9
			9
Support? Need to combine w	rith other sites:	Suitabilit	y for partial development:
no			
Highways Agency			
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	gency Constra	nints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Wate	r Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			

Site Ref: 3062	Site Name:	Land rear of 51 Hart Gildersome, LS27 7	hill Rise, Harthill Lane,
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Servi	ces:		
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archae	eology Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy Travelle	r Site Assessmen	t	
Could site be effect managed	ively Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
			1.4
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?			
Proximity to housed gypsies and travelle		No	
gypsies and travelle	(1974)		
Experience of previ		No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of As	ssessment		
Conclusion summary:			
		sting built up area and is in an e recedent for further unrestricted	
Site Capacity (dwellings	units): 30	Floorspace sq m (Nor	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 3063 Site Name: Land adjacent to 57b Spring View, Gildersome, Morley, LS27 7HG

## **Site Details**

 Northing:
 429513
 Area sq m:
 37876.87
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 424625
 Area Ha:
 3.787687
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Existing Use 3: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2729.94Distance to bus stop (metres)339.70Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID386

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.22	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		

No

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Site Ref: 3063 Site Name: Land adjacent to 57b Spring View, Gildersome, Morley, LS27 7HG

Site Ref: 3063 Site Name: Land adjacent to 57b Spring View, Gildersome, Morley, LS27 7HG

## 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 v	vith existing built up area)?	✓
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the se	ettlement pattern?:	No
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrie	r 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 barried development?	er/boundary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:		
No merging but there is no defensible boundary		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachmen	t	
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and	•	
Does the site provide access to the countryside?	Į.	✓
Does the site include local or national conservation design	ated areas?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerov significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	vs that are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	Ę.	✓
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?	<b>✓</b>
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion		
The site does not perform an important role in safeguardin	g the countryside from encroach	nment
Preserve the setting and special character of historic t	owns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed feature?	building or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this character?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting	g and special character of histor	ric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
No existing defensible boundaries and development could	set a precedent for further unre-	stricted sprawl.
Conformity with Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area Main Urba	n Area Extension	Brownfield
	ement Extension	Greenfield
	ttlement Extension	Mixed
Villages/Rural Village/Ru	al Extension	
Development unrelated to exist		
Regeneration Priority Area:		
Inner South Leeds: 0.	OO Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.	00 West Leeds Gateway	<i>r</i> : 0.00

Site Ref: 3063 Site Name: Land adjacent to 57b Spring View, Gildersome, Morley, LS27 7HG

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

HLAA C	onclusions				
Availability:	Unknown	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary	of Infrastruc	cture provide	r comments and	other planni	ing requirements
	Council Highw	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility Meets Core S		s except secondary	school		Rank (1-5
Miceto Core C	onatogy standards	except secondary	3011001		4
Access Cor	nments				Rank (1-5
Very poor ac	ccess options - no	way to access hou	sing development		1
Local netwo	ork comment				Rank (1-5
Potential cui	mulative impact w	th adjacent sites			4
					4
Mitigation n	measure				Total scor
		_			9
Support?		Need to combi	ine with other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
no					
Highways A		in combination with	n other sites. If site still in	ncluded at next sif	t assess as part of
	rsome cluster.	in combination with	r outor onco. In onco cum in	noidada at noxt on	t account as part of
Network Ra	ail :				
Biodiversit	<u>y</u>				
	nire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Offic		ary Amendment	
Supported					
Natural Engl	land:				
Education					
<u>Drainage/W</u>	Vater/Flooding				
	t Agency Comme	nts:	Environment	Agency Constra	ints:
Yorkshire W	ater Comments:		Yorkshire Wa	ater Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood F	Risk Management	:			

Site Ref: 3063	Site Name:	Land adjacent to S	
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	/ Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site:			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
	•		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. No existing def No access to site.	ensible boundaries a	nd development could set a	precedent for further unrestricted sprawl.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 85	Floorspace sq m (N	Non residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red			

#### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428693
 Area sq m:
 178319.12
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 423991
 Area Ha:
 17.831912
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings
Other uses: Neighbouring - Education

Site State: Majority greenfield, school building brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3030.97 Distance to bus stop (metres) 254.75

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 7820

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.06Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

ı				

## **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.40	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:	0.14		

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

## 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	ıp area)? <b>✓</b>				
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?	: No				
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing	g 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 condevelopment?	ntain $\square$				
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 urba	an area?				
Does the site provide access to the countryside?	$\checkmark$				
Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?					
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protect significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	ed, or				
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?   ✓					
Does the site contain buildings?	ultural 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 before the feature?	nistorical				
If yes, could development preserve this character?:					
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:					
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Whilst release of the site would be of significant scale, development could e especially if combined with site 3000.	ffectively 'round off' the settlement,				
Conformity with Core Strategy					
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield				
Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield				
Smaller Settlement Extensio	n Mixed				
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension					
Development unrelated to existing development					
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Va	alley: 0.00				
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West L	eeds Gateway: 0.00				

East Leeds

HLAA Conclu	isions			
Availability: Unknow	n Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: Long term	(11+ years)
iummary of Inf	rastructure provide	r comments and ot	her planning requi	rements
	il Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comm			ı	Rank (1-5
Meets Core Strategy	standards with exception of lo	ocal services		4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
access through the p	have no obvious access or lin bimrary school site if this is to sites might link to bradford Ro	be relocated but a second a		2
Local network com	ment			Rank (1-5
A site of this size is I the M62 and on the	ikely to require mitigation at n A62	nearby junctions and particul	arly at junction 27 of	3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
mitigation works likel	ly to be required to improve hi	ighway capacity		9
Support?	Need to combine	ne with other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
No		3004 might give an access cond access would be		
Morley/Gildersome cl  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Eco	ve impact in combination with uster.  logy and LCC Ecology Offic		ded at next sift assess as p	part of
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education _				
Drainago/Mata-/El	looding			
<u>Drainage/Water/Fl</u> Environment Agenc		Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
	<u>*</u>		-	
Yorkshire Water Co	mments:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Mar	nagement:			

## <u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref:	3064	Site Name:			ne, Morley, LS27
Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Re	scue Services:				
Built Herit	Council:				
	hire Archaeology	Service:			
English Her	ritage:				
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
	be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed		(Text)			
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers I site?	ive on the	(Text)			
Proximity t		Yes		No	
gypsies an	d travellers	(Text)			
	e of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampme	ents	(Text)			
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment			
Conclusion s	ummary:				-
settlement, esp considered. H	pecially if combine	d with site 3064. A core access. The site a	significant scale, develonged on the comprehensive developed rea includes part of the	ment along with site 3	vely 'round off' the 3000 could be chool. The site boundary
Site Capacity	(dwellings units)	401	Floorspace sq	m (Non residential	):
Residential C	onclusion:	Retai	Conclusion:	Em	ployment Conclusion:
Amber					

Site Ref: 3068 Site Name: Land north of Valley Mills, Valley Road, Morley, LS27 8AA

Morley North

Outer South West

# Site Details Northing: 428603 Area sq m: 21990.02 Ward Easting: 427577 Area Ha: 2.199002 HMCA:

#### 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:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 788.44 Distance to bus stop (metres) 578.52 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 2207 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class: 0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No Public Rights of Way: No Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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

Site Ref: 3068 Site Name: Land north of Valley Mills, Valley Road, Morley, LS27 8AA

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
11/00022/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by condition 13 of Planning Application 08/06433/FU	05/01/2011	18/01/2011	А	90.55
08/06433/FU	Engineering works to facilitate the remediation of the site	20/11/2008	20/04/2009	Α	90.55

Site Ref: 3068 Site Name: Land north of Valley Mills, Valley Road, Morley, LS27 8AA

## 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?		<b>✓</b>				
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	9 , ,	No				
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barr		<b>✓</b>				
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	n of settlements?					
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barr development?	ier/boundary to contain					
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:						
No merging but there is no defensible boundary						
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachme	ent					
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site a	nd the existing urban area?	<b>✓</b>				
Does the site provide access to the countryside?						
Does the site include local or national conservation designation						
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerd significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	ows that are protected, or					
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?		$\checkmark$				
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?					
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion						
The site does not perform an important role in safeguard	ng the countryside from encroad	chment				
Preserve the setting and special character of historic	towns					
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, lister feature?	d building or other historical					
If yes, could development preserve this character?:						
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:						
Development of the site would have no effect on the setti	ng and special character of histo	oric features				
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Small site that is isolated from urban area. Contained to north. Relates poorly to settlement.	south by railway but potential for	further sprawl to the				
Conformity with Core Strategy						
	an Area Extension	Brownfield				
,	tlement Extension	Greenfield				
	ettlement Extension	Mixed				
	ural Extension					
Development unrelated to exi	sting development					
Regeneration Priority Area:	Aire Veller	0.00				
	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00				
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0	0.00 West Leeds Gatewa	ay: 0.00				

Site Name: Land north of Valley Mills, Valley Road, Morley, LS27 8AA Site Ref: 3068

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusi	ions				
Availability: Unknown	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (1	1+ years)
Summary of Infra	structure provider	comments and	other planni	ing requir	ements
Leeds City Council I	Highways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment				1	Rank (1-5)
All of the site within the or secondary education	core strategy standards for	public transport and pr	imary education, n	ot health	3
Access Comments				·	Rank (1-5)
	o access to adopted highwat t too much development off		ll is not suitable). I	Relies on	2
Local network comme	ent			·	Rank (1-5)
Cumulative impact					3
Mitigation measure					Total score
					8
Support?	Need to combir	ne with other sites:	Suitability	for partial de	evelopment:
No					
Highways Agency					
Potential for cumulative i Morley/Gildersome cluste	impact in combination with er.	other sites. If site still i	ncluded at next sif	t assess as pa	art of
Network Rail :					
ssues	earby LC; Morley Station Im	provements (including	disabled access) (	Jeneral asset	protection
<u>Biodiversity</u>					
	y and LCC Ecology Office	er: Bound	lary Amendment		
Supported					
Natural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
Drainage/Water/Floo	oding				
Environment Agency C		Environmen	t Agency Constra	ints:	
Yorkshire Water Comm	nents:	Yorkshire W	ater Waste Water	Treatment W	orks Comme
TOTASINIE WALET COITIN	ionta.		aici vvasic vvalel	rrealinent VV	OINS COMMINE

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref: 3068	Site Name:	Morley, LS27	r valley Mills, v 8AA	alley Road,
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy Traveller Site	• Assessmen	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			•
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
site?				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. The site is isolat away towards the railway. Deve Green Belt, within the gap betwe	lopment of this site in	n isolation would resul	It in an island of develo	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 58	Floorspace s	sq m (Non residentia	l):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	En	nployment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	No	t assessed

Site Name: Site Ref: 3069 Harvester White Rose Pub, Dewsbury Road, Morley, Leeds, LS27 8PL

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 427654 Area sq m: 47151.73 Morley South Ward 428424 Easting: Area Ha: 4.715173 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Utilities & Infrastructure - Post and Telecom

Existing Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1528.27 Distance to bus stop (metres) 154.12 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 4947 SFRA Flood Zone:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 1.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

No

1.00

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Pylon and cable runs through 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?:	
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?: Site Ref: 3069 Site Name: Harvester White Rose Pub, Dewsbury Road, Morley, Leeds, LS27 8PL

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/193/91/	Outline application to layout access and erect 2 storeytelev ision centre and studios with car parking, landscapin	17/05/1991	19/02/1992	W	74.50

Site Ref: 3069 Site Name: Harvester White Rose Pub, Dewsbury Road, Morley, Leeds, LS27 8PL

## 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 physica	I connection of settlements?					
Do natural/physical features provide a good exdevelopment?		<u>✓</u>				
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:						
No merging but would significantly reduce the	green belt gap					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment					
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban area?	✓				
Does the site provide access to the countrysid	e?					
Does the site include local or national conserv	ation designated areas?					
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are protected, or					
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?	✓				
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use	? 🗸				
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	ı					
The site does not perform an important role in	safeguarding the countryside from encro	pachment				
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic towns					
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other historical					
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	eter?:					
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:						
Development of the site would have no effect	on the setting and special character of hi	storic features				
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Isolated site set away from urban area. Contai point would reduce the separation between Mo		development up to this				
Conformity with Core Strateg	ЭУ					
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield				
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield				
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed				
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension					
·	ated to existing development					
Regeneration Priority Area:	A de Maller	2.22				
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00				
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gate	way: 0.00				

Site Ref: 3069 Site Name: Harvester White Rose Pub, Dewsbury Road, Morley, Leeds, LS27 8PL

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Unknown	Suitability: LDF	to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider co	omments and o	other plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council Highy	vays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment	a with avacation of backt	and local consists		Rank (1-5
Meets Core Strategy standard	s with exception of neatt	i and local services		4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Access from Wide Lane would	d require widening into si	te and the loss of all	trees on bounda	ry 4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Site may require some off-site	mitigation works			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Could provide access to adjace	ent sites			12
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
yes with mitigation	joint appraoch with 1 1018 (inc access). A nrequires considerati	Access solution		
Highways Agency				
Potential for cumulative impact Morley/Gildersome cluster.	in combination with othe	er sites. If site still ind	cluded at next sit	t assess as part of
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Bounda	ry Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to pr corridor function of the beck al- metre buffer.				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comme	ents:	Environment /	Agency Constra	ints:
Vorkohiro Water Commente		Vorkobine 18/24	or Moote Mate	Transment Warks Carrens
Yorkshire Water Comments:		TOTKSHITE Wat	ei vvaste vvatel	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:	I I		

## <u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 3069	Site Name:	Harvester White Rose Pub Morley, Leeds, LS27 8PL	, Dewsbury Road,
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site:			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
	1		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
		djoin Morley along Wide Lane, and bein ed development within the Green Belt ga	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 124	Floorspace sq m (Non residen	tial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 3075 Site Name: Scrap Yard, Thorpe Lane, Middleton, Leeds, **LS10 4EP** 

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 426857 Area sq m: 67924.59 Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward 429795 Easting: Area Ha: 6.792459 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Other

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 3: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Other uses: Scrap Yard Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3093.83 Distance to bus stop (metres) 213.38 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 11867 SFRA Flood Zone:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: Yes

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

0.00

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.25	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 Site Ref: 3075 Site Name: Scrap Yard, Thorpe Lane, Middleton, Leeds, LS10 4EP

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H22/208/84/	Alterations and first floor ex tension, to form 1, 2 bedro om flat over workshop, garage and store, to dismantlin	09/10/1984	09/05/1985	Α	19.03
H21/129/81/	2, 3 bedroom semi-detached bun galows, and detached vehic le body repair workshop and st ore with vehicle dismantlin	31/03/1981	15/06/1981	А	18.34
H22/105/84/	Alterations and extension, to form utility room and detac hed rendered concrete block do uble garage, to sideof semi-de	24/05/1984	19/06/1984	А	20.72
H21/43/83/	Outline application to layout access and erect detachedhouse and detached store, with lorr y garage, flat and offices, a	11/03/1983	17/02/1984	W	15.54
H22/156/88/1	To layout access and vehicle d ismantling/storage yards, and e rect 2 detached bungalows, eac h with attached garage, er	15/07/1988	15/08/1989	А	19.64
H22/129/83/1	Amendment to previous applicat ion involving the perso nal condition for the laying o ut of access and erection o	15/07/1986	15/09/1986	Α	15.37
H22/179/88/	To lay out extended vehicle di smantling yard and erect two d etached bungalows, each with a ttached garage, withlandscapin	15/08/1988	15/08/1989	Α	20.30
H22/129/83/	Laying out of access and erect ion of detached garage and s tore and detached lorry garage, auto parts store, office, sa	13/07/1983	01/10/1984	Α	15.47

Site Ref: 3075 Site Name: Scrap Yard, Thorpe Lane, Middleton, Leeds,

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built	t up areas					
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?						
Would development result in isolated development	ment?					
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	ooundaries with existing built up area)?					
Would development of the site effectively "round	nd 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	Il connection of settlements?					
Do natural/physical features provide a good exdevelopment?	xisting barrier/boundary to contain	✓				
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:						
No merging of settlements						
Assist in safeguarding countryside from er	ncroachment					
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban area?	✓				
Does the site provide access to the countrysic	le?					
Does the site include local or national conserv	ation designated areas?					
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	es, hedgerows that are protected, or					
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	tural land?	<b>✓</b>				
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?					
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>1</u>					
The site does not perform an important role in	safeguarding the countryside from encroa	chment				
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic towns					
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other historical					
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	cter?:					
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:						
Development of the site would have no effect	on the setting and special character of hist	toric features				
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Existing employment site that is set to the sou pattern and development of the site would extended						
Conformity with Core Strate	gy					
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield				
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield				
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed				
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension					
Development unrel	ated to existing development					
Regeneration Priority Area:						
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00				
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay: 0.00				

Site Ref: 3075 Site Name: Scrap Yard, Thorpe Lane, Middleton, Leeds, LS10 4EP

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Unknown Suitability:	No	Achievability: Long te	rm (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider	comments and o	ther planning red	quirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			Pank (1.5)
Accessibility comment The site has access to 4 buses per hour. 80% of th	e site meets the core stra	tegy standards for	Rank (1-5)
primary & secondary education, 80% primary health			4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Access ok from Thorpe Lane			5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Spare capacity but cumulative issues			3
Mitigation measure			Total scor
			12
Support? Need to combin	ne with other sites:	Suitability for part	ial development:
yes			
<u> Highways Agency</u> <u>Network Rail :</u>			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the		y Amendment	
Beck which lies under the southern section of this sparts of the Dolphin Beck Marsh Leeds Nature Area	ite. Includes		
clear from the aerial photograph how much of this s	ite-based		
esignation (and UK BAP Habitat) has been destroy existing land use. Exclude the line of the Dolphin Bo	eck and a		
20m habitat corridor on both sides and restore this wildlife corridor, and link it eastwards to the woodlar			
Wood. Water Voles to consider.			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Varkahira Wate	er Waste Water Treatme	

Site Ref: 3075	Site Name:	Scrap Yard, Thorpe La LS10 4EP	ane, Middleton, Leeds,
	_		
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:		
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Owner Traveller City	Accepaman	4	
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Site	ASSESSITIETI	it i	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site :			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Site	• Assessmen	ıt	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site r			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	<del>'</del>	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		O maio mi

## **Conclusion of Assessment**

Site Ref: 3075 Site Name: Scrap Yard, Thorpe Lane, Middleton, Leeds,

#### Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. Site is currently in use as a scrap yard. Site would require remedial work before any alternative use could be considered. In Green Belt terms the site does not relate particularly well to the existing settlement pattern and development of the site would extend the existing built up urban area to the south.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 178 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red Not assessed Not assessed

1JB

	Si	te	De	tai	IS
--	----	----	----	-----	----

Northing: 425608 Area sq m: 93987.71 Ward Morley South
Easting: 427249 Area Ha: 9.398771 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Nearest Railway Station

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2514.04 Distance to bus stop (metres) 269.11

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Morley

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Bus Stop ID

10657

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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)

No

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Yes

1JB

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/737/80/	Detached 1000 litre oxygen sto rage tank to brick works.	29/12/1980	16/02/1981	Α	83.02

1JB

## 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 d	evelopment?		
Would development result in isolated development	nent?		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	oundaries with existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "rour	nd off" the settlement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	isting barrier between existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl			
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging			
Would development of the site lead to physica	connection of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex development?	isting barrier/boundary to contain	✓	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
No merging of settlements			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countrysid	e?	✓	
Does the site include local or national conserv	ation designated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are protected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural 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 encro	pachment	
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	ter?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:			
Development of the site would have no effect of	on the setting and special character of hi	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Site does not relate well to settlement. Potentia	al for urban sprawl and no defensible gre	een belt boundary.	
Conformity with Core Strateg	y		
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed	
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension		
Development unrela	ated to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0	.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gate	way: 0	.00

1JB

East Leeds

Availability:	0 1: 1 11:			
	Suitability:	Achi	evability:	
ummary of Infras	tructure provider c	omments and other	planning requi	irements
Leeds City Council Hi	ghways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment	danda wille avenuella alle alle	lile and least and as	I	Rank (1-
vieets Core Strategy stand	dards with exception of heal	th and local services		4
Access Comments			,	Rank (1-
Potential access off Dews access off Rein Road	bury Road (through adjace	nt part B) shared with 1135 a	nd secondary	3
Local network comment	t		'	Rank (1-
A site of this size is likely	to require off-site mitigation	works		4
				7
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Same as site 3078				11
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
yes with mitigation	combine with 3078,	1072 & 1135		
_				
Highways Agency				
No objection				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Am	endment	
Nest Yorkshire Ecology				
Supported with mitigation to corridor function of the Wometre buffer both sides of	to protect and enhance the odkirk Beck - including provite beck and creation of at ter Voles. Water Voles to co	wildife viding a 20 least one		
Supported with mitigation to corridor function of the Wometre buffer both sides of	odkirk Beck - including prov the beck and creation of at	wildife viding a 20 least one		
Supported with mitigation to corridor function of the Wometre buffer both sides of wildlife pond to benefit Wa	odkirk Beck - including prov the beck and creation of at	wildife viding a 20 least one		
Supported with mitigation to corridor function of the Wometre buffer both sides of wildlife pond to benefit Wanatural England:	odkirk Beck - including prov the beck and creation of at	wildife viding a 20 least one		
Supported with mitigation to corridor function of the Wometre buffer both sides of wildlife pond to benefit Wanatural England:	odkirk Beck - including prov the beck and creation of at ter Voles. Water Voles to co	wildife viding a 20 least one		
Supported with mitigation to corridor function of the Wometre buffer both sides of wildlife pond to benefit Wanatural England:	ing	wildife viding a 20 least one	y Constraints:	
Supported with mitigation to corridor function of the Wometre buffer both sides of wildlife pond to benefit Walaural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flood	ing	wildife viding a 20 least one onsider.	y Constraints:	
Supported with mitigation to corridor function of the Wometre buffer both sides of wildlife pond to benefit Washatural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flood Environment Agency Con	ing mments:	wildife yiding a 20 least one onsider.  Environment Agence		
Supported with mitigation to corridor function of the Wometre buffer both sides of wildlife pond to benefit Walatural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flood	ing mments:	wildife yiding a 20 least one onsider.  Environment Agence	y Constraints: ste Water Treatment	Works Comm

## <u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref:	3077A	Site Name:	118-168 Rein Road, 1JB	Tingley, Wakefield, WF3
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herit Leeds City West Yorks English Hei	Council: hire Archaeology	Service:		
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site managed	be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Mauld ave	aiaa and	Vaa	No	Mouho
Would gyp travellers I site?		Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Proximity t		Yes	No	
gypsies an	d travellers	(Text)		
	e of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme	ents	(Text)		
	on of Asses	sment		
division. Site	e. The original site	neighbouring residen		on the centre acting as a natural pen fields beyond the site's boundary.
Site Capacity	(dwellings units):	246	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential): 0
Residential C	onclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red		Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 425364 Area sq m: 47456.62 Morley South Ward 427082 Easting: Area Ha: 4.745662 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Mineral workings and quarries

Neighbouring Use 3: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2744.49 Distance to bus stop (metres) 259.99 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 9394

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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:	0.01		
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
Site		Site Type	
Howley Park Quarry & Brickworks Morley		Landfill Sites	
Howley Park Quarry & Brickworks Morley		Quarries	

1JB

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/32/78/	Alterations and extension, to form toilets and lobby, to cr icket club.	16/01/1978	20/02/1978	Α	13.15
H23/737/80/	Detached 1000 litre oxygen sto rage tank to brick works.	29/12/1980	16/02/1981	Α	99.82
H23/608/80/	Alterations and extensions to existing clubhouse to form detached clubhouse, with loung e, changing rooms, tea room,	24/09/1980	05/01/1981	Α	16.20

1JB

## 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	ng 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	n 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 settler	ments?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/bounda development?	ry to contain	
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 exist	ting urban area?	
Does the site provide access to the countryside?	$\checkmark$	
Does the site include local or national conservation designated area	ıs?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	e protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?		
Does the site contain buildings?	in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion		
The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from e	encroachment	
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns		
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building of feature?	or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this character?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and spe	ecial character of historic featu	ures
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Relates poorly to settlement, this section of the site is to the south of which could lead to further sprawl.	f the beck, no defenisble bou	ndary to south
Conformity with Core Strategy		
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Ex	tension	Brownfield
Major Settlement Major Settlement Ex	tension	Greenfield
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement B	Extension	Mixed
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extens	ion	
Development unrelated to existing devel	opment	
Regeneration Priority Area:		
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00

Site Name: 118-168 Rein Road, Tingley, Wakefield, WF3 Site Ref: 3077B

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusion			
vailability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
ummary of Infrastr	ucture provider c	omments and other planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council High	hways inc Metro		Davile (4.6
Accessibility comment Meets Core Strategy standa	rds with exception of heal	th and local services	Rank (1-5
weets dore dirategy standa	rus with exception of fical	ur and local scryices	4
Access Comments			Rank (1-
Potential access off Dewsbo	ury Road shared with 113	5 and secondary access off Rein Road	4
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
A site of this size is likely to	require off-site mitigation	works	4
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Same as site 3078			12
Support?	Need to combine v	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	tial development:
yes with mitigation	combine with 3078,	10/2 & 1135	
Highways Agency			
No objection			
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology ar	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	<b>Boundary Amendment</b>	
Supported with mitigation to corridor function of the Wood metre buffer both sides of the wildlife pond to benefit Wate	dkirk Beck - including prove e beck and creation of at l	viding a 20 least one	
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
<u> Drainage/Water/Floodin</u>	<u>a</u>		
Environment Agency Com	ments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comment	s:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatm	ent Works Comme
CC Flood Risk Manageme	ent:		

# **Utilities**

Site Ref: 3077B	Site Name:	118-168 Rein Road, 1JB	Tingley, Wakefield, WF3
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site:			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	·	
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			-
Green Belt site. The original site division. Site B is unrelated to the difficult. Development would set	e existing settlement.	The site slopes steeply toward	rn the centre acting as a natural ds the beck making any development
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	124	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 3078A Site Name: Land surrounding St Mary's Church/Cemetary/Parish Centre, Dewsbury

## **Site Details**

Northing: 425174 Area sq m: 59428.66 Ward Morley South
Easting: 427465 Area Ha: 5.942866 HMCA: Outer South West

## Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2975.26Distance to bus stop (metres)183.98Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID12095

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	98.60	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

Site Ref: 3078A Site Name: Land surrounding St Mary's Church/Cemetary/Parish Centre, Dewsbury

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
23/91/99/FU	Golf driving range to sports centre	09/04/1999	12/12/2000	R	84.64
H23/948/76/	Use of agricultural land as go If course, and change of us e of farmhouse to clubhouse.	10/12/1976	09/05/1977	W	11.01
H23/9/83/	Use of part of garden as fruit and vegetable sales, with stall and 4 car parking spaces.	10/01/1983	14/02/1983	А	39.63

# 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	th existing built up area)?	•				
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the set	tlement pattern?: P	artial				
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	of settlements?					
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/development?	boundary to contain					
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 designate	ted areas?					
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s that are protected, or					
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?  ✓						
Does the site contain buildings?	re these in agricultural use?					
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion						
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding	the countryside from encroachn	nent				
Preserve the setting and special character of historic to	wns					
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed b feature?	uilding or other historical					
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	efeatures				
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Strong links to settlement. Development would partially rour boundary to the south.	nd off built up area, but there is r	no defensible				
Conformity with Core Strategy						
Main Urban Area Main Urban	Area Extension	Brownfield				
Major Settlement Major Settle	ment Extension	Greenfield				
Smaller Settlement Smaller Sett	lement Extension	Mixed				
Villages/Rural Village/Rura	I Extension					
Development unrelated to existing	ng development					
Regeneration Priority Area:						
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley:	0.00				
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	) West Leeds Gateway:	0.00				

East Leeds

Availability:	Suitability:	A	Achievability:	
summary of Infrastr	ructure provider o	comments and oth	ner planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy standa	ards with exception of hea	Ith and local services		4
Access Comments			l	Rank (1-5)
Access achievable from Qu Dewsbury Road jct to acces to the east				4
Local network comment			'	Rank (1-5)
A site of this size is likely to	require off-site mitigation	works		4
Mitigation measure				Total score
Pedestrian crossing on Dev signalised junction	wsbury Road, good pedes	trian links in and thorugh	the site and new	12
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for partial of	development:
yes with mitigation				
Highways Agency Likely to require significant p Network Rail :	physical mitigation			
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	: Boundary	Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to corridor function of the Wood metre buffer both sides of the wildlife pond to benefit Wate	dkirk Beck - including prove be beck and creation of at	viding a 20 least one		
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floodin	ng			
oramage/Water/r room		Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Environment Agency Com	ments:	Environment Age		
	ments:	Environment Age	•	

# <u>Utilities</u>

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessm	ent		
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	1	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and	Yes		<b>1</b> 0	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	1.5	-	
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	N	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. Site 3078 has be could constitute a partial 'roundin			related to the existing settl	ement and development
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 1:	33 Floorsp	pace sq m (Non residenti	al):
Residential Conclusion:	R	Retail Conclusion:	E	mployment Conclusion:
Amber	N	lot assessed	N	ot assessed

Site Ref: 3078A

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 424905 Area sq m: 296248.90 Ward Morley South
Easting: 427195 Area Ha: 29.62489 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Wholesale distribution

Existing Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Mix (Mainly greenfield)

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

☑

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3210.15 Distance to bus stop (metres) 125.18

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 7824

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):1.54Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Church / cemetery on site (listed).

#### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.73	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:	0.01		
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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/263/86/	Detached pavilion, with changi ng rooms, toilets, store and v iewing area, to sports club.	10/09/1986	23/03/1987	А	14.56
H23/255/84/	Laying out of 9 hole golf cour se, to vacant site. (site area 2.95ha)	24/08/1984	29/07/1985	Α	14.66
H23/948/76/	Use of agricultural land as go If course, and change of us e of farmhouse to clubhouse.	10/12/1976	09/05/1977	W	47.44
H23/245/77/	Use of agricultural land as 18 hole golf course and c hange of use of farmhouse to c lubhouse. (part of this appli	15/04/1977	01/08/1977	Α	57.28

# 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 developmen						
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ bour	ndaries with existing built up area)?					
Would development of the site effectively "round of	off" the settlement pattern?:	No				
Do natural/physical features provide a good existi	ng 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 co	nnection of settlements?					
Do natural/physical features provide a good existi development?	ng barrier/boundary to contain					
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:						
No merging but there is no defensible boundary						
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encro	pachment					
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the	e site and the existing urban area?	✓				
Does the site provide access to the countryside?		✓				
Does the site include local or national conservation	n designated areas?					
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, he significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	nedgerows that are protected, or	<b>✓</b>				
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 h	nistoric towns					
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation are feature?	a, listed building or other historical	✓				
If yes, could development preserve this character	?:					
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:						
Development of the site would have a significant of	effect on the setting and special charac	eter of historic features				
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Church / cemetery on site, development would imsettlement. High potential for further sprawl.	pact on character of the area. Large si	te that relates poorly to				
Conformity with Core Strategy						
Main Urban Area	ain Urban Area Extension	Brownfield				
Major Settlement Ma	ajor Settlement Extension	Greenfield				
Smaller Settlement Sr	naller Settlement Extension	Mixed				
Villages/Rural Vil	lage/Rural Extension	_				
Development unrelated	d to existing development					
Regeneration Priority Area:						
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00				
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay: 0.00				

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusior	าร			
Availability:	Suitability:	A	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastr	ucture provider c	comments and oth	ner planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			ı	Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy standa	rds with exception of hea	lth and local services		4
Access Comments			'	Rank (1-5)
Access achievable from Qu Dewsbury Road junction to Road to the east				4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
A site of this size is likely to	require off-site mitigation	n works		4
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Pedestrian crossing on Dev signalised junction	vsbury Road, good pedes	strian links in and through	the site, new	12
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for partial of	development:
yes with mitigation				
Highways Agency				
Likely to require significant p	hysical mitigation			
Network Rail :				
<u> Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	: Boundary	Amendment	
Supported with mitigation to corridor function of the Wood metre buffer both sides of the wildlife pond to benefit Wate	dkirk Beck - including prove e beck and creation of at	viding a 20 least one		
Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Floodin	<u>ıq</u>			
Environment Agency Com	ments:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comment	s:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment \	Works Comme

# LCC Flood Risk Management:

<u>Utilities</u>

Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage					
Leeds City Council:					
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:				
English Heritage:					
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assess	sment			
Could site be effectively	Yes		No	Maybe	
managed	(Text)				
Would gypsies and	Yes		No	Maybe	
travellers live on the	(Text)		1.10	mayac	
site?					
Proximity to housed	Yes		No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		INO		
				F	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)		No	Unknown	
encampments	(,				
Conclusion of Asses	sment				
Conclusion summary:					
	arys Church	and cemetery.	The site relates po	ined boundaries and includes roads, orly to the settlement and development	
would result in a significant mount	John Into Gree	on Boit, in the	strategio gap betwee	Treate and randous.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	<del></del>	666	Floorspace sq m	(Non residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Cond	lusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion</b>	1:
Red		Not assesse	ed	Not assessed	

Site Ref: 3078B

#### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 427343
 Area sq m:
 229405.18
 Ward
 Morley South

 Easting:
 428072
 Area Ha:
 22.940518
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Storage

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1345.05Distance to bus stop (metres)361.48Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID11872

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:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:4.82Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.99	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.01	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:	0.03		
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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/328/79/	Outline application to erect d etached house to farm, and a lter existing farmhouse to for m farm shop and office.	09/05/1979	28/01/1980	Α	99.14
H23/63/81/	Regrading of land and planting to form access strip aroun d pig unit.	17/02/1981	30/03/1981	Α	17.80
H23/1029/79/	Change of use of part of farm to haulage depot, with vehic le maintenance workshop, and o ffice, and with lorry park	11/12/1979	18/09/1980	R	99.02
H23/127/78/	Detached farmhouse, comprising 4 bedrooms, bathroom, 2 sho wer rooms, kitchen, dining roo m, lounge, utility room and p	20/02/1978	10/04/1978	Α	99.24

# 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 d	evelopment?			
Would development result in isolated development	nent?			
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	oundaries with existing	built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "rour	nd off" the settlement pa	attern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	isting barrier between e	existing urban	✓	
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 settleme	ents?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex development?	isting barrier/boundary	to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:				
No merging but would significantly reduce the	green belt gap			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment			
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing	ng urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the countryside	e?		✓	
Does the site include local or national conserva	ation designated areas	?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are ր	orotected, or		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?		<b>✓</b>	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in	n agricultural use?	✓	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion				
The site performs an important role safeguardi	ng countryside from en	croachment		
Preserve the setting and special character of	of historic towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or	other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	ter?:			
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:				
Development of the site would have no effect of	on the setting and spec	ial character of hist	oric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	<b>G</b> ,			
Site relates poorly to settlement. Development east contains site but limited scope for further			and Middleton. Road to	
Conformity with Core Strateg	у			
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Exte	ension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Exte	ension	Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Ex	tension	Mixed	
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extensio	n 🔳		
·	ated to existing develop	oment		
Regeneration Priority Area:				
Inner South Leeds:		Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00	West Leeds Gatewa	ay:	0.00

East Leeds

HLAA C	Conclusions					
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)	)
ummary	of Infrastructi	ure provide	er comments and	other plann	ing requirements	S
Leeds City	/ Council Highway	s inc Metro				
	ty comment	-1	- t b 10b d l l 2		Rank	เ (1-5
70% of site i	meets Core Strategy	standards excep	ot health and local service	<del>2</del> \$		3
Access Co	mments				Rank	د (1-5
adjacent sit	es - on Wide Lane, fr	om which the n	t suitable. Further access umber of dwellings could ate or residential area			3
Local netw	ork comment				Rank	k (1-5
Likely to red	quire off-site mitigation	n and cumulativ	e impacts		4	4
Mitigation	measure				Total	l scor
					1	0
Support?		Need to comb	oine with other sites:	Suitabilit	y for partial developme	ent:
yes with mit	tigation					
Highways	Agency					
Potential for Road cluster		combination wit	th other sites. If site still in	ncluded at next si	ft assess as part of Dew	sbury
Network R	ail :					
Biodiversi	<u>ty</u>					
	hire Ecology and LC	C Ecology Off	icer: Bound	ary Amendment		
Supported						
Natural Eng	ıland:					
<u>Education</u>						
Dualis	Nataul[] 11					
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u> Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:						
	<u> </u>			•		
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme						
LCC Flood	Risk Management:					

# **Utilities**

		WF3 1SH	
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment		
	ASSESSITION	,	
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
manageu	(TOXI)		
Would gypsies and	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
small beck flowing through. The	eastern side of the site epresent a significant in	e is dominated by employmencursion into Green Belt an	residential area by a steep cutting with a ent uses. The north eastern boundary is d set a precedent for further sprawl and
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 602	Floorspace sq m (N	Ion residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail (	Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red	Not ass	sessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Topcliffe Grange, Dewsbury Road, Morley,

**Site Ref: 3120** 

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 426912 Area sq m: 2684.20 Ward Morley South
Easting: 426651 Area Ha: 0.26842 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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: Residential - Residential institution

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1234.73Distance to bus stop (metres)51.61Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID7351

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# 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?:	
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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
08/00733/FU	Change of use involving part demolition of school, to form 3 houses, demolition of caretakers dwelling and erection of 3 storey block of 11 flats, with car parking	07/02/2008	08/05/2008	Α	100.00
H23/234/87/	Detached toilet block to schoo I. (this item is also notice under reg ulation 4(1) of the town and c	23/07/1987	28/09/1987	Α	100.00

#### 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:

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.

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

Gas:

Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements  Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro Accessibility comment Good accessibility  Sourcess Comments Access Comments Access from Bridge Street should be achievable  Local network comment Spare capacity but cumulative issues  Total so  Mitigation measure  Total so  14  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: yes  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported  Natural England: Education	SHLAA Conclusions					
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro  Accessibility comment  Good accessibility  Access Comments  Access from Bridge Street should be achievable  Local network comment  Spare capacity but cumulative issues  And Mitigation measure  Total sc  Mitigation measure  Sujtability for partial development:  yes  Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Availability: Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability: Yes	Ac	hievability:	Short term (0-5y	rs)
Accessibility comment Good accessibility Good accessibility Good accessibility Access Comments Rank (1 Access from Bridge Street should be achievable Access from Bridge Street should be achievable Access from Bridge Street should be achievable Board access from Bridge Street should be achievable Access from Bridge Street should be achievable Board accessibility Access from Bridge Street should be achievable Access from Bridge Street should be achievable Bank (1 Access from Bridge Street should be achievable Access from Bridge Street should be achievable  Rank (1 Access from Bridge Street should be achievable  Bank (1 Access from Bridge Street should be achievable  Access from Bridge Street should be achievable  Bank (1 Access from Bridge Street sho	Summary of Infrastructure	provider comm	nents and othe	er planni	ng requirem	ents
Access Comments  Access from Bridge Street should be achievable  Local network comment Spare capacity but cumulative issues  Mitigation measure  Total so  14  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: yes  Highways Agency  Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported  Natural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	•	<u>ic Metro</u>				
Access Comments  Access from Bridge Street should be achievable  Local network comment  Spare capacity but cumulative issues  Mitigation measure  Total sc  14  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  yes  Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	1				1	Rank (1-5)
Access from Bridge Street should be achievable  Local network comment  Spare capacity but cumulative issues  Mitigation measure  Total sc  14  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  yes  Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Good accessibility					5
Local network comment  Spare capacity but cumulative issues  Mitigation measure  Total sc  14  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: yes  Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported  Natural England: Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Access Comments				l	Rank (1-5)
Mitigation measure  Total sc  14  Support? Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  yes  Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Access from Bridge Street should be	achievable				5
Mitigation measure  Total sc  14  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development:  yes  Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Local network comment					Rank (1-5)
Support? Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  Wes  Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Spare capacity but cumulative issues					4
Support? Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  Wes  Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Mitigation magazina					Total coor
Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  Wes  Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Mitigation measure					l otal score
Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding						14
Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Support? Nee	ed to combine with o	ther sites:	Suitability	for partial devel	opment:
Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	yes					
Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding						
Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	<u>Highways Agency</u>					
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Network Rail :					
Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	<u>Biodiversity</u>					
Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ec	cology Officer:	Boundary A	mendment		
Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Supported					
Drainage/Water/Flooding	Natural England:					
	Education					
Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	Drainage/Water/Flooding		Environment A.:	.a 0	into	
	Environment Agency Comments:		Environment Agen	cy Constrai	mtS:	
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comm	Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water W	aste Water	Treatment Work	s Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:	LCC Flood Risk Management:					
	<u>Utilities</u>					

Former school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential development herefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Site Ref: 3189	Site Name:	Bridge Street, Morley	
Fire and Rescue Services:  Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage:  Gypsy_Traveller Site Assessment  Could site be effectively managed	Electric:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage:  Gypsy_Traveller Site Assessment  Could site be effectively	Telecom:			
Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage:  Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment  Could site be effectively Maybe Text Text Text Text Text Text Text Tex	Fire and Rescue Services:			
Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage:  Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment  Could site be effectively Maybe Text Text Text Text Text Text Text Tex	Built Heritage			
English Heritage:  Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment  Could site be effectively Mes No Maybe (Text)  Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  Experience of previous encampments  Text)  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Tormer school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential developmentherefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	·			
Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment  Could site be effectively managed  Yes No Maybe  Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  (Text)  Experience of previous encampments  Yes No Unknown  (Text)  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Former school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential developmentherefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
Could site be effectively Maybe (Text)  Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  Text)  Experience of previous encampments  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Tormer school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential developmentherefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	English Heritage:			
Could site be effectively Maybe (Text)  Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  Text)  Experience of previous encampments  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Tormer school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential developmentherefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmei	nt	
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers  Text)  Experience of previous encampments  Yes No Unknown  (Text)  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Former school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential developmentherefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:		1		Mavbe
travellers live on the site?    Conclusion of Assessment   Conclusion summary:			1 112	1
travellers live on the site?    Conclusion of Assessment   Conclusion summary:				
travellers live on the site?    Conclusion of Assessment   Conclusion summary:	Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers    Yes	travellers live on the			1 ,
Conclusion of Assessment   Yes   No   Unknown	SITE?			
Experience of previous encampments  Yes No Unknown  Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Former school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential development herefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Former school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential developmen therefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Former school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential developmen therefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:				
Conclusion of Assessment  Conclusion summary:  Former school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential development herefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
Conclusion summary:  Former school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential developmen herefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion summary:  Former school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential developmen herefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:				
Conclusion summary:  Former school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential developmen herefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:				
Former school site in residential area with expired planning permission for housing development. Residential development herefore considered acceptable in principle.  Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment		
Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Conclusion summary:			
Site Capacity (dwellings units):  14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):  Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Former school site in residential	area with expired pla	anning permission for housing dev	velopment. Residential developmen
Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	lifererore considered acceptable	ш рипоріє.		
Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:				
	Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 14	Floorspace sq m (Non r	residential):
Green	Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
	Green			

Site Ref: 3320 Site Name: Thorpe Villa (land to north) Middleton Lane, Thorp, LS10 4GY

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 427299 Area sq m: 277625.15 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 431484 Area Ha: 27.762515 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Significant Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):4590.54Distance to bus stop (metres)463.33Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID2849

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

#### **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?:	
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

Thorpe Villa (land to north) Middleton Lane, Thorp, LS10 4GY Site Ref: 3320 Site Name:

**Planning History** 

Site Ref: 3320 Site Name: Thorpe Villa (land to north) Middleton Lane, Thorp, LS10 4GY

# 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.								
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:  No								
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between area and undeveloped land?	existing urban							
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 settlem	nents?							
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary development?	y to contain							
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 existi	ng urban area?							
Does the site provide access to the countryside?	$\checkmark$							
Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas	s?							
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	protected, or							
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	$\checkmark$							
Does the site contain buildings?	in agricultural use?							
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion								
The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from er	ncroachment							
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns								
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or feature?	other historical							
If yes, could development preserve this character?:								
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:								
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and spec	cial character of historic features							
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:								
Large site that relates poorly to settlement. Contained to the north by settlement and Middleton, potential for additional sprawl to east and								
Conformity with Core Strategy								
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Exte	ension Brownfield							
Major Settlement Extended Major Settlement Extended	ension Greenfield							
Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed								
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension	on 🔳							
Development unrelated to existing develo	pment							
Regeneration Priority Area:								
Inner South Leeds: 0.00		0.00						
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00						

Site Ref: 3320 Site Name: Thorpe Villa (land to north) Middleton Lane, Thorp, LS10 4GY

East Leeds

Public Transport not in line with Core Strategy standards and has a lack in local services  Access Comments  Access from Middelton Lane  5  Local network comment  Spare capacity but cumulative issues  Mitigation measure  Total sc  11  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  No  Highways Agency	HLAA Conclusions	IDE ( ) :		
Accessibility comment Public Transport not in line with Core Strategy standards and has a lack in local services  Access Comments Access from Middelton Lane  Local network comment Spare capacity but cumulative issues  Mitigation measure  Total sc  11  Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No  No  Network Rail:  Signored with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife portrior function of the Woodkin Beck - including providing a 20 netre buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one wildlife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  No  Boundary Amendment Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to planted with native shrubs and small trees. The woodland areas should not be broken up by roaks to other development (are vesting agas should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ci Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education	Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Sultabil	ty: LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Access Comments Access From Middelton Lane  Local network comment Spare capacity but cumulative issues  Mitigation measure  Total sc  11  Support?  Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: No  Boundary Amendment Support Wetwork Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported with midigation to protect and enhance the wildife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Water Voles of the beck and creation of at least one yildilife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Meanument Supported with midigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all voodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to planted with native shrubs and small trees. The woodland areas should not be broken up by roads other development (any existing gaps should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ci. Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Brank (1:  2  Rank (1:  5  Rank (1:  4  Boundary Amendment Supported with midigation if Red hatched areas are excluded with mispation if Red hatched areas are excluded with mispation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all voodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ci. Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Rank (1:  2  Rank (1:  4  Access Comments  Rank (1:  5  Rank (1:  4  Access Comments  Suitability for partial development:  Boundary Amendment  Supported with mispation if Red hatched areas are excluded with mispation if Red hatched areas are excluded with mispation if Red hatched areas are excluded with mispation will still be required to provide a coherent ecological network with a suitable providing a minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided a coherent eco	ummary of Infrastructure prov	ider comments a	and other plann	ing requirements
Access Comments Access from Middelton Lane  Coal network comment Spare capacity but cumulative issues  Mitigation measure  Total sc  In the supporter with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildiffe confor function of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 here buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one indiffie pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Drainage/Water/Flooding  Prainage/Water/Flooding  Rank (1:  Sundair In the same of the sundair sunda	eeds City Council Highways inc Met	<u>ro</u>		
Access Comments  Access from Middelton Lane  Local network comment  Spare capacity but cumulative issues  Mitigation measure  Total sc  11  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  No  Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Suported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife condition for the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 netre buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one wildife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM320. Mitigation will still be required to revice the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer loplanted with native shrubs and small trees. The woodland areas should not be broken up by roads other development (any existing gaps should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle C: Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education				Rank (1-
Access from Middelton Lane  Local network comment  Spare capacity but cumulative issues  Amitigation measure  Total sc  11  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  No  Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Signification of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 parter buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one visibility become site of the second	Public Transport not in line with Core Strategy	<i>i</i> standards and has a la	ick in local services	2
Local network comment  Spare capacity but cumulative issues  Mitigation measure  Total sc  11  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  No  Highways Agency  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the wildlife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Pawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one wildlife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Pawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer shoul also be provided aloogical network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer shoul date be provided about path Throstle Cabeck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education	Access Comments			Rank (1-
Mitigation measure  Total sc  11  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  No  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife corridor function of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 protect buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one wildifile pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer both are should not be broken up by roads of the development (any existing agps should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ct Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education	Access from Middelton Lane			5
Mitigation measure  Total sc  11  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  No  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife corridor function of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 parter buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one wildlife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Water Voles to consider.  Natural England:  Education  Total sc  11  Supported  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to the development (any existing agps should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ct Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education	Land action to a constant			Paralla (4)
Mitigation measure  Total sc  11  Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  No  Network Rail:  Siddiversity  Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife corridor function of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 prawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing almost add as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer both and the support of the providing a required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to development (any existing agps should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ct Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education				
Support?  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife corridor function of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 metre buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one wildlife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to provided and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to planted with native shrubs and small trees. The woodland areas should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle C: Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Patural England:  Education	Spare dapacity but dufficiality located			4
Support?  Need to combine with other sites:  Suitability for partial development:  No  Highways Agency  Network Rail :  Biodiversity  Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife corridor function of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 metre buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one wildlife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to planted with native shrubs and small trees. The woodland areas should not be broken up by roads of other development (any existing gaps should be planted up to provide a oberrent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Cit Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education	Mitigation measure			Total sco
Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife corridor function of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 metre buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one wildlife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to planted with native shrubs and small trees. The woodland areas should not be broken up by roads of other development (any existing gaps should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Cabeck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding				11
Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife corridor function of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 metre buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one wildlife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to planted with native shrubs and small trees. The woodland areas should not be broken up by roads of other development (any existing gaps should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Cabeck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Support? Need to co	ombine with other site	s: Suitabilit	v for partial development:
Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife corridor function of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Cabeck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Drainage/Water/Flooding				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife corridor function of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 enetre buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one wildlife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ca Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife corridor function of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 enetre buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one wildlife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ca Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Highways Agoney			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:  Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife corridor function of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 metre buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one wildlife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to planted with native shrubs and small trees. The woodland areas should not be broken up by roads of other development (any existing gaps should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ca Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Network Rail :			
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the wildife corridor function of the Woodkirk Beck - including providing a 20 metre buffer both sides of the beck and creation of at least one wildlife pond to benefit Water Voles. Water Voles to consider.  Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to planted with native shrubs and small trees. The woodland areas should not be broken up by roads of other development (any existing gaps should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Cabeck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Drainage/Water/Flooding	<del></del>	O#i D		
excluded and the boundary is amended as per Drawing RM/3320. Mitigation will still be required to protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to planted with native shrubs and small trees. The woodland areas should not be broken up by roads of other development (any existing gaps should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Cabeck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding				
protect and enhance the boundaries adjacent to all woodland - providing a minimum 20 metre buffer to planted with native shrubs and small trees. The woodland areas should not be broken up by roads of other development (any existing gaps should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ca Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	corridor function of the Woodkirk Beck - include	ding providing a 20 ex	cluded and the bound	ary is amended as per
planted with native shrubs and small trees. The woodland areas should not be broken up by roads of other development (any existing gaps should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ca Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding		oles to consider. pr	otect and enhance the	boundaries adjacent to all
other development (any existing gaps should be planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ca Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding				
planted up to provide a coherent ecological network rather than used for access). A minimum 20 metre buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ca Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding				
buffer should also be provided along the Throstle Ca Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Set the second of the should also be provided along the Throstle Ca Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Set the second of the should also be provided along the Throstle Ca Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Set the second of the should also be provided along the Throstle Ca Beck which runs along the northern boundary.  Set the second of the s		pl	anted up to provide a	coherent ecological network
Natural England:  Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding		bu	ıffer should also be pro	ovided along the Throstle Ca
Education  Drainage/Water/Flooding	Natural England:	В	еск which runs along t	ne northern boundary.
Drainage/Water/Flooding	-			
	<u>=qucation</u>			
	Drain aga/Matay/Ela a dina			
	·	Fnviron	ment Agency Constr	aints:

Thorpe Villa (land to north) Middleton Lane, Thorp, LS10 4GY Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme **Yorkshire Water Comments:** 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 Yes No Maybe (Text) managed Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) Proximity to housed Yes No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown encampments Gypsy \_Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively Yes No Maybe managed (Text) Would gypsies and No Yes Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? Proximity to housed Yes No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown encampments (Text)

Site Ref: 3320

Site Name:

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: 3320 Site Name: Thorpe Villa (land to north) Middleton Lane, Thorp, LS10 4GY

### **Conclusion of Assessment**

#### Conclusion summary:

Green Belt site. The site is unrelated to the settlement. Development would represent a significant incursion into Green Belt of a scale out of keeping with Thorpe on the Hill to the south, and would set a precedent for further unrestricted sprawl.

Site Capacity (dwellings units): 624 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red Not assessed Not assessed

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 425446 Area sq m: 36996.27 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 429347 Area Ha: 3.699627 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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: Vacant & Derelict - Vacant building

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3571.16Distance to bus stop (metres)131.67Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID4864

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

**Planning History** 

Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?

significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?

Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion

If yes, could development preserve this character?:

Does the site contain buildings?

feature?

Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or

Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical

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

### 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? **V** 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?

**~** 

Are these in agricultural use?

Overall Character Preserv	vation Concl	usion:			
Development of the site w	ould have n	o effect on the setting and special cha	aracter of historic for	eatures	
Greenbelt Assessment	Conclusion:	:			
Strong links to settlement	. Site is well	contained with low potential for furthe	er sprawl.		
Conformity with	Core S	trategy			
Main Urban Area		Main Urban Area Extension		Brownfield	
Major Settlement		Major Settlement Extension		Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement		Smaller Settlement Extension	on 🔳	Mixed	
Villages/Rural		Village/Rural Extension			
	Developme	ent unrelated to existing development			
Regeneration Priority	Area:				
Inner South Leeds:		0.00 Aire V	/alley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corrid	or:	0.00 West	Leeds Gateway:		0.00

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions					
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: L	LDF to determine Achievability: Long term (11+ year	rs)			
Summary of Infrastructure provider	r comments and other planning requiremen	its			
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	D-	nl. (4. F)			
Accessibility comment 2/3buses per hour, 100% primary & secondary educations and secondary educations.		nk (1-5)			
		4			
Access Comments	Rai	nk (1-5)			
Access from Westerton Road looks ok		5			
Local network comment	Rai	nk (1-5)			
spare capacity but cumulative issues		4			
Mitigation measure	Tot	al score			
new footway along site frontage		13			
Support? Need to combine	ne with other sites: Suitability for partial developn	nent:			
yes with mitigation	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
Highways Agency	- ·				
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with o Morley/Gildersome/Ardsley cluster.	n other sites. If site still included at next sift assess as part of				
Network Rail :					
<u>Biodiversity</u>					
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	•				
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the at the south-western tip of this proposed allocation (vadjacent to Ardsley Reservoir LNA - an open water a valuable for passage and wintering birds) by providin minimum 20 metre buffer of native shrubs and small	r area ding a				
Landscaping within the site should include mainly na increase feeding and breeding opportunities for birds	native trees to				
Natural England:	us.				
Education					
Drainage/Water/Flooding					
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:				
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme				

LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:				
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:					
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:				
English Heritage:					
Gyncy Traveller Site	Accocca	nont			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	; A5565511	nent			
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)		No		Maybe
managed	(Text)				
Would gypsies and	Yes		No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)				
Proximity to housed	Yes			No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)				
Experience of previous	Yes		No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)				
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment				
Conclusion summary:					
Green Belt site. The site has a lo settlement and development wou					
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	:	83 <b>Fi</b>	oorspace	sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusi	on:		Employment Conclusion:
Green		Not assessed			Not assessed

Site Name: Westerton Road, Tingley

Site Ref: 3365

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 424964 Area sq m: 12722.90 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 427769 Area Ha: 1.27229 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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 

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3243.61 Distance to bus stop (metres) 79.44

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 13897

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

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:

# **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:	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

**Planning History** 

# 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? Are these in agricultural use? Does the site contain buildings? 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area:

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.

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs	s) Suitability: Yes	A	chievability: Long term	(11+ years)
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provider co	mments and oth	er planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
The site lies within the accessib core strategy standards for prim			ne site lies meets the	3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Access should be achievable for	rom Baghill Road			5
				J
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Spare capacity but cumulative	issues			4
				7
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				12
				12
Support?	Need to combine wi	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
yes				
Highways Agency				
Potential for cumulative impact Morley/Gildersome/Ardsley clus		r sites. If site still includ	led at next sift assess as p	part of
Network Rail:	iter.			
Notificial I				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and I	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Supported				
National Englands				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Duning and // // // // // // // // // // // // //				
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u> Environment Agency Comme	nts:	Environment Age	ncv Constraints:	
			•	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water \	Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
CC Flood Risk Management:				

**Utilities** 

Site Ref: 3372	Site Name:	East side of Baghill Ro	oad, West Ardsley
Gas: Electric: Telecom: Fire and Rescue Services: Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:  Sypsy _Traveller Site	Assassmont	•	
Jypsy I raveller Site	ASSESSIIIEIII		
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Sypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment	t	
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown

### **Conclusion of Assessment**

#### Conclusion summary:

Designated as N11 - open land on the existing UDP, not within the Green Belt. Whilst in considering the UDP, the Inspector conceded that development of some of the N11 land for housing could not be ruled out, the importance of open views across the site was emphasised. This site is on the brow of a hill which provides views across and into the site. Development would affect the open character of this part of the wider UDP designation.

Site Capacity (dwellings units):

40 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):

Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Site Name:

East side of Baghill Road, West Ardsley

Red

Site Ref: 3372

Site Ref: 3373A Site Name: Haigh Wood, West Ardsley

### **Site Details**

Northing: 425118 Area sq m: 57824.35 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428023 Area Ha: 5.782435 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest
Existing Use 3: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3169.83 Distance to bus stop (metres) 283.70

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 8553

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

### **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/212/81/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to ea ch of two vacant sites. (site area 24.82ha).	31/03/1981	11/02/1985	R	29.52
H23/213/81/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to ag ricultural site. (site area 4h a).	31/03/1981	11/02/1985	R	50.44

### 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? Are these in agricultural use? Does the site contain buildings? 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area:

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.

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

East Leeds

Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infra	structure provider comments a	nd other planning requirements	
Leeds City Council I			
Accessibility comment		Rank	(1-5)
The site lies within the ac education and primary he	ccessibility standards for 2/3buses per hour, pealth	rimary and secondary 3	3
Access Comments		Rank	(1-5)
	could access from Upper Green Drive or Aven cycle access would be required	ue - given shape of site a	ļ
Local network comme	nt	Rank	(1-5)
Cumulative issues		3	3
Mitigation measure		Total s	scor
		10	0
Support?	Need to combine with other sites:	Suitability for partial developmen	nt:
yes with mitigation			
Highways Agency			
Comment awaited			

### Network Rail:

**Biodiversity** 

### West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). This site includes HaighWood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider.

### **Boundary Amendment**

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is ammended as per Drawing RM/3373. This will result in an allocation that is separated to the west and east of Baghill Beck there should not be a connecting road that goes through or over the beck and its associated grassland/scrub/woodland as this would fragment this habitat. Mitigation will be required to protect and enhance the boundary with Haigh Wood, adjacent scrub and grasslands and Baghill Beck by providing a 20 metre buffer with native shrub and small tree planting. Adjacent to the beck (in the 20 metre buffer) there should be flood water attenuation ponds designed to retain a minimum of 500mm of water for Water Vole enhancement linked to the beck corridor. There are also a number of species-rich hedgerows (UK BAP Priority habitat) and woodland/tree belts within the site and along boundaries which should be protected and enhanced to improve their connectivity across the siteby providing a 20m wide buffer planted with locally native trees and shrubs. Bats to consider.

#### **Natural England:**

#### **Education**

Site Ret: 33/3A	Site Name: na	lign wood, west A	rasiey
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Commo	ents:	Environment Agency	Constraints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water Was	te Water Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:		
<u>Utilities</u>			
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	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	140	Maybo
ono.			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		

#### Gypsy \_Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively No Maybe Yes managed Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? **Proximity to housed** Yes No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown encampments (Text)

### **Conclusion of Assessment**

#### **Conclusion summary:**

Designated as N11 - open land on the existing UDP, not within the Green Belt. Site 3373 has been split into 3. Site A relates well to the existing settlement and release of this part of the site would not adversely impact on the openness of the central valley. Any development would need to retain good public access into the valley. The site was historically put forward as a housing allocation in the draft Morley local plan, and whilst not subsequently allocated, in considering the UDP, the Inspector conceded that development of some of the land for housing could not be ruled out. This site is well

Site Capacity (dwellings units):	130	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ntial):	C
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Concl	usion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>	

### **Site Details**

Northing: 425012 Area sq m: 162380.64 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428122 Area Ha: 16.238064 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Existing Use 3: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 1 Forestry - Unmanaged Forest
Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3304.26 Distance to bus stop (metres) 398.76

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 8553

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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:	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

### **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/212/81/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to ea ch of two vacant sites. (site area 24.82ha).	31/03/1981	11/02/1985	R	60.70

### 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? Are these in agricultural use? Does the site contain buildings? 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area:

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.

0.00

0.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

East Leeds

Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infra	astructure provider comments	and other planning requ	uirements
Leeds City Council	Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility commen	t		Rank (1-5)
Site lies within accessib and primary health	ility standards of 2/3buses per hour and prima	ary and secondary education	3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Awkward to access wit	hout adjacent sites, especially given large siz	е	2
Local network commo	ent		Rank (1-5)
Cumulative issues			3
Mitigation measure			Total scor
			8
Support?	Need to combine with other site	s: Suitability for partia	I development:
no			
Highways Agency			
Comment awaited			

### **Biodiversity**

#### West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:

Not supported (RED). This site includes HaighWood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider.

### **Boundary Amendment**

Supported with mitigation if Red hatched areas are excluded and the boundary is ammended as per Drawing RM/3373. This will result in an allocation that is separated to the west and east of Baghill Beck there should not be a connecting road that goes through or over the beck and its associated grassland/scrub/woodland as this would fragment this habitat. Mitigation will be required to protect and enhance the boundary with Haigh Wood, adjacent scrub and grasslands and Baghill Beck by providing a 20 metre buffer with native shrub and small tree planting. Adjacent to the beck (in the 20 metre buffer) there should be flood water attenuation ponds designed to retain a minimum of 500mm of water for Water Vole enhancement linked to the beck corridor. There are also a number of species-rich hedgerows (UK BAP Priority habitat) and woodland/tree belts within the site and along boundaries which should be protected and enhanced to improve their connectivity across the site by providing a 20m wide buffer planted with locally native trees and shrubs. Bats to consider.

#### **Natural England:**

#### **Education**

Site Ret: 33/3B	Site Name: na	ign wood, west A	rasiey
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Commo	ents:	Environment Agency	Constraints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water Was	ste Water Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:		
<u>Utilities</u>			
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	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	140	Iwaybe
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
		T	T
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
onoumpmonto			

Gyps	y	ler Site /	Assessment
------	---	------------	------------

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

### **Conclusion of Assessment**

#### **Conclusion summary:**

Designated as N11 - open land on the existing UDP, not within the Green Belt. Site 3373 has been split into 3. Site B is the central valley. It is important that the openness of the central valley is protected and retained as an attractive local resource. The valley is popular among walkers and cyclists and offers impressive open views. Should sites A and C be released for development, the protection and enhancement of site B should be ensured.

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Rec

### **Site Details**

Northing: 424860 Area sq m: 64432.08 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428184 Area Ha: 6.443208 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3467.61 
Distance to bus stop (metres) 302.86

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 11844

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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:	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

## **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/27/90/	Outline application to lay out access, drainage and publi c open space and erect residen tial development to agricultur	23/01/1990	27/03/2003	0	19.42
H23/212/81/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to ea ch of two vacant sites. (site area 24.82ha).	31/03/1981	11/02/1985	R	85.04
23/122/99/OT	Outline application to erect school	04/05/1999	13/07/1999	R	17.39

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	าร				
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:			
ummary of Infrasti	ucture provider co	omments and other planning req	uirements		
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5		
Site has access to 2/3buse secondary education and pr		core strategy standards for primary and	3		
Access Comments			Rank (1-5		
Awkward shape site, site boundary needs to be reconsidered to allow for more access option - combine with 536					
Local network comment			Rank (1-5		
Cumulative issues			3		
			U		
Mitigation measure			Total sco		
			9		
Support?	Need to combine w	rith other sites: Suitability for partia	al development:		
yes subject to access	yes - 536				
Highways Agency Comment awaited					
Network Rail :					
<u>Biodiversity</u>					
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	<b>Boundary Amendment</b>			
Support		Support			
Natural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
Drainage/Water/Floodir	<u></u>				
Environment Agency Com	ments:	Environment Agency Constraints:			
Yorkshire Water Commen		Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatmer	nt Works Comme		
Tomornio Water Commen	<u>.                                    </u>	Torrow Marie			
LCC Flood Risk Managem	ent:				
<u>Utilities</u>					

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Site	e Assessr	ment		
Could site be effectively	Yes		No	Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes		No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	·		•
site?				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		110	
<b>5</b>		1.	N1 -	Halmanna
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)		No	Unknown
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Designated as N11 - open land of elates well to the existing settler entral valley. Any development orward as a housing allocation in JDP, the Inspector conceded that	nent and releas would need to n the draft Morle	se of this part of the si retain good public ac ey local plan, and whi	ite would not adversely imposess into the valley. The silst not subsequently allocations.	act on the openness of the ite was historically put ted, in considering the
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	:	144 Floors	pace sq m (Non residenti	<b>al):</b> 0
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion:	E	mployment Conclusion:
Green				

Site Name: Haigh Wood, West Ardsley

Site Ref: 3373C

### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428656
 Area sq m:
 38058.43
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 424454
 Area Ha:
 3.805843
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Wholesale distribution

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses: Neighbouring - outdoor sport facility

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2569.91Distance to bus stop (metres)210.32Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID7820

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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:	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

## **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/469/89/	5 externally illuminated fasci a signs to works.	19/09/1989	24/10/1989	Α	92.50
23/550/05/SI	2 internally illuminated and 3 non illuminated signs to depot	17/11/2005	12/01/2006	SPL	65.20
H23/795/77/	Laying out of building contrac tors access, to works.	14/11/1977	09/01/1978	Α	70.25
H23/948/79/	29.5m high replacement radio m ast to workshop roof, to ea rth moving vehicle repair and maintenance depot.	09/11/1979	10/12/1979	Α	70.25
23/178/94/FU	Detached security office to works	03/06/1994	18/07/1994	Α	67.63
H23/516/77/	Outline application to erect d etached canteen and kitch en building, to factory.	01/08/1977	19/09/1977	А	89.71
23/115/94/FU	2.4 metre and 2 metre high boundary fence to factory	31/03/1994	16/06/1994	Α	91.02
H23/697/79/	Alterations, to form locker ro om, drying room, toilets, showe r room, rest room and offices, to earth moving vehicle de	24/08/1979	29/10/1979	Α	70.25
H23/41/80/	Laying out of concrete hardsta nding to works.	18/01/1980	31/03/1980	Α	90.98
H23/75/76/	Outline application to erect a single storey, cater pillar earth moving equipment, repair workshop, to enginee	28/01/1976	05/04/1976	R	70.25
H23/797/77/	Alterations and extension, to form earth moving equip ment repair workshop including transmission and engine ass	14/11/1977	09/01/1978	Α	70.25
H23/307/74/	Two illuminated fascia signs, one size 5.5m (18ft) x 1.8m (6ft), height above ground 4.3 m (14ft) (underside)and one si	31/07/1974	11/11/1974	Α	70.25
H23/190/79/	Detached staff canteen, with se rvery, kitchen, store and boile r room, to works.	15/03/1979	22/05/1979	А	70.25
H23/328/76/	Outline application to relocat e existing prefabricated cante en building, and erect new spa re parts storage building,	29/04/1976	06/09/1976	W	89.26
H23/102/75/	Amendment to previous applicat ion involving elevational cladd ing treatment to existing depot and offices. (applicati	17/02/1975	17/03/1975	А	69.79
H23/358/74/	One illuminated fascia sign, s ize 4.26m (14ft) x 0.60m (2ft), height above ground 2. 13m (7ft)(underside)to factory	29/08/1974	11/11/1974	А	70.25
H23/553/77/	Temporary detached prefabricat ed canteen unit tofactory	17/08/1977	10/10/1977	А	88.96
H23/329/76/	Outline application to erect e xtension to form earth movin g equipment repair workshop, to plant workshop premises.	29/04/1976	17/08/1976	Α	89.26

H23/76/74/	Single storey cricket pavillio n comprising lounge, dress ing rooms, score room, store, w.c.s and shower.	26/04/1974	22/07/1974	А	70.25
H23/78/74/	Alterations to toilet accomoda tion and additional offic e accomodation within existing main office aera and formin	06/05/1974	30/09/1974	А	70.25

# 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 ribb	oon development?		
Would development result in isolated development	elopment?		
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 goo area and undeveloped land?	od existing barrier between existing urban		
Overall sprawl conclusion:			
Prevent neighbouring towns from mer	ging		
Would development of the site lead to phy	ysical connection of settlements?		
Do natural/physical features provide a goodevelopment?	od existing barrier/boundary to contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	m encroachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary bet	ween the site and the existing urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the count	ryside?		
Does the site include local or national cor	nservation designated areas?		
Does the site include areas of woodlands significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?			
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a ag	ricultural land?	<b>✓</b>	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclu	usion_		
Preserve the setting and special chara	cter of historic towns		
	ation area, listed building or other historical		
If yes, could development preserve this cl	naracter?:		
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion			
	<del></del>		
Consultation of Consultations			
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			_
Conformity with Core Stra	ategy		
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield	
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield	
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed	
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension		<del></del>
Development of	unrelated to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor	0.00 West Leads Gatew	/a//·	0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

	es	Achievability: Short to	erm (0-5yrs)
Summary of Infrastructure provider of	comments and o	ther planning red	quirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Well served by public transport and other local servic	es		4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Existing access would need to be moved but there is	s space for this		4
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Congested location with cumulative issues			3
			3
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Improved access and potential off-site works			11
Support? Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for part	ial development:
yes with mitigation			<u> </u>
<u>Highways Agency</u>			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer	: Boundar	y Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
Education			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water Treatmo	ent Works Comme

Site Ref: 3378	Site Name:	Finning (UK) Ltd, Gelder LS27 7JS	d Road, Gildersome,
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Accocemon	<b>•</b>	
	ı	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managed	(TOXI)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
		ntial development to the north and ea	st. Residential development
considered acceptable in principl	e.		
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 85	Floorspace sq m (Non resid	lential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Green			

### **Site Details**

Northing: 431434 Area sq m: 36968.53 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 426916 Area Ha: 3.696853 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Retail - Shops

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Office

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1441.66Distance to bus stop (metres)228.22Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID8064

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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:	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
Site		Site Type	
Royds Lane Holbeck/Beeston recent pp		General Waste Management Sites	

## **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
24/243/00/FU	Two single storey side extensions and single storey rear extension with roof mounted condenser unit to rear	15/08/2000	19/07/2005	W	87.57
H24/121/74/	One non-illuminated fascia sig n size, 5m (16ft.6ins) x 1.5 m (5ft) height above ground 3. 0m (10ft) (undersideone free s	21/05/1974	08/07/1974	Α	97.12
H24/353/80/	Addition of 2 entrance lobbies to wholesale warehouse.	19/06/1980	14/07/1980	Α	96.80
24/169/00/FU	Alterations to frontage and new entrance and exit lobbies to warehouse	16/06/2000	25/07/2000	Α	87.57
24/212/00/SI	1 internally illuminated sign 2 non- illuminated signs and 14 non- illuminated flag signs to retail unit	20/07/2000	16/01/2003	Α	87.57
24/311/98/FU	Alterations to elevations to cafe to wholesale warehouse	14/09/1998	25/11/1998	Α	38.50
H24/843/75/	One non-illuminated freestandi ng hoarding, size 6.1m. (20ft.) x 3.05m. (10ft.), hei ght above ground 1.52m. (5f	27/11/1975	22/12/1975	R	97.12
H24/247/82/1	Extension of permission for the use of part of existingwhole sale warehouse car park as gar den centre. (previous	11/10/1983	01/11/1983	Α	96.88
H24/247/82/	Use of part of existing wholes ale warehouse car park asgarde n centre.	22/09/1982	01/11/1982	Α	96.88
08/04175/FU	Replacement lighting to front car park to cash and carry	10/07/2008	31/10/2008	Α	98.84
H24/275/84/	Change of use of part of wareh ouse car park to wareh ouse garden centre.	21/11/1984	07/01/1985	Α	98.75
H24/335/88/	Alterations and extension, to form enlarged store area, to ex isting cash and carry warehous e.	23/11/1988	23/01/1989	Α	98.35

### 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 d	evelopment?	
Would development result in isolated development	nent?	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	oundaries with existing built up area)?	
Would development of the site effectively "rour	nd off" the settlement pattern?:	
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	isting barrier between existing urban	
Overall sprawl conclusion:		
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging		
Would development of the site lead to physica	connection of settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex development?	isting barrier/boundary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment	
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban area?	
Does the site provide access to the countrysid	e?	
Does the site include local or national conserva	ation designated areas?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion		
Preserve the setting and special character of	of historic towns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this characteristics	ter?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Conformity with Core Strateg	у	
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	=
Major Settlement	Maior Colling and Friday in	Brownfield
Smaller Settlement	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Greenfield
\(\frac{1}{2}\)		Mixed
-		
Regeneration Priority Area:	ated to existing development	
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	
		-

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	ns			
Availability: Short term (0-	5yrs) Suitability: Yes I	Physical	Achievability: Short term (0	0-5yrs)
ummary of Infrast	ructure provider co	mments and of	ther planning require	ements
_eeds City Council Hig	jhways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-
Meets Core Strategy standa	ards but distant from some lo	cal services and rail		4
Access Comments				Rank (1-
Access to Royds Lane and	Ring Road ok adjacent site	has approval with mit	igation for local junctions	4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Possible cumulative impac	t but brownfield should be ok			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Access improvements and	potential local signal junction	าร		12
Support?	Need to combine wit	th other sites:	Suitability for partial de	evelopment:
yes with mitigation	no		yes	
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u> Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	y Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floodi	ng			
Environment Agency Com		Environment A	gency Constraints:	
orkshire Water Commen	ts:	Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water Treatment W	orks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managem				
_				
<u>Jtilities</u>				

Site Ref:	3386	Site Name:	Makro store, Royds Lane, Lower Wortley Road, Leeds, LS12 6HU
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Res	cue Services:		
Built Herita	<u>ge</u>		
Leeds City C	ouncil:		
West Yorksh	ire Archaeology S	Service:	
English Herit	tage:		

### Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning requirements

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
Meets accessibility criteria		5
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
access option via Royds Lane		_
		4
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
congestion on Ring Road		3
Mitigation measure		Total score
signalisation of A58/ A6120 roundabout may be required	d, local pedestrian improvements	12
Support? Need to combine with	h other sites: Suitability for partia	al development:
Yes with mitigation		
Highways Agency		
Network Rail:		
Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported Supported		
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	<b>Environment Agency Constraints:</b>	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatmen	nt Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		
Utilities		
Gas:		
Electric:		
Telecom:		
Fire and Rescue Services:		

### **Built Heritage**

Site Ref: 3386 Site Name: Makro store, Royds Lane, Lower Wortley Road, Leeds, LS12 6HU **Leeds City Council:** West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: **English Heritage:** Gypsy \_Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively Yes No Maybe managed (Text) Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? Proximity to housed No Yes gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown (Text) encampments **Conclusion of Assessment** Conclusion summary: The site is currently a Makro store, in a mixed use (residential and employment) area, suitable for residential or employment uses in principle. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 97 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): **Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:** 

Not assessed

Not assessed

Amber

### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428741
 Area sq m:
 118472.69
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 425011
 Area Ha:
 11.847269
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

### 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: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries:

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2054.08Distance to bus stop (metres)287.90Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID6861

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

No

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Yes

### **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
23/60/03/OT	Outline application to erect business industrial and storage and distribution development	11/02/2003	22/06/2012	R	99.51
H23/135/92/	Extraction of coal by opencast method to agricultural site. (site area 12.2ha) m	16/03/1992	20/12/1993	AP	99.91
12/02470/OT	Outline application for proposed employment development for use classes B1(b) and B1(c) (Research and Development/Light Industrial Uses), B2 (General Industrial Uses) and B8 (Storage and Distribution Uses) with new accesses, associated infrastructure and landscaping	01/06/2012		PCO	99.43

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrac	structure provider commen	te and other planning re	quiromonte
buillilary or illitas	tructure provider comment	is and other planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment	OL TOLL		Rank (1-5)
Reasonably good accessi	Dility		4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
access achivevale from C	Gelderd Rd and Asquith avenue		4
Local network commen	t		Rank (1-5)
congested location with o	:umulative issues		3
Mitigation measure			Total score
new access and off-site v	vorks		11
Support?	Need to combine with other	sites: Suitability for par	tial development:
yes with mitigation			
Highways Agency	an ant in an arbination with athen sites. If		
Morley/Gildersome/Ardsle	npact in combination with other sites. If	site still included at next sitt assess	
Network Rail :	y ciusier.		as part of
Network Ivan .	y cluster.		o as part or
Biodiversity	y cluster.		as part ui
Biodiversity	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	as part ui
Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology  Not supported (RED). This Clubbed Oaks and Dean woodland site. The souther allocation site has been seen seen to be a seen			natched areas are mended as per be required to protectly to be required to protectly to be required to the south, as 20 metre buffer planting. Adjacent to rom the existing water attenuation oum of 500mm of ant linked to the beck designed to retain a Water Vole
Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology  Not supported (RED). This Clubbed Oaks and Dean V woodland site. The southe allocation site has been so woodland (0.29ha of which Inventory) lies within the s lowland mixed deciduous and west boundaries. This enhance the ancient wood	and LCC Ecology Officer: s proposed allocation lies adjacent to Wood LNA an important ancient ern boundary of the proposed et along the LNA, however the h is included on the Ancient Woodland site. In total the site includes 1.97ha of woodland along the south, south-west is woodland helps to buffer and	Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red I excluded and the boundary is am Drawing RM/3387. Mitigation will and enhance the boundary with ODen Wood LNA and the woodlan south-west and west by providing with native shrub and small tree if the beck (in the 20 metre buffer fi woodland) there should be flood ponds designed to retain a minim water for Water Vole enhanceme corridor.  be flood water attenuation ponds minimum of 500mm of water for Nater Vole enhanceme	natched areas are mended as per be required to protectly be required to protectly be a 20 metre buffer planting. Adjacent to rom the existing water attenuation burn of 500mm of ant linked to the beck designed to retain a Water Vole
Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology  Not supported (RED). This Clubbed Oaks and Dean Not woodland site. The souther allocation site has been seen woodland (0.29ha of which Inventory) lies within the solowland mixed deciduous and west boundaries. This enhance the ancient wood from the allocation.	and LCC Ecology Officer: s proposed allocation lies adjacent to Wood LNA an important ancient ern boundary of the proposed et along the LNA, however the h is included on the Ancient Woodland site. In total the site includes 1.97ha of woodland along the south, south-west is woodland helps to buffer and	Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red I excluded and the boundary is am Drawing RM/3387. Mitigation will and enhance the boundary with ODen Wood LNA and the woodlan south-west and west by providing with native shrub and small tree if the beck (in the 20 metre buffer fi woodland) there should be flood ponds designed to retain a minim water for Water Vole enhanceme corridor.  be flood water attenuation ponds minimum of 500mm of water for Nater Vole enhanceme	natched areas are mended as per be required to protectly be required to protectly be required to protectly be a 20 metre buffer planting. Adjacent to rom the existing water attenuation oum of 500mm of ant linked to the beck designed to retain a Water Vole

### **Drainage/Water/Flooding**

**Environment Agency Comments:** 

#### **Environment Agency Constraints:**

Site Ref: 3387	Site Name: G	elderd Road, Gild	ersome, LS27 7LQ
Yorkshire Water Comments:	:	Yorkshire Water W	aste Water Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemer	nt:		
<u>Utilities</u> Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	y Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Sit	e Assessment		
Could site be effectively		No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	ssment		
conclusion summary:			
he site is within the urban area IDP. Considered suitable for er			for employment uses on the existing
ite Capacity (dwellings units)	): 310	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
lesidential Conclusion:	Retail Co	nclusion:	Employment Conclusion:

Green

Red

Site Ref: 3394 Site Name: Sugar Mill, Oakhurst Avenue (just off Dewsbury Road), Leeds, LS11 7DF

### **Site Details**

Northing: 430085 Area sq m: 18498.44 Ward Beeston and Holbeck Easting: 428977 Area Ha: 1.849844 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1592.47Distance to bus stop (metres)161.02Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID4079

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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:	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

Site Ref: 3394 Site Name: Sugar Mill, Oakhurst Avenue (just off Dewsbury Road), Leeds, LS11 7DF

### **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H21/351/74/	Alterations to form external fire escape to wareh ouse and showroom premises.	15/10/1974	02/12/1974	Α	99.38
21/65/02/FU	Addition of canopy and new entrance to offices	08/03/2002	16/04/2002	Α	13.39
H21/59/74/	Change of use part 2nd floor, from, industrial wareh ouse, to accountancy tuition c entre.	03/05/1974	30/09/1974	Α	98.95
H21/637/75/	Alterations and addition of 2 fire escapes, to indus trial premises.	23/12/1975	23/02/1976	Α	98.95
21/32/94/FU	Microwave antenna to offices	10/03/1994	13/04/1994	Α	13.30
H21/350/75/	Alterations including new wind ows and new windows and roof to 2 units to industrial wareh ousing and show- room premi	10/07/1975	01/09/1975	A	98.95

Site Ref: 3394 Site Name: Sugar Mill, Oakhurst Avenue (just off Dewsbury Road), Leeds, LS11 7DF

# 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	ıp area)? □
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?	· ·
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing area and undeveloped land?	g urban 🗌
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 condevelopment?	ntain
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:	
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment	
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urba	an 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 protect significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	ed, or
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings?	ultural 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 refeature?	nistorical
If yes, could development preserve this character?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Conformity with Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield
Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement Extension	n Mixed
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension	
Development unrelated to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:	
Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Va	alley: 0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West L	Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 3394 Site Name: Sugar Mill, Oakhurst Avenue (just off Dewsbury Road), Leeds, LS11 7DF

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: \	Yes	Achievability: Short	term (0-5yrs)
summary of Infrastructure provider	comments and o	other planning re	equirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Good Accessibility			5
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
access can be taken from numerous points, mainly	Oakhurst Ave		5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
spare capacity but some cumulative issues			4
Mitigation measure			Total sco
			14
Support? Need to combine	e with other sites:	Suitability for pa	rtial development:
/es			
lighways Agency Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	er: Bounda	ry Amendment	
Supported			
latural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
<u> Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	Agency Constraints:	
orkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wat	er Waste Water Treatn	nent Works Comme
OO Flood Pick Management			
.CC Flood Risk Management:			

	De	wsbury Road), Lee	eds, LS11 7DF
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
O Tues all as 0'4			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	3 Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site !			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:  Brownfield site, within the urban a	Cuitable for recident	ial was in principle	
browniieid site, within the diban a	area. Sultable for resident	iai use in principie.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 66	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Con	clusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Green	Not assess	ed	Not assessed

Site Name: Sugar Mill, Oakhurst Avenue (just off

Site Ref: 3394

Site Ref: 3397 Site Name: 116 Old Lane, Beeston, Leeds, LS11

### **Site Details**

Northing: 430231 Area sq m: 5438.16 Ward Beeston and Holbeck Easting: 428734 Area Ha: 0.543816 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Retail - Shops

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Site Ref: 3397

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
11/04306/OT	Demolish existing buildings and erect a retail foodstore (Class A1), with car parking, landscaping and access	11/10/2011		PCO	100.00
H21/75/74/	Outline application to erect 5 and 6 storey warehouse premi ses with ancilliary office acc ommodation and car parking fa	15/05/1974	22/07/1974	R	12.85
H21/588/78/	Alterations and extension, to w arehouse to form motor vehicle servicing garage, comprising	25/10/1978	11/04/1979	А	91.09
H21/444/78/	10 warehouse units, each with ancillary offices and toile ts with car parking areas, ser vicing areas, access roa	03/08/1978	09/07/1979	Α	13.63
H21/437/78/	Outline application to erect 1 0 warehouse units, each with ancillary offices and wit h car parking areas, to	31/07/1978	14/11/1978	W	13.31
H21/449/74/	Alterations, including new roo fing and offices, to units 2-3, and alterations includin g new offices entrance a	28/11/1974	17/03/1975	Α	99.07
H21/184/80/	One internally illuminated ind ividual letter sign, size12.4m x 1.2m height above ground 4. 7m (underside) and one intern	28/03/1980	28/04/1980	Α	88.06
H21/33/80/	One internally illuminated ind ividual letter sign, size 7m x 0.6m height above ground 4.7m (underside), one intern	15/01/1980	10/03/1980	R	88.47
H21/375/78/	Change of use of warehouse to motor vehicle maint enance workshop and siting of 1 block of 10 warehouse	06/07/1978	30/10/1978	Α	90.47
H21/134/81/	Detached block of 4 light indu strial units, with 8 car parki ng spaces, to vacant site. (site area	29/04/1981	15/06/1981	R	32.75
H21/65/85/	13, 638 litres underground petr ol storage tank, to car maint enance depot.	28/03/1985	11/09/1986	W	88.73

Site Ref: 3397 Site Name: 116 Old Lane, Beeston, Leeds, LS11

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 3397 Site Name: 116 Old Lane, Beeston, Leeds, LS11

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	Yes Physical	Achievability:	Short term (0-5yrs)
Summary of Infrastructure provid	er comments and o	ther plannii	ng requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			5 . 4 . 5
Accessibility comment Good Accessibility			Rank (1-5)
Good Accessibility			5
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Takes access from an industrial (private) road			
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Spare capacity but some cumulative issues			4
Mitigation measure			Total scor
			10
Support? Need to com	bine with other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
no			<u> </u>
Highways Agency			
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Of	ficer: Boundary	y Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<b>Education</b>			
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	gency Constraii	nts:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water	Freatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			
<u>Utilities</u>			

Site Ref:	3397	Site Name:	116 Old Lane	, Beeston, Le	eds, LS11
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Res	cue Services:				
Built Herita	ge				
Leeds City C					
West Yorksh	ire Archaeology	Service:			
English Herit	tage:				
O T.	U Oite				
Gypsy_Ir	aveller Site	e Assessmen	τ		
	e effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed		(Text)			
Would gyps		Yes	No		Maybe
travellers liv	ve on the	(Text)			
Proximity to		Yes		No	
gypsies and	d travellers	(Text)			
Experience		Yes	No		Unknown
encampmer	nts	(Text)			
Conclusio	n of Asses	sment			
Conclusion sur	mmary:				
Within the urbar	n area. Pending a				d employment uses and
industrial road.	be most appropri	ate for employment t	use. Highway concer	ns re residential ad	cess through private
Site Capacity (	dwellings units):	19	Floorspace	sq m (Non resider	ntial):
Residential Co	nclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:		<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Amber		Red			Green

### **Site Details**

Northing: 428580 Area sq m: 6072.95 Ward Morley North
Easting: 426963 Area Ha: 0.607295 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 473.95 
Distance to bus stop (metres) 201.13

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 10316

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.01	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/110/85/	Outline application to erect r esidential development, to va cant site. (site area 0.66ha).	29/03/1985	09/09/1985	W	96.35
H23/634/80/	Outline application to layout access road and erection of 18 semi-detached houses, each wi th detached garage space and	08/10/1980	17/11/1980	R	96.72
13/00625/FU	14 detached houses with associated car parking and landscaping	05/02/2013		PCO	98.81

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	Yes Achievability: Short	term (0-5yrs)
Summary of Infrastructure provider	comments and other planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
Site lies within accessibility standard for 3/4 buses standards for employment, 100% of site for primar		4
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Access could be provied from Daisy Hill Close		5
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Cumulative impact with adjacent sites in busy loca	ition	3
Mitigation measure		Total scor
		12
Support? Need to combin	ne with other sites:  Suitability for par	tial development:
yes but mitigation required for adjacent sites 1282/1283		
Highways Agency		
Potential for cumulative impact in combination with Morley/Gildersome/Ardsley cluster.	other sites. If site still included at next sift assess	s as part of
Network Rail :		
<u>Biodiversity</u>		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	er: Boundary Amendment	
Supported		
Natural England:		
Education		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	<b>Environment Agency Constraints:</b>	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatm	ent Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:	I I	

Site Ref:	3428	Site Name:	Land off Dais	y Hill Close, I	Morley, Leeds
0					
Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Re	scue Services:				
Built Herit Leeds City	<del></del> _				
West Yorks	shire Archaeology	Service:			
English He	ritage:				
		•			
Gypsy_I	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
	be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed		(Text)			
Would gyp		Yes	No		Maybe
travellers I site?	ive on the	(Text)			
Site:					
Proximity t	to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies an	nd travellers	(Text)			
Experience	e of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampme		(Text)	•		
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment			
Conclusion s	ummarv:				
Site within the		red on three sides by	housing. Residentia	al development acce	entable in principle
		······································	g		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
Site Capacity	(dwellings units)	: 22	Floorspace	sq m (Non resident	tial):
Residential C	onclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	ı	Employment Conclusion:
Green					

### **Site Details**

Northing: 424885 Area sq m: 15515.86 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 428572 Area Ha: 1.551586 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Transport - Car Parks

Existing Use 3: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Utilities & Infrastructure - Water Storage and Treatment

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3600.56Distance to bus stop (metres)108.03Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID11844

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site topography is flat and sloping

### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	66.88	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:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

No

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/75/92/	Erection of 6 dwellings compri sing 4, 3 bedroom detac hed houses with integral garag e, 2, 4 bedroom semidetac	14/02/1992	08/06/1992	R	15.72
H23/253/85/	Outline application to erect 7 detached houses to 2 vac ant agricultural sites. (site area 0.48ha)	13/08/1985	21/10/1985	R	15.11

### 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 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 represent partial infill development and would retain the openness between the built up area and reservoir. Conformity with Core Strategy

#### Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
ummary of Infrastructur	e provider co	omments and other planning req	uirements
_eeds City Council Highways	inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-
The site lies within the accessibility accessibility zone for primary & second		ses per hour, 100% of the site lies within the nd primary health	4
Access Comments			Rank (1-
Frontage with Haigh Moor Road sh	ould provide acces	s	5
Local network comment			Rank (1-
Cumulative impact issues with other	r nearby sites - cor	ngested area	3
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Widen footway on Haigh Moor Roa	d		Total Sct
Widen footway on Haigh Moor Roa	u		12
Support? N	leed to combine w	vith other sites: Suitability for parti	al development:
Yes with mitigation			
Highways Agency Comment awaited			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC	Ecology Officer:	<b>Boundary Amendment</b>	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:		Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatme	nt Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			

Site Ref:	3456A	Site Name:	Ardsley Rese	ervoir WF3	
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Re	escue Services:				
Built Herit	age				
Leeds City	Council:				
	shire Archaeology	Service:			
English He	ritage:				
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
Could site	be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	_	(Text)	•		
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers I site?	ive on the	(Text)			
Site :					
Proximity t		Yes		No	
gypsies an	nd travellers	(Text)			
	e of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampme	ents	(Text)			
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment			
Conclusion s	ummary:				
		en split into 2. Develo built up area and res		ld represent partial in	nfill development and would
rotain the oper	mood bottoon the	bant up aroa ana roc	, o. v o		
Site Capacity	(dwellings units)	41	Floorspace	sq m (Non resident	ial):
Residential C	onclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	E	Employment Conclusion:
Green					

### **Site Details**

Northing: 425086 Area sq m: 120680.87 Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward 428815 Easting: Area Ha: 12.068087 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Utilities & Infrastructure - Water Storage and Treatment

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings Neighbouring Use 3: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3542.66 Distance to bus stop (metres) 205.25 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 6167 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: **Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard: 0.00 Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: No No

Public Rights of Way:

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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?:	
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

**Planning History** 

### 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? **V** 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 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 site borders the reservoir and it is considered important to protect the openness between the built up area and reservoir. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development

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.

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infras	tructure provider cor	nments and other planning req	uirements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
The site lies within the ac accessibility standard for	cessibility standard of 2/3 buses primary & secondary education	s per hour, 80% of the site lies within the n and primary health	3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Requires part site 3456A	for access		3
I			
Local network commen	t		Rank (1-5)
Cumulative impact issue:	s with other nearby sites - cong	ested area	3
Mitigation measure	Moor Bood		Total scor
Widen footway on Haigh	WOOI ROAU		9
Support?	Need to combine wit	h other sites: Suitability for partia	al development:
yes subject to access			
<u>lighways Agency</u>			
Comment awaited			
Comment awaited			
Highways Agency Comment awaited Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Comment awaited  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology  Not supported (RED). Thi adjacent to Ardsley Reserved is important for passage a isields can be import food in the would remove approximate margin of the site. It is que would be adequate for this used as a recreational spansite could only be consider.	and LCC Ecology Officer: as is a large allocation immediativoir Local Nature Area. The resumd wintering wildfowl and surror resources for this type of site. The resumble whether or not a buffer situation as it would seem like ace with associated disturbance ared acceptable if habitat around the for feeding wildfowl with no	Supported with mitigation if Red ha excluded and the boundary is amm Drawing RM/3456 (a minimum of 50 western edge of the road around th Westerton Wood) - but no public ac within this removed area and it beir positively as a nature area for pass wildfowl. Mitigation will be required enhance the boundaries through pr	ended as per 0 metres from the e reservoir and cess permitted ag managed sage and wintering to protect and oviding permanent ed with a minimum
Comment awaited  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology  Not supported (RED). This adjacent to Ardsley Reserved is important for passage a fields can be import food to would remove approximation approximation of the site. It is questioned by a dequate for this used as a recreational spasite could only be considereservoir could be enhanced.	s is a large allocation immediativoir Local Nature Area. The resund wintering wildfowl and surroresources for this type of site. The layone third of this habitat aroustionable whether or not a bufful situation as it would seem like ace with associated disturbance ared acceptable if habitat around the layone is situation.	Supported with mitigation if Red ha excluded and the boundary is amm Drawing RM/3456 (a minimum of 50 western edge of the road around th Westerton Wood) - but no public ac within this removed area and it beir positively as a nature area for pass wildfowl. Mitigation will be required enhance the boundaries through pr fencing to deter access and screen 20 metre buffer planted with native	ended as per 0 metres from the e reservoir and cess permitted ag managed sage and wintering to protect and oviding permanent ed with a minimum
Comment awaited  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology  Not supported (RED). This adjacent to Ardsley Reserved in the supportant for passage a dields can be import food a would remove approximate margin of the site. It is queroused as a recreational spasite could only be consider eservoir could be enhanced access.	s is a large allocation immediativoir Local Nature Area. The resund wintering wildfowl and surroresources for this type of site. The layone third of this habitat aroustionable whether or not a bufful situation as it would seem like ace with associated disturbance ared acceptable if habitat around the layone is situation.	Supported with mitigation if Red ha excluded and the boundary is amm Drawing RM/3456 (a minimum of 50 western edge of the road around th Westerton Wood) - but no public ac within this removed area and it beir positively as a nature area for pass wildfowl. Mitigation will be required enhance the boundaries through pr fencing to deter access and screen 20 metre buffer planted with native	ended as per 0 metres from the e reservoir and cess permitted ag managed sage and wintering to protect and oviding permanent ed with a minimum
Comment awaited  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology  Not supported (RED). This adjacent to Ardsley Reserved in the Ardsley Reserved i	s is a large allocation immediativoir Local Nature Area. The resund wintering wildfowl and surroresources for this type of site. The layone third of this habitat aroustionable whether or not a bufful situation as it would seem like ace with associated disturbance ared acceptable if habitat around the layone is situation.	Supported with mitigation if Red ha excluded and the boundary is amm Drawing RM/3456 (a minimum of 50 western edge of the road around th Westerton Wood) - but no public ac within this removed area and it beir positively as a nature area for pass wildfowl. Mitigation will be required enhance the boundaries through pr fencing to deter access and screen 20 metre buffer planted with native	ended as per 0 metres from the e reservoir and cess permitted as managed sage and wintering to protect and coviding permanent ed with a minimum
Comment awaited  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecology  Not supported (RED). This adjacent to Ardsley Reserved in the Ardsley Reserved i	s is a large allocation immediativoir Local Nature Area. The resund wintering wildfowl and surroresources for this type of site. Tely one third of this habitat aroustionable whether or not a buffs situation as it would seem like ace with associated disturbance and acceptable if habitat arounded for feeding wildfowl with no	Supported with mitigation if Red ha excluded and the boundary is amm Drawing RM/3456 (a minimum of 50 western edge of the road around th Westerton Wood) - but no public ac within this removed area and it beir positively as a nature area for pass wildfowl. Mitigation will be required enhance the boundaries through pr fencing to deter access and screen 20 metre buffer planted with native	ended as per 0 metres from the e reservoir and cess permitted ag managed sage and wintering to protect and oviding permanent ed with a minimum

Site Ref: 3456B Site Name: Ardsley Reservoir WF3 Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme **Yorkshire Water Comments:** 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 Yes No Maybe (Text) managed Would gypsies and No Maybe Yes travellers live on the (Text) Proximity to housed Yes No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown encampments **Conclusion of Assessment** Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. The site has been split into 2. Site B borders the reservoir and it is considered important to protect the openness between the built up area and reservoir. The path around the reservoir is well used. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 271 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0 **Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:** 

### **Site Details**

Northing: 427102 Area sq m: 4676.34 Ward Morley South
Easting: 425311 Area Ha: 0.467634 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Utilities & Infrastructure - Water Storage and Treatment

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1935.06Distance to bus stop (metres)59.02Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID4435

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
09/02886/FU	Laying out of access road and erect 5 detached houses	02/07/2009	26/08/2009	W	95.95
09/04620/FU	Laying out of access road and erect 5 detached dwellings	26/10/2009	15/01/2010	R	95.95

### 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	ng built up area)?
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement	pattern?:
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between	n existing urban
area and undeveloped land?	
Overall sprawl conclusion:	
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging	
Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlen	nents?
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundar development?	ry to contain
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:	
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment	
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the exist	ting urban area?
Does the site provide access to the countryside?	
Does the site include local or national conservation designated area	s?
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	e protected, or
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	$\checkmark$
Does the site contain buildings?	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 of feature?	or other historical
If yes, could development preserve this character?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:	
Overall Character Freservation Conclusion.	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Conformity with Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Ex	tension Brownfield
Major Settlement Major Settlement Ex	tension Greenfield
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement E	Extension Mixed
Villages/Rural Willage/Rural Extensi	ion 🔲
Development unrelated to existing development	opment
Regeneration Priority Area:	
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley: 0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Suitability:	Achievability:	
ummary of Infrastructure provider con	nments and other planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-
25% of Site within accessibility zone for 4 buses per hour standards for primary health, primary & secondary educa		3
Access Comments	·	Rank (1-
Access ok from Bruntcliffe Road		5
Local network comment		Rank (1-
Cumulative impact issues with other nearby sites		3
Mitigation measure		Total sco
Local mitigation may be required for adjacent sites 1064		4.4
		11
Support? Need to combine with	h other sites: Suitability for partial o	development:
Yes Local mitigation may be required for adjacent sites 1064		
Highways Agency		
Network Rail :		
<u>Biodiversity</u>		
Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	<b>Boundary Amendment</b>	
Supported		
Natural England:		
<u>Education</u>		
<u> Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
orkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
CC Flood Risk Management:		
Jtilitie <u>s</u>		

Site Ref: 3467	Site Name:		to the covered ad, Morley LS2	
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
	_			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	140		Maybe
site?				
Proximity to housed	Yes (Text)		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	ement			
Conclusion of Asses	SILICIT			
Conclusion summary:				
Site within the urban area. Accessopportunity for limited development	ss through site is request	uired for the covered re	eservoir. However, the	ere may be the
opportunity for infilted developme	ent of the site if acces	s is maintaineu.		
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 16	Floorsnace so	q m (Non residential)	<u>.</u>
		-		
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Em	ployment Conclusion:
Amber				

### **Site Details**

Northing: 430640 Area sq m: 5149.49 Ward Beeston and Holbeck Easting: 428480 Area Ha: 0.514949 HMCA: Outer South West

#### **Site Characteristics**

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant & Derelict - Vacant building

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Community Services - Education

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1234.89Distance to bus stop (metres)133.75Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID6671

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# LIDB Decignation

### **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H21/194/78/	Alterations, including new cl oakroom and extension, to fo rm laundry room and bathroom, to day centre. (this item	14/04/1978	23/05/1978	Α	97.41

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:	A	chievability:	
Summary of Infras	tructure provider co	mments and oth	er planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			Danis (4.5
Accessibility comment Good Accessibility				Rank (1-5
Good Accessibility				5
Access Comments			·	Rank (1-5
Access from Beeston Pa	rk Place			5
Local network commen	t		·	Rank (1-5
Spare capacity but some	cumulative issues			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				14
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
Yes				
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<b>Education</b>				
Drainage/Water/Flood	ling			
Environment Agency Co	mments:	Environment Age	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Water \	Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ment:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Owner Translan City				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment			
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe	
managed	(Text)		•	
Would avancies and	Vac	No	Movibo	
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe	
site?	(TOXI)			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
<b>53.</b>				
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown	
encampments	(Text)	·		
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Previously a care home and now	vacant If the school red	quires snace to expand the	en this site would provide an	
			received will be considered before	
making final decisions on sites.	The site is otherwise suit	able for residential develor	oment in principle.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 18	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Co	onclusion:	Employment Conclusion	n:
Green	Not asses	ssed	Not assessed	

Site Name: Park Lees site, St Anthony's Road, Beeston

Site Ref: 4002

Site Ref: 4004 Site Name: Thorpe Hill Farm, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe

### **Site Details**

Northing: 426740 Area sq m: 21741.79 Ward Ardsley and Robin Hood Easting: 431509 Area Ha: 2.174179 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Other
Other uses: Stables
Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):4745.81Distance to bus stop (metres)124.84Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID2849

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### 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		

Yes

### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

# **Planning History**

Site Ref: 4004

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
08/01227/FU	Erection of 2 detached (B2) industrial units	03/03/2008	25/04/2008	R	99.99
H21/456/78/	Outline application to erect d etached bungalow to farm.	10/08/1978	20/11/1978	R	81.96
22/292/01/FU	Amendment to condition no 10 of application no 86/22/00207 (agricultural occupancy)	05/12/2001	01/02/2002	R	11.19
H21/31/80/	Outline application, to erect detached bungalow to farm.	16/01/1980	20/05/1980	R	88.79
H21/27/80/	Alterations and extension, to form enlarged broiler unit, to farm.	14/01/1980	20/05/1980	R	88.77
22/300/03/FU	Change of use of farm buildings to storage and warehousing	22/08/2003	17/10/2003	R	10.29
22/329/05/CLU	Certificate of lawfulness for non agricultural dwelling house	03/10/2005	29/11/2005	Α	11.19
22/5/04/FU	Change of use of farm buildings to storage and warehousing	05/01/2004	09/09/2004	А	10.29
H22/445/77/	Outline application to erect d etached farm house, to form small holding to vacant site.	10/11/1977	12/12/1977	R	15.66
07/07291/FU	Erection of 2 detached (B2) industrial units	22/11/2007	28/01/2008	W	99.99
H21/500/80/	Alterations and extension, to form enlarged broiler unit, detached broiler unit, and 3 hoppers, to farm.	11/12/1980	26/01/1981	Α	88.45
22/122/00/CLU	Certificate of lawful use for straw processing	23/05/2000	22/12/2000	А	63.41
H22/115/79/	Number cancelled	27/03/1979	09/04/1979	W	81.96
10/02996/FU	Retrospective change of use of warehouse/storage (use class B8) to general industry (use class B2)	29/06/2010	08/09/2010	Α	79.78
H21/151/79/	Detached single storey broiler rearing unit to farm.	27/03/1979	07/08/1979	А	82.15

Site Ref: 4004 Site Name: Thorpe Hill Farm, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe

### 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 ribb					
Would development result in isolated deve					
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 goo area and undeveloped land?	od existing barrier between existing urban				
Overall sprawl conclusion:					
Low potential to lead to unrestricted spraw	vl				
Prevent neighbouring towns from merg	ging				
Would development of the site lead to phy	ysical connection of settlements?				
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?	od existing barrier/boundary to contain	$\checkmark$			
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
No merging of settlements					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	m encroachment				
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	ween the site and the existing urban area?				
Does the site provide access to the count	ryside?				
Does the site include local or national con	servation designated areas?				
Does the site include areas of woodlands, significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?					
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a ago	ricultural land?	✓			
Does the site contain buildings?	✓ Are these in agricultural use?				
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclu	usion				
•	——— le in safeguarding the countryside from encro	achment			
Preserve the setting and special characteristics					
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:					
Brownfield site with existing employment of	use. Strong links to settlement, well contained	l site.			
Conformity with Core Stra	ategy				
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield			
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield			
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed			
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension					
Development u	unrelated to existing development				
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00			
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatev	vav: 0.00			

Site Ref: 4004 Site Name: Thorpe Hill Farm, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider c	omments and other planning requ	iirements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
The site has access to 2 buses & secondary education and pri		e meets the core strategy standards for primary	3
Access Comments		'	Rank (1-5
Access from Lingwell Gate La	ne		5
Local network comment		'	Rank (1-5
Spare capacity but cumulative	issues		3
			3
Mitigation measure			Total scor
			11
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites: Suitability for partia	development:
yes			
<u>Highways Agency</u>			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	<b>Boundary Amendment</b>	
Supported			
Natural England:			
-			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding		Environment Agency Constraints	
Environment Agency Comme	ents:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management	t:		
<u>Utilities</u>			

Site Ref: 4004	Site Name:	Thorpe Hill Farm, L	ingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	INO	Iwaybe
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
0			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	evelopment, well con	tained and has a road frontag	e. However, the site is in existing
employment use.			
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 57	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
			·
Residential Conclusion:		il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

### **Site Details**

Northing: 427739 Area sq m: 12223.35 Ward Middleton Park Easting: 430199 Area Ha: 1.222335 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3255.48Distance to bus stop (metres)44.95Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID11226SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
22/213/97/DN	Determination to demolish 44 dwelling houses	04/11/1997	21/11/1997	ANR	98.90
12/05335/FU	Variation of conditions 2 (plans approved), 16 (surface water run-off discharge rates) and 23 (code for sustainable homes) of planning application 12/02500/FU	17/12/2012	16/04/2013	А	99.79
12/05336/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 of Planning Application 12/02500/FU	17/12/2012		PCO	99.79
12/02500/FU	Residential development comprising 128 houses, access roads and public open space	06/06/2012	01/10/2012	А	99.79

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusi	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:	A	Achievability:	
Summary of Infras	structure provider co	omments and oth	ner planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			ı	Rank (1-5
Mostly meets accessibility	y standards			4
Access Comments			'	Rank (1-5
good frontage with Thorp	e Road			5
Local network commer	nt		J	Rank (1-5
Spare capacity within loc	al network			5
				5
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				14
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
Yes				
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Luucation				
Drainage/Water/Flood	dina			
Environment Agency Co		Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Commo	ents:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ement:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
rile alla Rescue Selvices.			
Built Heritage  Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	140	Iwaybe
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	1.2.2	1 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
0			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Vacant site in an existing residen	tial area. Suitable for res	sidential development in p	rinciple.
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 44	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Co	onclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Green	Not asses	ssed	Not assessed
•			

Site Name: Thorpe Road

Site Ref: 4028

Site Ref: 4029 Site Name: Ravells Works, Gelderd Road, Farnley

### **Site Details**

430909 Area sq m: 27556.58 Northing: Farnley and Wortley Ward 427046 Easting: Area Ha: 2.755658 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 2: Forestry - Managed Forest

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: greenfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 904.51 Distance to bus stop (metres) 137.06 Nearest Railway Station Cottingley Bus Stop ID 4472

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	10.58	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?: Yes Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?: Site Site Type Ravells Works (E Pease) Beeston Vehicle Dismantling and Scrap Metal

Yes

# **Planning History**

Site Ref: 4029

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H24/2/81/	Continuation of tipping, with restoration on completionto wo odland and agricultural use, to existing tipping site. (thi	06/01/1981	02/02/1981	Α	12.86
24/370/97/MIN	Removal of spoil heap and regrading	21/11/1997	03/07/1998	Α	22.83
H24/251/86/	Excavation of shale, to vacant site. (site area 0.64ha) m	15/10/1986	08/12/1986	Α	22.76
24/269/92/FU	Use of former quarry for storage of motorway scalpings m	06/08/1992	06/01/1993	Α	11.92
24/208/93/SN	I non illuminated individual letter sign	17/06/1993	17/09/1993	W	72.90
H24/74/92/	Tipping of inert material m	16/04/1992	06/01/1993	Α	72.28
24/364/98/MIN	Use of former quarry for storage of motorway scalpings	06/11/1998	01/02/2000	Α	12.18
H24/418/90/	Tipping, to former quarry. m	20/11/1990	11/02/1991	Α	24.51
24/384/05/FU	Single storey plant hire depot with ancillary offices and 15 car parking spaces	22/07/2005	30/01/2006	Α	24.77
H24/493/78/	Outline application to erect o ffices and lay out civil engineering construction depo t, to vacant site. (sit	14/07/1978	05/02/1979	R	22.74
24/303/92/FU	Detached drum and tank recycling and storage building	16/09/1992	24/11/1992	Α	72.28
24/9/00/MIN	Single storey extension to factory and warehouse	14/01/2000	03/04/2000	Α	93.40
H24/512/80/	Extraction of shale, to land f ill site and vacant land. (site area 0.63ha) (this item is also notice under regu	02/10/1980	27/10/1980	Α	23.09
H24/51/92/	Application for established use certificate for the use of premises for general industrial purposes	04/02/1992	26/04/1993	Α	62.40

Site Ref: 4029 Site Name: Ravells Works, Gelderd Road, Farnley

### 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:** Green Belt site. Development potential through linking of sites 2078, 3056 4029 and 1171B dependent on the necessary infrastructure and link road from Whitehall Road to Gelderd Road. Conformity with Core Strategy Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 4029 Site Name: Ravells Works, Gelderd Road, Farnley

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability:	Suitability:	F	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastruc	cture provider co	mments and oth	ner planning red	quirements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro			5
Accessibility comment Currently poorly served by all s	arvices however some r	octential if linked with a	diacent sites	Rank (1-5
ouncing poons served by an s	ervices, nowever some p	oterna ii iiikea wiiii a	ajacent sites	3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
needs to be considered with a	djacent sites and potenti	al link road to A58		3
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
local congestion on A62 and R	ting Road - requires com	prehensive developme	nt and adjacent sites	3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Requires link road				9
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for part	ial development:
Yes with mitigation	Development potential sites 2078, 3056 402 dependent on the new			
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comme	nts:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Vorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatme	unt Works Commo
TOTKSHIFE WATER COMMENTS:		TOTKSHIRE Water	vvaste vvater i reatme	ent works comme
LCC Flood Risk Management	:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Site Ref: 4029	Site Name:	Ravells Works, Gel	derd Road, Farnley
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	,	·
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	140	
Fd	N	NI-	I I to Lor accord
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. Development poinfrastructure and link road from			d 1171B dependent on the necessary
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 83	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

### **Site Details**

Northing: 427627 Area sq m: 4753.79 Ward Middleton Park Easting: 430362 Area Ha: 0.475379 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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: Brownfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3431.38Distance to bus stop (metres)152.16Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID3448

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

ı				

# **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
12/02500/FU	Residential development comprising 128 houses, access roads and public open space	06/06/2012	01/10/2012	А	99.16
12/05335/FU	Variation of conditions 2 (plans approved), 16 (surface water run-off discharge rates) and 23 (code for sustainable homes) of planning application 12/02500/FU	17/12/2012	16/04/2013	А	99.16
12/05336/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 of Planning Application 12/02500/FU	17/12/2012		PCO	99.16
22/129/99/DN	Determination to demolish dwelling houses	12/07/1999	20/07/1999	ANR	62.71
22/194/05/DN	Determination to demolish block of 4 terrace houses	10/06/2005	06/07/2005	ANR	25.09

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusio	)			
Availability:	Suitability:	А	Achievability:	
Summary of Infras	tructure provider co	mments and oth	ner planning require	ements
Leeds City Council Hi	ghways inc Metro			<b>5</b> 1 // 5
Accessibility comment  Mostly meets accessibility	etandarde		I	Rank (1-5
Woodly Moots accessionity	standards			4
Access Comments			'	Rank (1-5
good frontage with Thorpe	e Road			5
				D-11/4 5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Spare capacity within loca	ai network			5
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				14
Support?	Need to combine wi	th other sites:	Suitability for partial de	velopment:
Yes				<u> </u>
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flood	ing			
Environment Agency Co	mments:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	nts:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment Wo	orks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manager	ment:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
The ana Recourt Co. No.				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:	_			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy Traveller Site	Assessment			
Could site be effectively		No	Maybe	1
managed	Yes (Text)	INU	Iviaybe	
J				
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe	
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Site:				
Proximity to housed	Yes	No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	,		
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown	
encampments	(TOXI)			
<b>Conclusion of Asses</b>	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Cleared site in residential area cu	urrently grassed. Would	be suitable for residential de	velopment in principle.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 17	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail C	onclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion</b>	:
Green	Not asse	essed	Not assessed	
•				

Site Name: Thorpe Road / Thorpe Crescent

Site Ref: 4030

### **Site Details**

Northing: 427573 Area sq m: 6190.46 Ward Middleton Park Easting: 430451 Area Ha: 0.619046 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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: Brownfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3526.97Distance to bus stop (metres)48.57Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID3448

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
22/129/99/DN	Determination to demolish dwelling houses	12/07/1999	20/07/1999	ANR	29.12
22/56/05/DE	Determination to demolish one block of 4 terrace houses	04/02/2005	25/02/2005	ANR	19.83
22/373/02/DN	Determination to demolish 30 dwelling houses	05/12/2002	27/01/2003	PAG	28.74

### 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:

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.

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusio	)			
Availability:	Suitability:	А	Achievability:	
Summary of Infras	tructure provider co	mments and oth	ner planning require	ements
Leeds City Council Hi	ghways inc Metro			<b>5</b> 1 // 5
Accessibility comment  Mostly meets accessibility	etandarde		I	Rank (1-5
Woodly Moots accessionity	standards			4
Access Comments			'	Rank (1-5
good frontage with Thorpe	e Road			5
				D-11/4 5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Spare capacity within loca	ai network			5
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				14
Support?	Need to combine wi	th other sites:	Suitability for partial de	velopment:
Yes				<u> </u>
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flood	ing			
Environment Agency Co	mments:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	nts:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment Wo	orks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manager	ment:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment			
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe	ī
managed	(Text)	110	Imayoo	=
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe	
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown	
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Cleared site in residential area cu	irrently grassed. Would be	e suitable for residential de	evelopment in principle.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	22	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Cor	nclusion:	Employment Conclusion:	
Green	Not asses	sed	Not assessed	

Site Ref: 4031

Site Name: Thorpe Road / Thorpe Crescent / Thorpe Way

### **Site Details**

Northing: 427529 Area sq m: 7202.98 Ward Middleton Park Easting: 430545 Area Ha: 0.720298 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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: Brownfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3626.67Distance to bus stop (metres)55.21Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID3448

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
22/373/02/DN	Determination to demolish 30 dwelling houses	05/12/2002	27/01/2003	PAG	86.80

### 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusi	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:	A	Achievability:	
Summary of Infras	structure provider co	omments and oth	ner planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			ı	Rank (1-5
Mostly meets accessibility	y standards			4
Access Comments			'	Rank (1-5
good frontage with Thorp	e Road			5
Local network commer	nt		J	Rank (1-5
Spare capacity within loc	al network			5
				5
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				14
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
Yes				
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Luucation				
Drainage/Water/Flood	dina			
Environment Agency Co		Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Commo	ents:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ement:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	<sup>,</sup> Service:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment			
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe	
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site?	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe	
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No		-
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown	
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Cleared site in residential area cu	ırrently grassed. Woul	d be suitable for residential d	levelopment in principle.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 26	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):	C
Residential Conclusion: Green		Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion: Not assessed	

Site Name: Thorpe Square

Site Ref: 4032

### **Site Details**

Northing: 427381 Area sq m: 2292.42 Ward Middleton Park Easting: 430642 Area Ha: 0.229242 HMCA: Outer South West

### 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: Brownfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage 

☑
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 3747.78 Distance to bus stop (metres) 225.12

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 3448

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	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

**Planning History** 

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:		A objevobility:	
wanabinty.	Guitability.		Achievability:	
Summary of Infras	structure provider co	omments and ot	her planning requ	iirements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			Donk (4.6
Accessibility comment  Mostly meets accessibility	, etandarde			Rank (1-
wiosity fricets decessionity	y standards			4
Access Comments				Rank (1-
reasonable frontage with	Thorpe Road			4
Local network commen	t			Rank (1-
Spare capacity within loc	al network			5
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				13
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
Yes				
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education				
<u>Luadation</u>				
<u>Drainage/Water/Flood</u>				
Environment Agency Co	emments:	Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	ante:	Vorkshire Water	· Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
. J. Raime Water Confille	,	i oi kainie watei	Tradic Water Heatinetic	
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ment:			
<u>Jtilities</u>				

Site Ref: 4033	Site Name:	Throstle Road / Thro	ostle Terrace
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeolo	gy Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy <sub>Traveller</sub> Si	te Assessmen	nt	
Could site be effectivel		No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	•	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		<u>,</u>
<b>Conclusion of Asse</b>	essment		
Conclusion summary:			
Flat site in residential area suit	able in principle for res	idential development.	
Site Capacity (dwellings unit	<b>s):</b> 9	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:		il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
residential Conclusion.	Neta	ii Conciusion.	Employment Conclusion.

### **Site Details**

Northing: 427620 Area sq m: 3551.40 Ward Middleton Park Easting: 429737 Area Ha: 0.35514 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2814.84Distance to bus stop (metres)56.60Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID8199

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

# **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:	0.00		
Protected Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

No

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
22/206/04/DN	Determination to demolish 5 blocks of flats	11/05/2004	07/06/2004	ANR	73.61

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusi	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:	A	chievability:	
Summary of Infras	structure provider co	mments and oth	er planning require	ements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			D1- (4.5
Accessibility comment  Mostly meets accessibility	v standards			Rank (1-5
moonly moone decederation	, otanida do			4
Access Comments			·	Rank (1-5
Good opportunities for a	ccess			5
Local network commer				Rank (1-5
Spare capacity within loc	:al network			5
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				14
Support? Yes	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial de	evelopment:
res				
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<b>Education</b>				
Drainage/Water/Flood	 ding			
Environment Agency Co	omments:	Environment Age	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Commo	ents:	Yorkshire Water V	Waste Water Treatment W	orks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ement:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage					
Leeds City Council:					
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:				
English Heritage:					
Company Travellar City	- Accessment				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment				
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe	
managed	(Text)				
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe	$\dashv$
travellers live on the	(Text)			mayoo	٦
site?					
Proximity to housed	Yes		No		4
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		INO		-
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown	_
encampments	(Text)				
	L				
Conclusion of Asses	sment				١
Conclusion summary:					
Flat grassed site in residential ar	ea previously occupied b	y flats. Suitable i	in principle for resid	dential development.	
					_
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 14	Floorspace	sq m (Non residen	ntial):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Co	onclusion:		<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>	
Green	Not asses	ssed		Not assessed	

Site Name: Sisson Drive / Sissons Road

Site Ref: 4034

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 427198 Area sq m: 3732.45 Ward Middleton Park Easting: 429877 Area Ha: 0.373245 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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: Community Services - Education

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3050.95Distance to bus stop (metres)92.52Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID5297

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

#### 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:	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
22/138/96/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	13/06/1996	25/10/1996	Α	96.86

#### 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

SHLAA Conclus	ions			
Availability:	Suitability:	Ac	hievability:	
Summary of Infra	structure provider co	mments and other	er planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council I				
Accessibility comment			ı	Rank (1-5
Mostly meets accessibili	ty standards			4
Access Comments			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Rank (1-5
Reasonable opportuniti	es for access			4
				4
Local network comme	ent		'	Rank (1-5
Spare capacity within lo	ocal network			
				5
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Janes medel				
				13
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial of	levelopment:
Yes				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<b>Biodiversity</b>				
West Yorkshire Ecolog	y and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	mendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education				
Ludcation				
Drainage/Water/Floo	<u>oding</u>			
Environment Agency C	omments:	Environment Agen	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comm		Verkobire Meter M	/aste Water Treatment V	Norka Commo
TORSHITE WATER COMM	ients.	Torksille Water W	vaste water Treatment v	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manag				
	oo.iti			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	<b>Assessme</b>	nt	
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	NO	Maybe
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Site is within a residential area, is residential development.	s currently vacant a	and has had previous permissio	on for housing. Suitable in principle for
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 15	Floorspace sq m (N	lon residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Ret	ail Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not	assessed	Not assessed

**Site Name: Throstle Mount** 

Site Ref: 4035

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 425364 Area sq m: 3266.16 Ward Morley South
Easting: 427636 Area Ha: 0.326616 HMCA: Outer South West

#### 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: Greenfield and brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Significant Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2823.73Distance to bus stop (metres)106.94Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID12095SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	
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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
PREAPP/08/00186		28/05/2008		PRECAG	74.53
09/03293/DEM	Determination for demolition of 5 dwellings and 2 outbuildings	28/07/2009	19/08/2009	PAR	100.00

#### 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:

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.

West Leeds Gateway:

0.00

0.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusi	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:	А	chievability:	
Summary of Infras	structure provider c	omments and oth	er planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			1	Rank (1-5
Mostly meets accessibilit	y standards			4
Access Comments			·	Rank (1-5
Awkward access onto SI	kye Road - any development	should be kept to minimu	m	3
Local network commer	nt		l.	Rank (1-5
Spare capacity within loc	al network			5
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				12
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for partial d	evelopment:
Yes, subject to suitable access				
400033				
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<b>Education</b>				
Drainage/Water/Flood		_	_	
Environment Agency Co	mments:	Environment Age	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Commo	ents:	Yorkshire Water \	Waste Water Treatment V	Vorks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ment:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Site Ref:	4052	Site Name:	Syke Road, V	Voodkirk	
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Re	scue Services:				
Built Herita Leeds City (					
_	hire Archaeology	Service:			
English Her	-				
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
	be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed		(Text)			
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers li		(Text)			
site?					
Proximity t	o housed	Yes		No	
	d travellers	(Text)		1	
Experience	of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampme		(Text)	INO		Olikilowii
-					
Conclusio	on of Asses	ement			
Conclusio	JII OI ASSES	Silicit			
Conclusion su					
appropriate for	in area. The site f residential develo	nas a number of trees pment in principle.	s on site but buildings	on site have been d	emolished and it would be
Site Capacity	(dwellings units)	: 10	Floorspace	sq m (Non resident	ial):
Residential Co	onclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	E	Employment Conclusion:
Green					

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 427735 Area sq m: 4007.06 Ward Morley South
Easting: 426730 Area Ha: 0.400706 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Community Services - Education

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: Neighbouring uses include social club and car repairs

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):439.42Distance to bus stop (metres)189.13Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID7851

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	
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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/830/79/	Alterations, to form toilets a nd extensions, to form toile ts, to school. (this item is a lso notice under regulation	09/10/1979	19/11/1979	А	99.33
08/04563/FU	Metal storage container to lower car park of college	23/07/2008		APPRET	99.99
23/403/98/FU	Addition of enclosed area to access ramp to college	16/12/1998	04/02/1999	А	99.97
07/04333/FU	Canopy and level platform with lighting and security fence to form external workshop to education building	06/07/2007	12/09/2007	А	99.99

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:	А	chievability:	
Summary of Infras	tructure provider co	mments and oth	er planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Hi	ighways inc Metro			Danie (4.5
Accessibility comment  Meets all accessibility crite	eria			Rank (1-5
Wilder all added limity of the	5.na			5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Opportunities for access				4
Local network commen	•			Rank (1-5
Small development - neg	·-			
oman development mag	ngioto todal impadi			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				13
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
Yes				
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flood				
Environment Agency Co	mments:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ment:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Site Ref: 4053	Site Name: Jo	seph Priestley Co	llege, Peel Street, Morley
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Company Transaller City			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managed	(TOXI)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?	(TOXI)		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
gypsies and travellers	(1314)		
			F
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
onoumpmonto			
Conclusion of Asses	ement		
	Siliciti		
Conclusion summary:	ad and assumed but as	itable for registersial in usin	sial a
Existing building should be retain	ed and converted, but su	itable for residential in princ	cipie.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 14	Floorspace sq m (Nor	
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Co	nclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green			

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 427649 Area sq m: 2247.38 Ward Morley South
Easting: 426700 Area Ha: 0.224738 HMCA: Outer South West

#### **Site Characteristics**

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Transport - Car Parks

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Other

Other uses: Non residential institution (nursery)

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):528.32Distance to bus stop (metres)114.62Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID905

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:

No Strategic Employment Buffer:

0.00

Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:

No Conservation Areas

No

Listed Buildings:

No

No

Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00
Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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:	0.00		
Protected Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

#### Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
23/33/96/FU	6 floodlighting columns and 2.0m high boundary fence and wall to car park	29/01/1996	22/07/1996	А	100.00
23/295/93/FU	6.8m high lighting columns to car park	19/08/1993	04/02/1994	W	74.83
H23/395/90/	Laying out of car park to vaca nt site.	02/10/1990	11/04/1991	Α	73.81

#### 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:	А	chievability:	
Summary of Infras	structure provider co	mments and oth	er planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			Donk (4 E
Accessibility comment  Meets all accessibility crit	teria			Rank (1-5
,				5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
opportunities for access				4
				•
Local network commer	nt			Rank (1-5
Small development - neg	gligible local impact			4
				7
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				13
				13
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
Yes				
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary /	Amendment	
Supported	<b></b>			
Natural England:				
<b>Education</b>				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Flood	<u>pnik</u>			
Environment Agency Co	omments:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme		Vorkobire Meter	Waste Water Treatment	Works Campa
TOTKSHIFE WATER COMME	ants:	TORKSHIRE Water	vvaste vvater Treatment	vvorks comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ement:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

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 (Text)	No	Maybe
manageu	(Total)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	1 -	1
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	<u>,                                      </u>	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Site currently used for parking in (including a nursery) to three side			. There is residential development e.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 8	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail (	Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Green	Not ass	sessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Melbourne Street, Morley

Site Ref: 4054

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 431435 Area sq m: 36605.94 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 426916 Area Ha: 3.660594 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Retail - Shops

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Office

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1442.68Distance to bus stop (metres)227.63Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID8064

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

- 1			

## **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:	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
24/243/00/FU	Two single storey side extensions and single storey rear extension with roof mounted condenser unit to rear	15/08/2000	19/07/2005	W	88.64
H24/121/74/	One non-illuminated fascia sig n size, 5m (16ft.6ins) x 1.5 m (5ft) height above ground 3. 0m (10ft) (undersideone free s	21/05/1974	08/07/1974	Α	98.06
H24/353/80/	Addition of 2 entrance lobbies to wholesale warehouse.	19/06/1980	14/07/1980	А	97.70
24/169/00/FU	Alterations to frontage and new entrance and exit lobbies to warehouse	16/06/2000	25/07/2000	Α	88.64
24/212/00/SI	1 internally illuminated sign 2 non- illuminated signs and 14 non- illuminated flag signs to retail unit	20/07/2000	16/01/2003	Α	88.64
24/311/98/FU	Alterations to elevations to cafe to wholesale warehouse	14/09/1998	25/11/1998	Α	38.88
H24/843/75/	One non-illuminated freestandi ng hoarding, size 6.1m. (20ft.) x 3.05m. (10ft.), hei ght above ground 1.52m. (5f	27/11/1975	22/12/1975	R	98.06
H24/247/82/1	Extension of permission for the use of part of existingwhole sale warehouse car park as gar den centre. (previous	11/10/1983	01/11/1983	Α	97.77
H24/247/82/	Use of part of existing wholes ale warehouse car park asgarde n centre.	22/09/1982	01/11/1982	А	97.75
08/04175/FU	Replacement lighting to front car park to cash and carry	10/07/2008	31/10/2008	А	99.20
H24/275/84/	Change of use of part of wareh ouse car park to wareh ouse garden centre.	21/11/1984	07/01/1985	Α	98.66
H24/335/88/	Alterations and extension, to form enlarged store area, to ex isting cash and carry warehous e.	23/11/1988	23/01/1989	Α	98.30

## 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?	?
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	
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield
Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension	
Development unrelated to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:	
Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gate	wav: 0.00

East Leeds

**Utilities** 

HLAA Conclusio	ns			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infrast	ructure provider co	omments and ot	her planning requ	uirements
Leeds City Council Hig	ghways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			,	Rank (1-5)
Meets accessibility criteria				5
Access Comments			ı	Rank (1-5)
Access option via Royds L	ane			4
Local network comment			l	Rank (1-5)
Congestion on Ring Road				3
				<u> </u>
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Signalisation of A58/ A612	0 roundabout may be requir	red, local pedestrian im	provements	12
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability for partia	I development:
Yes with mitigation				
Highways Agency				
	pact in combination with other	er sites. If site still inclu	ided at next sift assess as	s part of Morley /
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology a	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floodi	ng			
Environment Agency Con		Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Commer	nts:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managen	nent:			

Site Ref:	CFSM003	Site Name:	Makro Store, Road, Leeds,		Lower Wortley
Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Re	scue Services:				
Built Herit	age				
Leeds City	Council:				
West Yorks	hire Archaeology	Service:			
English He	ritage:				
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
	be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed		(Text)			
Would gyp		Yes	No		Maybe
travellers I site?	ive on the	(Text)			
Site:					
Proximity t		Yes		No	
gypsies an	nd travellers	(Text)			
Experience	e of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampme	ents	(Text)			
		1			
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment			
Conclusion s	ummary:				
Call for sites -	mixed use submis	sion for 200 dwellings	s and retail (11.000sq	m). See site 3386.	
Site Capacity	(dwellings units)	: 200	Floorspace	sq m (Non residen	tial):
Residential C	onclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:
Amber					

#### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428549
 Area sq m:
 299577.06
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 425047
 Area Ha:
 29.957706
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

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: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined

 Natural Landscape:
 Significant Tree Cover
 Road Frontage
 ✓

 Distance to Rail Station (metres):
 1968.20
 Distance to bus stop (metres)
 420.18

 Nearest Railway Station
 Morley
 Bus Stop ID
 6861

 SFRA Flood Zone:
 0.00
 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary: Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

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:

ı				

## **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:	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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/234/88/	Outline application, to layout access and erection of distr ibution depot with offices and car parking to vacant sit	03/06/1988	12/04/1990	W	16.25
23/60/03/OT	Outline application to erect business industrial and storage and distribution development	11/02/2003	22/06/2012	R	41.58
H23/143/91/	Extraction of coal by open cas t mining to existing rugby pitch. m	03/05/1991	16/07/1991	Α	10.23
H23/667/80/	Extraction of coal and fire cl ay, to agricultural land.(site area 14.05ha). (county matter ).	04/11/1980	23/05/1984	A	45.90
H23/135/92/	Extraction of coal by opencast method to agricultural site. (site area 12.2ha) m	16/03/1992	20/12/1993	AP	40.41
23/248/04/OT	Outline application to layout access road and erect distribution centre	02/04/2004	25/06/2012	R	11.56
23/47/96/OT	Outline application to erect mail distribution depot with offices	09/02/1996	28/02/2000	W	22.53
12/02470/OT	Outline application for proposed employment development for use classes B1(b) and B1(c) (Research and Development/Light Industrial Uses), B2 (General Industrial Uses) and B8 (Storage and Distribution Uses) with new accesses, associated infrastructure and landscaping	01/06/2012		PCO	94.93
23/35/01/OT	Outline application to layout access and erect business park	22/01/2001	25/06/2012	R	46.44

## 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?	e? 🗌
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	
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield
Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension	IMINGO
Development unrelated to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:	
Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gal	teway: 0.00

East Leeds

Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infra	astructure provider comme	nts and other planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council	Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility commer	nt		Rank (1-5)
Reasonably good acce	ssibility close to north west part of site,	poor towards southern end	3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Access achievable from	m Gelderd Rd, Asquith avenue and Nep	shaw Lane	4
Local network comm	ent		Rank (1-5)
Congested location wit	th cumulative issues		3
Mitigation measure			Total score
New access and off-si	e works		10
Support?	Need to combine with other	r sites: Suitability for par	tial development:
yes with mitigation			
Highways Agency			
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative Gildersome cluster.	impact in combination with other sites.	If site still included at next sift assess	as part of Morley /
Potential for cumulative	impact in combination with other sites.	If site still included at next sift assess	as part of Morley /
Potential for cumulative Gildersome cluster.	impact in combination with other sites.	If site still included at next sift assess	as part of Morley /
Potential for cumulative Gildersome cluster. Network Rail: Biodiversity	impact in combination with other sites.  gy and LCC Ecology Officer:	If site still included at next sift assess  Boundary Amendment	as part of Morley /
Potential for cumulative Gildersome cluster.  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecolo  Not supported (RED). Tooss of part of Clubbed (LNA). This is an area of Biodiversity Action Plarunder increasing pressuplantation woodland when NA forms an important is lowland mixed decidabitat. All connected a single block. This will	gy and LCC Ecology Officer: This proposed allocation will result in the Oaks and Dean Wood Local Nature Are of replanted ancient woodland and a UK is Priority Habitat. The site will also come ure as a result of the allocation. The iich is linked to the western end of the taddition to the overall woodland areadluous woodland a UK BAP Priority areas of woodland should be retained as mean splitting the site in two along the ar woodland corridors are important for	Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red I excluded and the boundary is am Drawing RM/CFSM006 . Mitigatic protect and enhance the boundar areas through providing a minimuthat is planted with native shrubs buffer can be used for creation of designed to benefit Water Voles a	natched areas are lended as per on will be required to ry with the woodland um 20 metre buffer and small trees - this inew water features and amphibians as age scheme. All
Potential for cumulative Gildersome cluster.  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecolo  Not supported (RED). Toss of part of Clubbed (LNA). This is an area of Clubbed (LNA). This is an area of Clubbed increasing pressionantation woodland when the common of th	gy and LCC Ecology Officer: This proposed allocation will result in the Oaks and Dean Wood Local Nature Are of replanted ancient woodland and a UK is Priority Habitat. The site will also come ure as a result of the allocation. The iich is linked to the western end of the taddition to the overall woodland areadluous woodland a UK BAP Priority areas of woodland should be retained as mean splitting the site in two along the ar woodland corridors are important for	Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hexcluded and the boundary is am Drawing RM/CFSM006. Mitigatic protect and enhance the boundar areas through providing a minimuthat is planted with native shrubs buffer can be used for creation of designed to benefit Water Voles apart of a sustainable urban draina woodland edges will need to prote	natched areas are lended as per on will be required to ry with the woodland um 20 metre buffer and small trees - this inew water features and amphibians as age scheme. All
Potential for cumulative Gildersome cluster.  Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecolo Not supported (RED). Toss of part of Clubbed (LNA). This is an area of Gildersity Action Plarunder increasing pressulantation woodland whan A forms an important is lowland mixed decided as ingle block. This will woodland corridor. Line feeding and potentially	gy and LCC Ecology Officer: This proposed allocation will result in the Oaks and Dean Wood Local Nature Are of replanted ancient woodland and a UK is Priority Habitat. The site will also come ure as a result of the allocation. The iich is linked to the western end of the taddition to the overall woodland areadluous woodland a UK BAP Priority areas of woodland should be retained as mean splitting the site in two along the ar woodland corridors are important for	Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hexcluded and the boundary is am Drawing RM/CFSM006. Mitigatic protect and enhance the boundar areas through providing a minimuthat is planted with native shrubs buffer can be used for creation of designed to benefit Water Voles apart of a sustainable urban draina woodland edges will need to prote	natched areas are lended as per on will be required to ry with the woodland um 20 metre buffer and small trees - this inew water features and amphibians as age scheme. All
Potential for cumulative Gildersome cluster.  Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecolo Not supported (RED). Toss of part of Clubbed (LNA). This is an area of Clubbed (LNA). This is an area of Clubbed (LNA). This is an area of Clubbed (LNA) and a ricreasing pression of the company of	gy and LCC Ecology Officer: This proposed allocation will result in the Oaks and Dean Wood Local Nature Are of replanted ancient woodland and a UK is Priority Habitat. The site will also come ure as a result of the allocation. The iich is linked to the western end of the taddition to the overall woodland areadluous woodland a UK BAP Priority areas of woodland should be retained as mean splitting the site in two along the ar woodland corridors are important for	Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hexcluded and the boundary is am Drawing RM/CFSM006. Mitigatic protect and enhance the boundar areas through providing a minimuthat is planted with native shrubs buffer can be used for creation of designed to benefit Water Voles apart of a sustainable urban draina woodland edges will need to prote	natched areas are lended as per on will be required to ry with the woodland um 20 metre buffer and small trees - this inew water features and amphibians as age scheme. All
Potential for cumulative Gildersome cluster.  Network Rail:  Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecolo Not supported (RED). Toss of part of Clubbed (LNA). This is an area of Clubbed (LNA). This is an area of Clubbed (LNA). This is an area of Clubbed (LNA) and a ricreasing pression of the company of	gy and LCC Ecology Officer: This proposed allocation will result in the Oaks and Dean Wood Local Nature Are of replanted ancient woodland and a UK is Priority Habitat. The site will also come are as a result of the allocation. The iich is linked to the western end of the taddition to the overall woodland areaduous woodland a UK BAP Priority areas of woodland should be retained as mean splitting the site in two along the ar woodland corridors are important for roosting bats.	Boundary Amendment  Supported with mitigation if Red hexcluded and the boundary is am Drawing RM/CFSM006. Mitigatic protect and enhance the boundar areas through providing a minimuthat is planted with native shrubs buffer can be used for creation of designed to benefit Water Voles apart of a sustainable urban draina woodland edges will need to prote	natched areas are lended as per on will be required to ry with the woodland um 20 metre buffer and small trees - this inew water features and amphibians as age scheme. All

and Nepshaw Lane, Gildersome **Yorkshire Water Comments:** Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme 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 Yes No Maybe managed (Text) Would gypsies and Yes No Maybe travellers live on the (Text) site? Proximity to housed Yes No gypsies and travellers (Text) **Experience of previous** Yes No Unknown encampments (Text) **Conclusion of Assessment** Conclusion summary: Call for sites - mixed use submission for 400-600 dwellings or flats, B1b/c or B8, offices and retail. See sites 3387 & 1112 Site Capacity (dwellings units): Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0 **Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:** 

Site Ref: CFSM006

Site Name:

Land Between Gelderd Road/Asquith Avenue

#### Site Ref: CFSM010 Site Name: Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

#### **Site Details**

Northing: 426970 Area sq m: 353520.40 Morley South Ward 427639 Easting: Area Ha: 35.35204 HMCA: Outer South West

#### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Residential - Dwellings Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

#### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1321.62 Distance to bus stop (metres) 517.38 Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 11557 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.68	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 Site Ref: CFSM010 Site Name: Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/130/74/	Single storey building for sto rage accommodation to works .	16/05/1974	12/08/1974	Α	22.43
H23/161/75/	Single storey workshop, compri sing plant repair area, medic al unit, w.c., office, store, tyre store, and tyrerepair are	13/03/1975	14/04/1975	Α	22.43
H23/9/82/	Outline application to erect i ndustrial development, tovacan t site. (site area 49.27ha).	19/01/1982	11/11/1982	W	99.19
H23/500/78/	Change of use of store to mung o and shoddy production, and m ungo and shoddy production to store.	22/06/1978	10/07/1978	Α	22.43

Site Ref: CFSM010 Site Name: Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, 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	ilt up area)?					
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement patte	rn?:					
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between exist area and undeveloped land?	ating urban					
Overall sprawl conclusion:						
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging						
Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements	s?					
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to development?	contain					
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:						
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment						
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing u	ırban 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 prot significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	tected, or					
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?						
Does the site contain buildings?	gricultural 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 othe feature?	er historical					
If yes, could development preserve this character?:						
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:						
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Call for sites - mixed use submission for 420 dwellings, B1b/c or B8 (22,0	000sqm), offices. See site 1018 above.					
Conformity with Core Strategy						
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension	on Brownfield					
Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension						
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement Exten						
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension						
Development unrelated to existing developme	ent					
Regeneration Priority Area:	•					
Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire	e Valley: 0.00					
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 Wes	st Leeds Gateway: 0.00					

Site Ref: CFSM010 Site Name: Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusio			
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrast	ructure provider co	omments and other planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Hig	ghways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
	for health and 30% for sec	of the site meets the core strategy standards condary education	3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Access available from Top	ocliffe Lane (through industri	al estate or fom eastern part of site)	3
Local network comment		·	Rank (1-5)
Likely to require off-site mi	itigation and cumulative imp	acts	4
Mitigation measure			Total score
Must have pedestrian con	nections to north and west o	of site	10
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites: Suitability for partial	development:
yes with mitigation			
Highways Agency			
Potential for cumulative imp	pact in combination with other	er sites. If site still included at next sift assess as	part of Morley /
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology a	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported	-		
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Floodi	ng		
Environment Agency Con	nments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	ı
Yorkshire Water Commer	nts:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme

## LCC Flood Risk Management:

#### **Utilities**

Site Ref:	CFSM010	Site Name:	Land Off Topcliffe La North Of Capitol Park	ne, Morley And to The k, Leeds
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	escue Services:			
Built Herit	age_			
Leeds City	Council:			
West Yorks	hire Archaeology	Service:		
English He	ritage:			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed		(Text)		
Would gyp		Yes	No	Maybe
travellers I	ive on the	(Text)		
Site:				
Proximity t	to housed	Yes	No	
	nd travellers	(Text)		
Experience	e of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme	ents	(Text)	·	
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment		
Conclusion s	ummary:			
Call for sites -	mixed use submis	sion for 420 dwellings	s, B1b/c or B8 (22,000sqm), offic	es. See site 1018 above.
Site Capacity	(dwellings units)	: 420	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):
Residential C	onclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	<b>Employment Conclusion:</b>
Red				

Site Ref: CFSM019 Site Name: Sugar Mill, Oakhurst Avenue (Just Off Dewsbury Road), Leeds, LS11 7DF

### **Site Details**

Northing: 430085 Area sq m: 18498.44 Beeston and Holbeck Ward 428977 Easting: Area Ha: 1.849844 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

#### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1592.47 Distance to bus stop (metres) 161.02 Nearest Railway Station Cottingley Bus Stop ID 4079 SFRA Flood Zone:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: No

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

0.00

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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:	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 Site Ref: CFSM019 Site Name: Sugar Mill, Oakhurst Avenue (Just Off Dewsbury Road), Leeds, LS11 7DF

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H21/351/74/	Alterations to form external fire escape to wareh ouse and showroom premises.	15/10/1974	02/12/1974	Α	99.38
21/65/02/FU	Addition of canopy and new entrance to offices	08/03/2002	16/04/2002	Α	13.39
H21/59/74/	Change of use part 2nd floor, from, industrial wareh ouse, to accountancy tuition c entre.	03/05/1974	30/09/1974	Α	98.95
H21/637/75/	Alterations and addition of 2 fire escapes, to indus trial premises.	23/12/1975	23/02/1976	Α	98.95
21/32/94/FU	Microwave antenna to offices	10/03/1994	13/04/1994	Α	13.30
H21/350/75/	Alterations including new wind ows and new windows and roof to 2 units to industrial wareh ousing and show- room premi	10/07/1975	01/09/1975	A	98.95

Site Ref: CFSM019 Site Name: Sugar Mill, Oakhurst Avenue (Just Off Dewsbury Road), Leeds, LS11 7DF

## 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 ar	ea)?
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urb	en 🗌
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 ar	ea?
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?	or
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings?	al 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 histo feature?	rical
If yes, could development preserve this character?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:	
Overall ordinates in reconvenient estimation.	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Greenbert Assessment Conclusion:	
Conformity with Core Strategy	
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield
Major Settlement  Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield
Smaller Settlement	Mixed
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension	
Development unrelated to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:	
Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds	s Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: CFSM019 Site Name: Sugar Mill, Oakhurst Avenue (Just Off Dewsbury Road), Leeds, LS11 7DF

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusion	S			
Availability:	Suitability:	А	chievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	ucture provider con	nments and oth	er planning req	uirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Good Accessibility				5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Access can be taken from nu	umerous points, mainly Oakl	hurst Ave		5
Local network comment			'	Rank (1-5)
Spare capacity but some cur	nulative issues			4
				7
Mitigation measure				Total score
				14
Summart?	Nord to combine with	h athan aita a	Cuitabilitu fan manti	al davidanmant.
Support?	Need to combine with	n other sites:	Suitability for partia	ai development:
,				
Highways Agency				
Potential for cumulative impac Road cluster.	ct in combination with other	sites. If site still includ	ed at next sift assess a	s part of Dewsbury
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	d LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding	 1			
Environment Agency Comm	nents:	Environment Age	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments	<u>:</u>	Yorkshire Water \	Waste Water Treatmer	nt Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	nt:			

## <u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref:	CFSM019	Site Name:	Sugar Mill, Oakhu Dewsbury Road),	rst Avenue (Just Off Leeds, LS11 7DF
Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herit	age			
Leeds City	_			
West Yorks	hire Archaeology	Service:		
English Her	ritage:			
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed		(Text)	1	
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers I		(Text)		,
site?				
Proximity t	to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies an	nd travellers	(Text)		
Experience	e of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme	ents	(Text)		
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment		
Conclusion s	ummary:			
Call for sites si	ubmission for resid	lential, offices and re	tail. See site 3394.	
Site Capacity	(dwellings units)	:	Floorspace sq m (N	Non residential):
Residential C	onclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green				

### **Site Details**

Northing: 430231 Area sq m: 5387.87 Ward Beeston and Holbeck Easting: 428734 Area Ha: 0.538787 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Retail - Shops

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **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:	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H21/437/78/	Outline application to erect 1 0 warehouse units, each with ancillary offices and wit h car parking areas, to	31/07/1978	14/11/1978	W	13.15
H21/449/74/	Alterations, including new roo fing and offices, to units 2-3, and alterations includin g new offices entrance a	28/11/1974	17/03/1975	Α	99.09
H21/184/80/	One internally illuminated ind ividual letter sign, size12.4m x 1.2m height above ground 4. 7m (underside) and one intern	28/03/1980	28/04/1980	А	88.20
H21/33/80/	One internally illuminated ind ividual letter sign, size 7m x 0.6m height above ground 4.7m (underside), one intern	15/01/1980	10/03/1980	R	88.60
H21/375/78/	Change of use of warehouse to motor vehicle maint enance workshop and siting of 1 block of 10 warehouse	06/07/1978	30/10/1978	Α	90.62
H21/134/81/	Detached block of 4 light indu strial units, with 8 car parki ng spaces, to vacant site. (site area	29/04/1981	15/06/1981	R	33.05
H21/65/85/	13, 638 litres underground petr ol storage tank, to car maint enance depot.	28/03/1985	11/09/1986	W	88.87
11/04306/OT	Demolish existing buildings and erect a retail foodstore (Class A1), with car parking, landscaping and access	11/10/2011		PCO	100.00
H21/75/74/	Outline application to erect 5 and 6 storey warehouse premi ses with ancilliary office acc ommodation and car parking fa	15/05/1974	22/07/1974	R	12.71
H21/588/78/	Alterations and extension, to w arehouse to form motor vehicle servicing garage, comprising	25/10/1978	11/04/1979	А	91.26
H21/444/78/	10 warehouse units, each with ancillary offices and toile ts with car parking areas, ser vicing areas, access roa	03/08/1978	09/07/1979	Α	13.45

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?: 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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
ummary of Infras	structure provider co	omments and other plannir	ng requirements
Leeds City Council H	lighways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-
Good Accessibility			5
Access Comments			Rank (1-
Takes access from an in	ndustrial (private) road		1
Local network commer	nt		Rank (1-
Spare capacity but some	cumulative issues		4
Mitigation measure			Total sco
			10
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites: Suitability f	or partial development:
no			
Highways Agency			
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
	y and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported	and Loo Leology Officer.		
Natural England:			
Education			
Drainage/Water/Flood	ding		
Environment Agency Co	omments:	Environment Agency Constrain	its:
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water T	reatment Works Comme
forkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water T	reatment Works Commo

Site Ref:	CFSM023	Site Name:	116, Old Lane	, Beeston, Lee	ds LS11
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Re	escue Services:				
Built Herit Leeds City					
West Yorks	shire Archaeology	Service:			
English He	ritage:				
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
	be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed		(Text)			
Would gyp		Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
site?	iive on the	(Text)			
Proximity avpsies ar	to housed nd travellers	Yes (Text)		No	
371					
Experience	e of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampme		(Text)	INO		Olikilowii
Conclusi	on of Asses	sment			
Conclusion s	ummary:				
Call for sites s	ubmission for resic	dential - houses/flats,	B1b/c, B8 and retail.	See site 3397 above.	
Site Capacity	(dwellings units)	:	Floorspace s	sq m (Non residentia	1):
Residential C	onclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	En	nployment Conclusion:
Red					

### **Site Details**

Northing: 428032 Area sq m: 33123.37 Ward Morley North
Easting: 424379 Area Ha: 3.312337 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage 

☑
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2586.94 Distance to bus stop (metres) 72.65

Nearest Railway Station Morley Bus Stop ID 7561

SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00 Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **UDP Designation**

Crearbalt N20 (0())	0.01	Urban Craan Carridar No (9/):	0.00
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?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

## Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
10/04597/OT	Outline application to layout access road and erect light industry, general industry and warehouse development (Use Classes Class B1c, B2 and B8), a 90 bed hotel and pub/restaurant, with car parking	08/10/2010		PCO	99.43
23/360/03/RE	Renewal of outline permission to erect office development	18/06/2003	10/09/2007	Α	99.93
23/265/01/FU	Variation of condition no 6 of application no 23/308/99/re (highways work)	09/07/2001	18/09/2001	Α	99.99
23/308/99/RE	Renewal of outline permission to erect office development	13/10/1999	18/07/2000	Α	99.99
23/95/94/DN	Determination for demolition of detached dwelling and outbuildings	31/03/1994	16/05/1994	Α	70.82
23/410/00/FU	Variation of condition no 22 of application no 23/308/99/re (gross office floorspace)	14/11/2000	21/02/2001	Α	99.99
23/2/95/OT	Outline application to erect office development	23/12/1994	27/02/1997	Α	99.93
23/398/00/FU	Variation of condition no 6 of planning permission 23/308/99 (highway works)	02/11/2000	08/06/2001	R	99.99
PREAPP/09/00038		29/06/2009	01/09/2009	PRECAG	99.93

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 Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extension Brownfield Major Settlement Major Settlement Extension Greenfield **Smaller Settlement** Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension Development unrelated to existing development Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability:	Suitability:	ı	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider con	nments and ot	her planning require	ments
Leeds City Council Highy	vays inc Metro			D (4. 5)
Accessibility comment  Meets Core Strategy standard	s with exception of local se	rvices		Rank (1-5)
mooto ooro onatogy standard	o man oxoopaon on loodi oo	111000		4
Access Comments			'	Rank (1-5)
Access achievable onto the A	650 - likely to require a sig	nalised junction		4
Local network comment			l	Rank (1-5)
May require some local junction	on interventions			4
L				
Mitigation measure				Total score
Signalised access and potent	ial junction imporvements			12
Support?	Need to combine witl	h other sites:	Suitability for partial dev	/elopment:
yes with mitigation				
Highways Agency Potential for cumulative impact	t in combination with other	sites. If site still inclu	ded at next sift assess as par	t of Morlev /
Gildersome cluster.				
Network Rail :				
<u> Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Commo	ents:	Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	I
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment Wo	orks Comme
.CC Flood Risk Managemen	4.			

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref:	CFSM040	Site Name:	Wakefield Ro	ad, Gildersome	, Morley, Leeds
Gas:					
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Re	scue Services:				
Duilt Havit					
Built Herit Leeds City	<del></del>				
-	hire Archaeology	Service:			
English Her	ritage:				
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t		
	be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed		(Text)			
Would gyp		Yes	No		Maybe
travellers I site?	ive on the	(Text)			
Proximity t		Yes (Text)		No	
gypsies air	nd travellers	(Text)			
Experience encampme	e of previous	Yes (Text)	No		Unknown
encampine	illo	(Text)			
Canalusia	on of Asses	omont			
Conclusio	UII UI ASSES	Sillelli			
Conclusion s			(1.172		
Call for sites si	ubmission for 100	dwellings, B1b/c, B8,	offices (11500sqm),	retail, A3, A4, C1 uses	. See site 3007 above.
011-0-11	/describbs to N				
	(dwellings units)		•	sq m (Non residential	
Residential Co	onclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Em	ployment Conclusion:
Red					

Site Ref: CFSM046 Site Name: Cotton Mill and Grove Farm Dewsbury Road,

### **Site Details**

Northing: 429122 Area sq m: 325842.50 Ward Morley North 428185 Easting: Area Ha: 32.58425 HMCA: Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Retail - Shops

Existing Use 2: Retail - Restaurants and Cafes

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Office Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage **~** Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1240.95 Distance to bus stop (metres) 293.74 Nearest Railway Station Cottingley Bus Stop ID 11121 SFRA Flood Zone: Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

**Environment Agency Flood Zone:** 1.00 Agricultural Land Class:

0.00 Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No No Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): 0.00 Listed Buildings: Yes

1.00

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

### **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	4.24	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

Site Ref: CFSM046 Site Name: Cotton Mill and Grove Farm Dewsbury Road, Leeds

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
23/466/96/SI	Various illuminated and non illuminated signs to shopping complex	03/12/1996	14/02/1997	Α	14.96
23/418/93/RE	Renewal of outline permission to erect shopping complex with cinema, garden centre and hotel with car parking	03/12/1993	16/09/1994	W	44.71
23/388/94/FU	Removal of condition no 12 of application no 87/23/00059/01 (highways improvements)	11/11/1994	22/12/1994	Α	94.05
H23/60/87/	Outline application to layout accesses and erect shopp ing complex with 10 screen cin ema, garden centre and detach	27/02/1987	26/11/1990	W	94.05
23/294/94/FU	Works adjacent to millshaw beck and landscaping to shopping complex	02/09/1994	02/12/1994	Α	94.05
H23/177/90/	Laying out of access and sitin g of retail centre, with multi screen cinema, petrol station and garden centre with car p	18/04/1990	06/11/1990	Α	94.05
23/295/94/RM	Amendment to previous approval for shopping complex and food court with car parking, access and landscaping	02/09/1994	02/12/1994	Α	94.05
H23/10/74/	Two precast concrete show gara ges to nursery.	05/04/1974	24/06/1974	Α	14.90
23/465/96/FU	23 traffic control barriers to shopping centre car park	05/12/1996	22/01/1997	Α	14.96
06/04798/FU	Single storey rear extension to shop unit	07/08/2006	09/10/2006	Α	94.02
07/06600/ADV	4 internally illuminated free standing signs; 4 internally illuminated individual letter signs and 4 internally illuminated logo signs to shopping centre	22/10/2007	03/12/2007	A	15.64
H23/59/87/1	Renewal of outline application to layout accesses and erect shopping complex with 10 scre en cinema, garden centre and	01/08/1991	03/09/1991	А	94.05
H23/59/87/	Outline application to layout accesses and erect shopp ing complex with 10 screen cin ema, garden centre and detach	27/02/1987	30/01/1989	AP	94.05
23/126/94/RM	Shopping complex and food court with car parking, access and landscaping	27/04/1994	18/07/1994	А	94.05
23/296/94/RM	Amendment to alignment of site perimeter road and additional car parking to shopping complex	02/09/1994	02/12/1994	Α	94.05
0-23/35/97/MOD	New build shopping centre	28/10/1997	10/11/1997	M09	94.05
H23/174/81/	Outline application to erect i ndustrial and warehouse devel opment, to vacant site. (site area 14.32ha)	31/03/1981	12/01/1982	Α	42.38
23/297/94/RM	Amendment to access to service area, car parking and landscaping to shopping complex	02/09/1994	02/12/1994	А	94.05

Site Ref: CFSM046 Site Name: Cotton Mill and Grove Farm Dewsbury Road, Leeds

ENQ/09/01727 Mezzanine floor for storage purposes 25/09/2009 05/10/2009 PD 14.71

Site Ref: CFSM046 Site Name: Cotton Mill and Grove Farm Dewsbury Road,

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built	ıp areas	
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon de	velopment?	
Would development result in isolated developm	ent?	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ bo	oundaries with existing built up area)?	
Would development of the site effectively "round	d off" the settlement pattern?:	
Do natural/physical features provide a good exist area and undeveloped land?	sting barrier between existing urban	
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 exidevelopment?	sting barrier/boundary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from end	roachment	
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 conserva-	tion designated areas?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	, hedgerows that are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultu	ral land?	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion		
Preserve the setting and special character o	f historic towns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation a feature?	rea, listed building or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this charact	er?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Conformity with Core Strateg		
	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield
,	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield
	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed
	Village/Rural Extension	
·	ted to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:		_
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay: 0.00

Site Ref: CFSM046 Site Name: Cotton Mill and Grove Farm Dewsbury Road, Leeds

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusion	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
ummary of Infras	tructure provider co	omments and ot	her planning req	uirements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
	buses per hour, 15% of the s or health and 100% for seco		egy standards for	4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Existing access arrangm	ents for the White Rose would	d be suitable for housing	g development	5
Local network commen	t			Rank (1-5
Congested local network				3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				12
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability for partic	al development:
yes with mitigation				
lighways Agency				
	npact in combination with other	er sites. If site still inclu	ded at next sift assess a	s part of Dewsbur
Network Rail :				
<u> Biodiversity</u>				
	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education _				
Drainage/Water/Flood	=	Fundamen		
Environment Agency Co	mments:	Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatme	nt Works Comme
.CC Flood Risk Manage	ment:			

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: CFSM046	Site Name:	Cotton Mill and Grove Leeds	Farm Dewsbury Road,
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	INO	Maybe
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	,	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		·
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Call for sites submission for resid	lential (houses/flats),	retail and leisure. See site 1208.	

Site Ref: CFSM046 Site Name: Cotton Mill and Grove Farm Dewsbury Road, Leeds

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

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red

### **Site Details**

 Northing:
 428391
 Area sq m:
 327831.67
 Ward
 Morley North

 Easting:
 428225
 Area Ha:
 32.783167
 HMCA:
 Outer South West

### Site Characteristics

### Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Storage

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture
Neighbouring Use 2: Retail - Shops

Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield and brownfield

### Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1291.61Distance to bus stop (metres)280.16Nearest Railway StationMorleyBus Stop ID4304

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:NoStrategic Employment Buffer:0.00Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:NoConservation AreasNoAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

## **UDP Designation**

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.97	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

# **Planning History**

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H23/102/77/	Tipping of industrial refuse a nd demolition materials, to fo rm enlarged tip. (site area 1. 8ha (4.4 acres)).	18/02/1977	18/07/1977	А	15.42
23/296/93/FU	Extraction of coal by opencast mining	16/08/1993	25/08/1995	Α	66.26
H23/326/81/	Laying out of access and tippi ng of controlled waste, with compound containing detached g arage and fuel store, off	04/08/1981	15/09/1981	А	24.02
H23/454/81/	Tipping of industrial refuse a nd demolition materials, to ex isting tip. (site area 1.49ha) . (county matter)	18/12/1981	23/02/1982	А	11.34
23/128/96/MIN	Variation of conditions nos 2 and 18 of application no 23/296/93/fu (extension of coal extraction area)	15/04/1996	04/09/1996	А	66.03
H23/614/79/	Change of use, involving alter ations and extension, of di sused barn to 1 bedroom flat.	31/07/1979	08/10/1979	R	51.27
H23/214/81/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to va cant site. (site area 23.07ha) .	31/03/1981	15/06/1981	R	53.15
H23/215/81/	Outline application to erect r esidential development to va cant site. (site area 17ha).	31/03/1981	15/06/1981	R	53.14

# 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 d									
Would development result in isolated development	✓								
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b									
Would development of the site effectively "rour	No								
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	isting barrier between existing urban								
Overall sprawl conclusion:									
High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl									
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging									
Would development of the site lead to physica	ald development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements?								
Do natural/physical features provide a good exdevelopment?	✓								
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:									
No merging but would significantly reduce the	green belt gap								
Assist in safeguarding countryside from en	croachment								
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	✓								
Does the site provide access to the countrysid									
Does the site include local or national conserva									
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	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 characteristics	eter?:								
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:									
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features									
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:									
Not connected to urban area, would result in an isolated development. Contained to the east by the motorway but would reduce the green belt gap between Morley and Middleton.									
Conformity with Core Strateg	у								
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield							
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield [							
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extension	Mixed [							
Villages/Rural									
Development unrela	ated to existing development								
Regeneration Priority Area:			6 5 <del>-</del>						
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00						
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay:	0.00						

East Leeds

	Suitability:	Achievability:	
lummary of Infra	structure provider co	omments and other planning requir	ements
anniary or initia	otraotaro providor ot	on the case of the planning require	Omonto
	Highways inc Metro		5 1 (4.5)
Accessibility comment		f the cite mosts the save standards for primary	Rank (1-5)
		of the site meets the core standards for primary the site meets core strategy standards for health	4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Access onto junction wi through from sites 1275		ed - potential for left in left out and linking	3
Local network comme	nt		Rank (1-5)
Large site is likely to red	quire some off-site mitigation w	vorks	4
Mitigation measure			Total score
Needs to link with site 1	275 for access and provide cro	ossing facilities on Dewsbury Rd	11
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites: Suitability for partial d	evelopment:
yes with mitigation			
<u> Highways Agency</u>			
Potential for cumulative in Road cluster.	impact in combination with oth	er sites. If site still included at next sift assess as page	art of Dewsbury
	impact in combination with oth	er sites. If site still included at next sift assess as p	art of Dewsbury
Road cluster.  Network Rail :  Biodiversity			art of Dewsbury
Road cluster.  Network Rail :  Biodiversity	impact in combination with other	er sites. If site still included at next sift assess as page 1. Boundary Amendment	art of Dewsbury
Road cluster. Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecolog			art of Dewsbury
Road cluster.  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  Nest Yorkshire Ecolog  Supported			art of Dewsbury
Road cluster.  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  Nest Yorkshire Ecolog  Supported  Natural England:			art of Dewsbury
Road cluster.  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecolog  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Orainage/Water/Floo	y and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	art of Dewsbury
Road cluster.  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecolog  Supported  Natural England:  Education	y and LCC Ecology Officer:		art of Dewsbury
Road cluster.  Network Rail:  Biodiversity  West Yorkshire Ecolog  Supported  Natural England:  Education  Orainage/Water/Floo	y and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	art of Dewsbury

## <u>Utilities</u>

LCC Flood Risk Management:

Site Ref: CFSM047	Site Name: White Rose Shopping Centre Dewsbury Road, Leeds					
Gas:						
Electric:						
Telecom:						
Fire and Rescue Services:						
Built Heritage						
Leeds City Council:						
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:					
English Heritage:						
Gypsy <sub>-</sub> Traveller Site	e Assessmen	<u> </u>				
Could site be effectively	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe			
managed	(Text)					
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe			
travellers live on the	(Text)					
site?						
Proximity to housed	Yes	No				
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	140				
			_			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown			
encampments	(Text)					
	•					
Gypsy _Traveller Site Assessment						
Could site be effectively		No	Maybe			
managed	(Text)					
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe			
travellers live on the	(Text)	-				
site?						
Dravimity to haused	Voc	No				
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No				
<b>.</b>						
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown			
encampments	(Text)					
	•					
Conclusion of Asses	sment					
Name   1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1						
Conclusion summary:  Call for sites submission for residential, retail, leisure and complementary commercial uses. See site 1209 above.						
zan or once eastinoción noi recidential, retail, icidate and complementary commeteia dees. Dee site 1209 above.						

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

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Red