Site Details

 Northing:
 432777
 Area sq m:
 5263.10
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 421993
 Area Ha:
 0.52631
 HMCA:
 Outer 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: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

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):1753.22Distance to bus stop (metres)73.70Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID12775SFRA 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:

Site is within the main urban area surrounded by residential development. Previous employment use on site (which is currently vacant), consisting of three storey stone mill buildings. To the south of the site are other industrial units which are still in operation. Road frontage to the site on three boundaries, west north and east.

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 %
25/254/92/FU	Change of use of engineering factory to warehouse	18/09/1992	17/02/1993	R	31.04
H25/466/78/	Outline application to erect p ortable, 2 storey office unit, to works.	19/07/1978	04/09/1978	W	71.21
25/103/93/FU	Change of use of engineering works to warehousing	13/05/1993	13/07/1993	Α	31.04
25/13/96/FU	Permission for change of use of engineering works to warehouse	18/01/1996	21/05/1996	R	28.90
25/136/96/FU	Roller shutter to door	31/05/1996	09/07/1996	Α	28.90
11/01860/FU	Erection of 23 dwelling houses	09/05/2011	01/06/2012	Α	99.59
H25/417/79/	One non illuminated individual letter wall sign, size 0.4m x 7.65m height above ground 5m (underside) and three non	26/06/1979	16/07/1979	Α	99.35
H25/237/89/	Alterations, to form showroom, workshop, offices, toile ts and rest room and erection of 2 storey factory to existin	17/07/1989	23/04/1990	Α	22.75
H25/520/78/	Detached two storey prefabrica ted office unit to engin eering works.	07/08/1978	04/09/1978	Α	71.08
H25/464/78/	Alterations to form new stairc ases, offices, toilets, recep tion and pattern store and add ition of external fire escap	13/07/1978	25/09/1978	Α	71.17
25/102/93/FU	Change of use of engineering works to warehouse	13/05/1993	13/07/1993	Α	31.04
12/03483/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16 and 18 of Planning Application 11/01860/FU	10/08/2012		PCO	99.59

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:	

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 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 existence 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 Constitution		
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:		2.22
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	100.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:		Achiovability:	
			Achievability:	
ummary of Infras	structure provider co	omments and o	other planning req	uirements
<u>Leeds City Council H</u> Accessibility comment	lighways inc Metro			Rank (1-5
Good accessibility all rou	nd			5
Access Comments				Rank (1-
Unclear frontage rights (site not bounded to adopted h	nighway) but seems po	ossible	3
Local network commer				Rank (1-5
Local capacity, congestion	on in pudsey			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				12
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability for parti	al development:
Yes				
Highways Agency				
n/a				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
-	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Bounda	ry Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education _				
Drainage/Water/Flood	dina			
Environment Agency Co		Environment A	Agency Constraints:	
<u> </u>				
Yorkshire Water Commo	ents:	Yorkshire Wat	er Waste Water Treatme	nt Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ement:			

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)	NO	iviaybe
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
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Gypsy _Traveller Site Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	
Could site be effectively	Yes		Maybe Maybe
Could site be effectively managed Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	
Could site be effectively managed Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed	Yes (Text) Yes (Text) Yes	No No	
Could site be effectively managed Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text) Yes (Text) Yes (Text) Yes (Text)	No No No	Maybe
Could site be effectively managed Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Experience of previous	Yes (Text) Yes (Text) Yes (Text) Yes (Text)	No No No	Maybe

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 Name: Daytona Works, Carlisle Road, Pudsey, Leeds

LS28 8PL

Site Ref: 33

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Green Not assessed Not assessed

Site Details

 Northing:
 432777
 Area sq m:
 5263.10
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 421993
 Area Ha:
 0.52631
 HMCA:
 Outer 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: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

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):1753.22Distance to bus stop (metres)73.70Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID12775SFRA 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:

Site is within the main urban area surrounded by residential development. Previous employment use on site (which is currently vacant), consisting of three storey stone mill buildings. To the south of the site are other industrial units which are still in operation. Road frontage to the site on three boundaries, west north and east.

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 %
25/254/92/FU	Change of use of engineering factory to warehouse	18/09/1992	17/02/1993	R	31.04
H25/466/78/	Outline application to erect p ortable, 2 storey office unit, to works.	19/07/1978	04/09/1978	W	71.21
25/103/93/FU	Change of use of engineering works to warehousing	13/05/1993	13/07/1993	Α	31.04
25/13/96/FU	Permission for change of use of engineering works to warehouse	18/01/1996	21/05/1996	R	28.90
25/136/96/FU	Roller shutter to door	31/05/1996	09/07/1996	Α	28.90
11/01860/FU	Erection of 23 dwelling houses	09/05/2011	01/06/2012	Α	99.59
H25/417/79/	One non illuminated individual letter wall sign, size 0.4m x 7.65m height above ground 5m (underside) and three non	26/06/1979	16/07/1979	Α	99.35
H25/237/89/	Alterations, to form showroom, workshop, offices, toile ts and rest room and erection of 2 storey factory to existin	17/07/1989	23/04/1990	Α	22.75
H25/520/78/	Detached two storey prefabrica ted office unit to engin eering works.	07/08/1978	04/09/1978	Α	71.08
H25/464/78/	Alterations to form new stairc ases, offices, toilets, recep tion and pattern store and add ition of external fire escap	13/07/1978	25/09/1978	Α	71.17
25/102/93/FU	Change of use of engineering works to warehouse	13/05/1993	13/07/1993	Α	31.04
12/03483/COND	Consent, agreement or approval required by conditions 3, 4, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16 and 18 of Planning Application 11/01860/FU	10/08/2012		PCO	99.59

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:	

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 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 existence 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 Constitution		
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:		0.00
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	100.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclu				
Availability: Medium	term (6-10 y Suitability:	Yes Physical	Achievabili	ity: Medium term (6-10 years)
ummary of Inf	rastructure provider	comments a	and other plai	nning requirements
	il Highways inc Metro			5.145
Accessibility comme				Rank (1-5
Good accessibility all	round			5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Unclear frontage righ	nts (site not bounded to adopte	ed highway) but se	ems possible	3
Local network com	ment			Rank (1-5
Local capacity, cong	estion in pudsey			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				12
Support?	Need to combin	ne with other sites	s: Suitab	oility for partial development:
Yes				
Highways Agency				
n/a				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecol	logy and LCC Ecology Office	er: Bo	oundary Amendme	ent
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education _				
Drainage/Water/FI		F		-4
Environment Agency	/ Comments:	Environi	ment Agency Cons	Su allitS:
Yorkshire Water Cor	nments:	Yorkshir	re Water Waste Wa	ater Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Man	agement:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

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)	NO	iviaybe
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
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
Gypsy _Traveller Site Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	
Could site be effectively	Yes		Maybe Maybe
Could site be effectively managed Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	
Could site be effectively managed Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed	Yes (Text) Yes (Text) Yes	No No	
Could site be effectively managed Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text) Yes (Text) Yes (Text) Yes (Text)	No No No	Maybe
Could site be effectively managed Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Experience of previous	Yes (Text) Yes (Text) Yes (Text) Yes (Text)	No No No	Maybe

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 Name: Daytona Works, Carlisle Road, Pudsey, Leeds

LS28 8PL

Site Ref: 33

Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:

Green Not assessed Not assessed

3RS

Site Details

 Northing:
 433744
 Area sq m:
 9950.79
 Ward
 Armley

 Easting:
 426193
 Area Ha:
 0.995079
 HMCA:
 Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

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: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2171.87
Distance to bus stop (metres) 160.77

Nearest Railway Station Headingley Bus Stop ID 3978

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:

Previous employment site - now cleared and vacant. Set in urban area.

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:	5.07	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 %
24/92/97/FU	Addition of 3.1m high flue to roof of factory	02/04/1997	17/07/1997	Α	92.08
H24/39/78/	Alterations and extension to f orm metal descaling works hop, to factory.	19/01/1978	13/02/1978	W	86.63
24/183/94/FU	External flue pipe to works	27/06/1994	28/09/1994	Α	92.48
24/296/92/FU	New external stairs	08/09/1992	30/11/1992	Α	92.48
12/01848/FU	Laying out of access road and erect 47 houses	24/04/2012	16/07/2012	W	91.74
H24/545/77/	Detached storage shed, to work s.	22/09/1977	07/11/1977	Α	87.52
H24/138/90/1	Alterations and two storey ext ension to form offices, recep tion and toilets, including la ying out new access and car pa	24/04/1990	02/07/1990	Α	92.90
H24/170/79/	Alterations and extension, to form shotblast machine store, to engineering works.	20/03/1979	08/05/1979	Α	90.64
H24/160/85/	Alterations and extension, to form loading bay with lifti ng ramp, to works.	07/06/1985	08/07/1985	Α	85.77
24/85/93/FU	Alterations and new chimney to works	23/03/1993	06/07/1993	Α	92.48
24/23/95/FU	Addition of 6 vents and flues to factory	12/01/1995	01/03/1995	Α	92.08
24/438/05/FU	Laying out of new access and erection of 53 flats and 9 houses	22/07/2005	03/12/2009	Α	100.00

3RS

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	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 "rour	nd off" the settlement pattern?:	_
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	xisting 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?	kisting 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	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	rural land?	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	1	
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 Strateg	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	Mixeu
-	ated to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:		
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	100.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay: 0.00

3RS

East Leeds

Gas:

	bility: Yes Achievability: Short	term (0-5yrs)
Summary of Infrastructure pro	ovider comments and other planning re	equirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Mo	<u>etro</u>	
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5
Good accessibility all round		5
Access Comments		Rank (1-5
Substandard accesses to adopted highway widen. Previous application on site with co	ys, narrow access along Tower Lane with no scope to mpromised access	4
Local network comment		Rank (1-5
Cumulative impact on Stanningley Road		4
Mitigation measure		Total scor
highway safety improvements for accesses	s in to site, possible cumulative fund required	13
Support? Need to	combine with other sites: Suitability for pa	rtial development:
Yes		
Highways Agency n∕a Network Rail :		
<u>Biodiversity</u>		
Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecolog	gy Officer: Boundary Amendment	
Supported		
Natural England:		
Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatn	nent Works Comme

		3RS	
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
Gypsy ₋ Traveller Site	e Assessme	nt	
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 (Text)	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Residential development conside over Lane narrow with no scop		orinciple. Highways issues - sub	standard access to adopted highway.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 62	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Ret	ail Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
nmber en la company de la comp	Not	assessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Tower Works, Moorfield Road, Leeds LS12

Site Ref: 41

Site Ref: 157 Site Name: Edroyd House Red Lane Farsley

Site Details

Northing: 435420 Area sq m: 5302.11 Ward Calverley and Farsley Easting: 421537 Area Ha: 0.530211 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

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

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1185.12 Distance to bus stop (metres) 259.68

Nearest Railway Station New Pudsey Bus Stop ID 13311

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 AreasYesAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site contains one large dwelling. Rest of site heavily treed. Set in conservation area.

UDP Designation

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

No

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

account prior to making decisions on which sites to allocate.

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
25/357/04/CA	Conservation area application to part demolish boundary wall to residential development	17/09/2004	16/12/2004	AP	100.00
25/92/01/FU	8 dwelling houses	11/04/2001	06/08/2001	R	57.04
25/220/99/FU	Detached garage block with 2 bedroom flat over	04/10/1999	15/05/2000	W	95.23
09/00558/FU	Conversion of 4 flats to single dwelling and addition of extension to side , to form double garage	09/02/2009	05/11/2010	Α	68.07
25/358/04/FU	Laying out of access and erection of 12 two bedroom flats and 2 detached garages	17/09/2004	16/12/2004	AP	100.00
09/00557/FU	2 five bedroom detached houses, each with detached double garage	09/02/2009	05/11/2010	R	39.90

Site Ref: 157 Site Name: Edroyd House Red Lane Farsley

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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 157 Site Name: Edroyd House Red Lane Farsley

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions					
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitabi	lity: Yes	А	chievability:	Short term (0-	ōyrs)
Summary of Infrastructure prov	/ider comm	ents and oth	er plann	ing require	ments
Leeds City Council Highways inc Me	tro				
Accessibility comment				1	Rank (1-5
Good accessibility all round					5
Access Comments					Rank (1-5
Inadequate access to site for 5 houses					2
Local network comment					Rank (1-5
Cumulative impact on ring road					4
Mitigation measure					Total scor
Improvements to access junction and intern	al access road re	equired			11
Support? Need to d	ombine with ot	har sitas:	Suitability	y for partial dev	elonment:
No No	ombine with or	ner sites.	planning f	for 3 houses devents to access a	eloped and
<u>Highways Agency</u> n/a <u>Network Rail :</u>					
Biodiversity					
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology	Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment		
Supported					
Natural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>					
Environment Agency Comments:		Environment Age	ency Constra	ints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water	Waste Water	Treatment Wo	rks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:					
<u>Utilities</u>					

Site Ref: 157	Site Name:	Edroyd House R	ed Lane Farsley
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:			
Current permission to convert cu	rrent dwelling from fla	ats into one dwelling (Nov	2010). Significant tree cover and highway
concerns regarding access.			
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 5	Floorspace sq m	(Non residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 163 Site Name: Salvation Army, 139 Broad Lane, Bramley,

Site Details

Northing: 435437 Area sq m: 10867.32 Ward ramley and Stanningley
Easting: 425133 Area Ha: 1.086732 HMCA: Outer 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

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):1561.17Distance to bus stop (metres)100.88Nearest Railway StationBramleyBus Stop ID11153

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

Environment Agency Flood Zone:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:

Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:

No Agricultural Land Class:

Strategic Employment Buffer:

O.00

Conservation Areas

No

Listed Buildings:

No

0.00

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Grassland that adjoins new child day care nursery. Set in urban area.

UDP Designation

Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):

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: 163 Site Name: Salvation Army, 139 Broad Lane, Bramley, Leeds

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
24/202/03/RM	Single storey childrens nursery with car parking	23/04/2003	23/07/2003	Α	40.11
0-24/18/04/MOD	Outline application to erect single storey nursery	15/03/2004		REC	40.11
H24/50/77/2	Renewal of outline application to demolish existing hoste I buildings, lay out new acces s road and erect 48 dwellings	31/03/1983	20/06/1983	А	98.78
H24/50/77/	Renewal of outline application to demolish existing hoste I buildings, layout new access road and erect 48 dwellings,	10/02/1977	18/04/1977	Α	82.17
H24/34/76/	Outline application to demolis h existing former mater nity home, and erect new women and girls hostel and reside	22/01/1976	05/07/1976	А	99.94
24/333/02/OT	Outline application to erect single storey nursery	24/09/2002	03/02/2003	Α	40.11
H24/50/77/1	Renewal of outline application to demolish existing hoste I buildings, lay out new acces s road and erect 48 dwellin	01/02/1980	14/04/1980	А	81.85
24/135/95/FU	Detached two storey annexe to hostel	19/04/1995	24/10/1995	Α	99.93
H24/803/76/	Renewal of outline application to erect mothers and child rens home, to vacant site. (ou tline permission no oee 656	17/11/1976	24/01/1977	Α	11.65

Site Ref: 163 Site Name: Salvation Army, 139 Broad Lane, Bramley,

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

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: 163 Site Name: Salvation Army, 139 Broad Lane, Bramley, Leeds

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusio	ns							
Availability: Short term (0-	5yrs) Suita	ability:	Yes		Achievabi	lity: Shor	t term (0-5)	rs)
Summary of Infrast	ructure pr	ovide	r comm	ents and o	ther pla	nning r	equiren	nents
Leeds City Council Hig	thways inc N	<u>lletro</u>						
Accessibility comment							ī	Rank (1-5
Good access to Public Tran	isport, education	on and e	mpioymen	and nealth				5
Access Comments								Rank (1-5
The existing access servin brought up to adoptable st involve setting back the ex	andards and im	nprovem					е	4
Local network comment								Rank (1-5
Scale of development wou	ld not have an	adverse	impact on	capacity of loca	al network			5
Mitigation measure								Total sco
Access improvements								14
								'-
Support?	Need to	o combi	ne with ot	her sites:	Suital	bility for pa	artial deve	lopment:
Yes with mitigation	No							
Highways Agency								
Comments Awaited								
Network Rail :								
<u>Biodiversity</u>								
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecolo	gy Offic	er:	Boundar	ry Amendm	ent		
Natural England:								
ratural England.								
Education								
<u>Drainage/Water/Floodi</u> Environment Agency Con				Environment A	aencv Cor	straints:		
Yorkshire Water Commen	ts:			Yorkshire Wate	er Waste W	ater Treat	ment Work	s Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managem	ent:							
<u>Utilities</u>								

		Leeds		
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:	OCI VIOC.			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessme	ent		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes	No		Maybe
site?	(Text)			
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)		No	
371				
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)	140		Olikilowii
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Site within existing urban area. Feeclude the recently developed c			nciple. Boundary o	f site has been amended to
exolude the recently developed of	mila dare day ridio	ory.		
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	2	1 Floorspace	sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:	Re	etail Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:
Green	No	ot assessed		Not assessed

Site Name: Salvation Army, 139 Broad Lane, Bramley,

Site Ref: 163

Site Details

Northing: 432646 Area sq m: 16956.87 Ward Farnley and Wortley
Easting: 427320 Area Ha: 1.695687 HMCA: Outer 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: Retail - Shops

Other uses:

Site State: Mix

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2434.11Distance to bus stop (metres)103.55Nearest Railway StationLeeds CityBus Stop ID12061

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:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	100.00
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:	99.91		

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 %
24/90/05/FU	Laying out of access road and erection of 49 dwelling houses and 15 flats	18/01/2005	06/04/2005	W	71.94

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 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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 100.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: L	DF to determine	Achievability:	Medium term (6-10 years)
summary of Infrastructure provider of	comments and o	other planni	ng requirer	ments
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment			i	Rank (1-5
Good accessibility all round				5
Access Comments			'	Rank (1-5
Good frontage with Oldfield Lane				5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Local network fine on Oldfield Lane, likely cumulative Road	e impact on Inner Ring	Road and Outer	Ring	4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Traffic calming on Oldfield Lane, possibly achievable applications.	e through financial cont	ributions from pla	anning	14
Support? Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability	for partial deve	elopment:
Yes				
Highways Agency				
n/a				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer	: Bounda	ry Amendment		
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	Agency Constra	ints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wat	ter Waste Water	Treatment Wor	ks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:				
<u>Utilities</u>				

Site Ref: 254	Site Name:	Oldfield Lane (Lee	ds City Boy's pitch) LS12
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:		
English Hentage:			
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)	<u>'</u>	•
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion cummenu			
Conclusion summary: Site is designated as a protected	plaving pitch (N6) or	the existing UDP. However	the adopted West Leeds Gateway
Supplementary Planning Docume	ent states that the site	e is suitable for residential de	velopment providing on site greenspace as the site to greenspace at Oldfield
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 58	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

 Northing:
 433691
 Area sq m:
 13220.18
 Ward
 Armley

 Easting:
 426842
 Area Ha:
 1.322018
 HMCA:
 Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Derelict

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

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

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Significant Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1824.44Distance to bus stop (metres)153.97Nearest Railway StationBurley ParkBus Stop ID9279

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:

Cleared site. No constraints. Set in urban area.

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

Site Ref: 255 Site Name: Far Fold, Theaker Lane, LS12

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H24/285/74/	Single storey extension to veh icle maintenance workshopto fo rm new bay, to mineral-water w orks.	29/07/1974	23/09/1974	Α	83.22
H24/82/77/	Change of use of manufacturing and warehouse premises to wa rehouse and distribution premi ses.	24/02/1977	21/03/1977	Α	68.78
PREAPP/08/00394		03/12/2008	12/02/2009	PRECAG	99.56
12/03868/FU	One three storey care home, 46 affordable homes comprising 40 houses and 6 flats, laying out of access road and associated landscaping	10/09/2012	08/03/2013	A	98.87

Site Ref: 255 Site Name: Far Fold, Theaker Lane, 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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 100.00

Site Ref: 255 Site Name: Far Fold, Theaker Lane, LS12

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: Yes	Ac	hievability: Mediun	n term (6-10 years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider co	mments and other	er planning red	quirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
Good accessibility all round			5
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Access off Theaker Lane through Leeds City Council la	and.		4
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Congestion on Stanningley Road, Inner Ring Road and	d Armley		3
Mitigation measure			Total scor
Possible financial contribution from planning application	ns required to fund highw	ay works.	12
Support? Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for part	ial development:
Yes			
lighways Agency			
n/a			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	mendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
Education			
<u> Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agen	cy Constraints:	
Orkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water W	aste Water Treatme	ent Works Comme
CC Flood Risk Management:			
Jtilities .			

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)				•
Would gypsies and	Yes		No		Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)				1 2
site?					
Proximity to housed	Yes			No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			1	
Experience of previous	Yes		No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)				Cinarowii
Conclusion of Asses	sment				
Conclusion summary: Planning permission recently gran	atad (9th March	2013) for 46 offer	table be	amas plus cara han	no. The cite will become a
'lime green' site once the plan is		2013) 101 40 811010	able III	ornes pius care non	ne. The site will become a
Site Capacity (dwellings units):		46 Floo i	space	sq m (Non resider	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion	:		Employment Conclusion:
Green	N	Not assessed			Not assessed

Site Name: Far Fold, Theaker Lane, LS12

Site Details

Northing: 436555 Area sq m: 49111.01 Ward ramley and Stanningley
Easting: 424139 Area Ha: 4.911101 HMCA: Outer 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: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Significant Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2146.41Distance to bus stop (metres)555.43Nearest Railway StationBramleyBus Stop ID13466

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(%):94.08Listed Buildings:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

The site is part of a larger wood and is heavily treed. There are no bulidings on site, though pedestrian access is available through a series of tracks. To the north the site abuts a canal, along the western boundary is a road whilst to the south is a playing pitch.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	100.00
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:	100	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 %
H24/187/87/	Laying out of access road and filling of quarry with waste material. m	20/08/1987	03/07/1989	R	55.45
H24/144/81/	Laying out of access road and tipping of inert and non-t oxic waste to disused quarry. (site area 7.05ha). (county ma	27/03/1981	06/08/1981	А	99.48
H24/651/75/	Alterations to access and use of vacant sandstone quarr y for tipping.	16/09/1975	08/05/1978	R	99.59

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: 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 would significantly reduce the green belt gap Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area? **~** Does the site provide access to the countryside? Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas? Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or **~** significant unprotected tree/hedge cover? **~** Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land? Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use? Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature? If yes, could development preserve this character?: Overall Character Preservation Conclusion: Development of the site would have marginal effect on the setting & special character of historic features, which c **Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:** Site provides important access to countryside. Low chance of sprawl due to strong boundaries and dense trees. Would reduce green belt gap between Horsforth and Bramley. 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

Availability: Long term (11+ year Suitability: LDF to determine	
Availability. Long term (11+ year Suitability. LDF to determine	Achievability: Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider comments a	and other planning requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	
Accessibility comment	Rank (1-5
Poor public transport / access to health services. Average primary an	d secondary school accessibility.
Access Comments	Rank (1-5
Poor access along Pollard Lane.	2
Local network comment	Rank (1-5
Cumulative impact on ring road and kirkstall.	4
Mitigation measure	Total scol
Public transport and road improvements required but unlikely to be a	chievable.
Support? Need to combine with other sites	s: Suitability for partial development:
Highways Agency n/a Network Rail :	
<u>Biodiversity</u>	
Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: B	oundary Amendment
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). All of the site is Bramley Fall and Newlay Quarry LNA, together with an additional area of woodland. Any development of this site would result in the loss of mature woodland and place additional disturbance on the remaining woodland and protected species including Otters and Badgers. Possible that all this site would meet Local Wildlife Site (SEGI)	oundary Amendment eeds assessment against Local Wildlife Sites criteria
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). All of the site is Bramley Fall and Newlay Quarry LNA, together with an additional area of woodland. Any development of this site would result in the loss of mature woodland and place additional disturbance on the remaining woodland and protected species including Otters and Badgers. Possible that all this site would meet Local Wildlife Site (SEGI) criteria - needs to he assessed.	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). All of the site is Bramley Fall and Newlay Quarry LNA, together with an additional area of woodland. Any development of this site would result in the loss of mature woodland and place additional disturbance on the remaining woodland and protected species including Otters and Badgers. Possible that all this site would meet Local Wildlife Site (SEGI) criteria - needs to he assessed. Natural England:	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). All of the site is Bramley Fall and Newlay Quarry LNA, together with an additional area of woodland. Any development of this site would result in the loss of mature woodland and place additional disturbance on the remaining woodland and protected species including Otters and Badgers. Possible that all this site would meet Local Wildlife Site (SEGI) criteria - needs to he assessed. Natural England:	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). All of the site is Bramley Fall and Newlay Quarry LNA, together with an additional area of woodland. Any development of this site would result in the loss of mature woodland and place additional disturbance on the remaining woodland and protected species including Otters and Badgers. Possible that all this site would meet Local Wildlife Site (SEGI) criteria - needs to he assessed. Natural England: Education	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). All of the site is Bramley Fall and Newlay Quarry LNA, together with an additional area of woodland. Any development of this site would result in the loss of mature woodland and place additional disturbance on the remaining woodland and protected species including Otters and Badgers. Possible that all this site would meet Local Wildlife Site (SEGI) criteria - needs to he assessed. Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). All of the site is Bramley Fall and Newlay Quarry LNA, together with an additional area of woodland. Any development of this site would result in the loss of mature woodland and place additional disturbance on the remaining woodland and protected species including Otters and Badgers. Possible that all this site would meet Local Wildlife Site (SEGI) criteria - needs to he assessed. Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding	eeds assessment against Local Wildlife Sites criteria
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Not supported (RED). All of the site is Bramley Fall and Newlay Quarry LNA, together with an additional area of woodland. Any development of this site would result in the loss of mature woodland and place additional disturbance on the remaining woodland and protected species including Otters and Badgers. Possible that all this site would meet Local Wildlife Site (SEGI) criteria - needs to he assessed. Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environ	eeds assessment against Local Wildlife Sites criteria

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	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)	110		Olikilowii
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Officiasion of Asses	Silicit			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. Site is heavily w	ooded. Highw	vays concerns regarding acc	cess along Pollard	Lane and poor accessibility.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	:	129 Floorspace	sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:
Red		Not assessed		Not assessed

Site Name: Pollard Lane, LS13

Site Ref: 308 Site Name: The Manor, Stony Royd, Farsley

Site Details

Northing: 435306 Area sq m: 15199.18 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 421257 Area Ha: 1.519918 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Community Services - Medical & Health care services

Existing Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring Use 2: Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Mixed

Site Detail

Nearest Railway Station

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: No Tree Cover Road Frontage
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1008.66 Distance to bus stop (metres) 246.54

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

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

New Pudsey

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

2172

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Southern section brownfield, northern part is existing playing pitch.

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:	99.99		

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 %
H25/14/82/	Alterations and extension, to form changing rooms, to socia I club.	22/01/1982	01/02/1982	Α	99.66
H25/179/83/	Change of use, involving alter ations and extension of club house to public house, with 2 bedroom flat.	03/08/1983	10/10/1983	Α	96.42
H25/37/76/	Detached, pre-cast concrete, t ackle shed to cricket groun d.	22/01/1976	16/02/1976	Α	99.61
H25/614/79/	Erection of four 7.62m high fl oodlighting posts, to bowli ng green	04/09/1979	15/10/1979	Α	83.97
25/357/03/FU	Single storey extension to living accommodation to public house	30/09/2003	14/11/2003	Α	97.35
H25/331/86/	Alterations and extension to f orm 2 bedrooms, to side of de tached bungalow.	20/10/1986	18/12/1986	А	66.29
25/243/05/FU	Single storey extension to side of function suite	20/05/2005	05/10/2005	Α	100.00
H25/154/84/	One externally illuminated wal I mounted sign, size 1.83m x 1.08m, height above ground, 3.35m (underside), to public	22/06/1984	30/07/1984	A	95.51
H25/290/83/	One externally illuminated wal I sign, size 1.83m x 1.08m height above ground 3.35m (un derside) and one externally	15/12/1983	20/02/1984	R	96.41
25/242/05/FU	Laying out of enlarged car park to function suite	20/05/2005	01/08/2005	W	100.00
25/396/03/FU	Detached garage and office to social functions premises	30/10/2003	04/05/2004	Α	100.00
09/02736/FU	Change of use from a wedding function room with living accommodation to funeral directors with chapel of rest and function room	23/06/2009	06/08/2009	A	99.82
H25/175/79/	Alterations and extension, to form kitchen, to sport s club pavilion.	22/03/1979	08/05/1979	Α	83.97
H25/117/83/	Alterations and extension, to form bowls room, to side of cl ub house.	08/06/1983	20/06/1983	Α	69.43

Site Ref: 308 Site Name: The Manor, Stony Royd, Farsley

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 performs well in green belt terms. 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

100.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Site Ref: 308 Site Name: The Manor, Stony Royd, Farsley

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Long term (11+ year Suitability	: LDF to determine	Achievability: Lo	ong term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provide	der comments and c	other planning	requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	<u>.</u>		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Poor public transport. Good acces to primary / s	secondary education and hea	alth services.	3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Access not wide enough for carriageway and f	ootways		2
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Likely cumulative impact on ring road			4
Mitigation measure			Total scor
Needs additional land from cricket club for acc	ess		9
			3
Support? Need to con	nbine with other sites:	Suitability for	partial development:
No		Yes	
Highways Agency			
n/a			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology O	fficer: Bounda	ry Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	Agency Constraints	:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wat	er Waste Water Tre	eatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			
_			
<u>Utilities</u>			

Site Ref: 308	Site Name:	The Manor, St	ony Royd, Fai	rsley
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmer	it		
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			
0 1 :				
Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. Development wo	uld not relate well to	the existing settlement	form in that it would	I not 'round off' the
settlement, but could set a prece	dent for further sprav	vl. The site is designate	ed as N6 playing pit	ch in the existing UDP and
has access issues as there is ins to be considered through the gre	enspace review. Se	vide an access to curre e greenspace section, p	ent standards. Loss o page 31, question G	8.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 48	Floorspace so	q m (Non residentia	al):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	Eı	mployment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	assessed	Ne	ot assessed

Site Details

 Northing:
 432352
 Area sq m:
 14044.99
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 422869
 Area Ha:
 1.404499
 HMCA:
 Outer 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):2330.99Distance to bus stop (metres)99.30Nearest Railway StationBramleyBus Stop ID13729SFRA 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:

Cleared site set in the main urban area, previous residential use and there is a central road which runs down the site. Housing is located on all sides of the site except to the west, which is yet to be developed.

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 %
H25/316/90/	Alterations and laying out of car parking spaces to 148dwell ing houses. (this item	19/09/1990	31/12/1990	А	98.21
06/05475/DEM	Determination to demolish 60 dwellings	06/09/2006	25/09/2006	Α	86.76
13/00004/FU	Residential development of 36 dwellings and associated landscaping works	02/01/2013	11/04/2013	Α	96.12

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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

ummary of Infractructure provider of		
unimary of infrastructure provider co	omments and other planning requi	rements
eeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5)
Poor public transport links. Good primary / secondary realth services.	education accesibility. Average accessibility to	3
Access Comments		Rank (1-5
Good road frontage with adopted highway		5
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Congestion in Pudsey		3
Mitigation measure		Total scor
Traffic calming on local network, public transport impr	rovements	11
Support? Need to combine v	with other sites: Suitability for partial o	development:
Yes		
lighways Agency /a letwork Rail :		
<u> Biodiversity</u>		
Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported		
latural England:		
Education		
Orainage/Water/Flooding		
invironment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
orkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
.CC Flood Risk Management:		

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 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:			
Brownfield site with pending plan	ning application. No constraint	is that would prevent develop	ment.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 60 F	loorspace sq m (Non resid	ential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conclus	sion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not assessed		Not assessed

Site Name: Walmer Grove, Pudsey

Site Details

 Northing:
 434395
 Area sq m:
 8266.57
 Ward
 Armley

 Easting:
 424108
 Area Ha:
 0.826657
 HMCA:
 Outer 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

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):158.05Distance to bus stop (metres)176.55Nearest Railway StationBramleyBus Stop ID4383

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:

Cleared brownfield site set in employment area.

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 %
24/103/05/OT	Outline application to layout access and erect residential development	25/02/2005	26/05/2005	R	96.56
12/04846/EXT	Extension of time for Application 09/04648/EXT (to layout access and erect residential development)	15/11/2012	03/01/2013	Α	99.13
24/452/05/OT	Outline application to layout access and erect residential development	20/09/2005	07/09/2006	Α	99.77
06/06263/FU	Engineering and remediation of land in connection with redevelopment for residential purposes	19/10/2006	23/02/2007	Α	99.77
H24/484/76/	Demolition of existing buildin gs and erection of singl e storey warehouse unit, with 10 car parking spaces, to	05/07/1976	04/10/1976	Α	97.56
09/04648/EXT	Extension of time for Outline Application 06/06936/OT (To layout access and erect residential development)	28/10/2009	26/01/2010	Α	99.13
H24/177/76/	Outline application to carry o ut alteration to form shodd y-sorting building to works pr emises.	15/03/1976	12/04/1976	PD	97.56
06/06936/OT	Outline application to layout access and erect residential development. Variation of condition 21 of application 24/452/05/OT: calculation of green space contribution.	21/11/2006	12/01/2007	А	99.77

Site Ref: 613 Site Name: Elder Road/Swinnow Road LS13

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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 613 Site Name: Elder Road/Swinnow Road LS13

East Leeds

Gas:

	(6-10 y Suitability: Ye	s A	chievability: Medi	um term (6-10 years)
summary of Infrast	ructure provider c	omments and oth	er planning r	equirements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Good				5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Access achievable onto Ele	der Road			5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Ok				5
Mitigation measure				Total scor
				15
Support?	Need to combine v	with other sites:	Suitability for pa	artial development:
yes				
Highways Agency				
n/a				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	mendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Natural England: Education				
Education Drainage/Water/Floodin		Environment Acc	ncy Constraints	
Education Drainage/Water/Floodi		Environment Age	ncy Constraints:	
<u>Education</u>	nments:			ment Works Comme

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	n Assassment		
Gypsy _ Traveller Sitt	z Assessificit		
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)		
	1		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	an established employment area	surrounded by employme	nt uses and the railway line.
	permission on site. Access achiev		•
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 25 Floo	rspace sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Conclusion: Amber	Retail Conclusior Not assessed	1:	Employment Conclusion: Green
AITIDO	INOL assessed		Oreen

Site Name: Elder Road/Swinnow Road LS13

Site Details

Northing: 432778 Area sq m: 14201.27 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 426871 Area Ha: 1.420127 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant & Derelict - Vacant building
Existing Use 2: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

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:Significant Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2610.47Distance to bus stop (metres)92.77Nearest Railway StationBurley ParkBus Stop ID8063

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:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Brownfield site in urban area. Surrounded by residential dwellings.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	65.95
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 %
07/02317/FU	Change of use of school to form 24 flats and erection of 29 houses and 18 flats in 2 three storey blocks with associated car parking and laying out of access road	11/04/2007	18/01/2008	A	99.89
10/05419/EXT	Extension of Time of application 07/02317/FU for change of use of school to form 24 flats, erect 29 dwellings and 18 flats in 2 three storey blocks with associated car parking and laying out of access road	30/11/2010	16/03/2011	W	99.89
10/05462/EXT	Extension of time of application 07/02320/LI for Listed Building application to convert school to 24 flats and demolish site buildings	30/11/2010	16/03/2011	W	99.89
07/02320/LI	Listed Building application to convert school to 24 flats and demolish site buildings	11/04/2007	18/01/2008	Α	99.89
12/02704/FU	Change of use of school to form 24 flats and erection of 29 houses and 18 flats in 2 three storey blocks with associated car parking and laying out of access road	19/06/2012		APPRET	99.89

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: Ye	es Ach	ievability: Short term (0	-5yrs)
Summary of Infrastructure provider of	omments and other	r planning require	ements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Good			5
Access Comments		ı	Rank (1-5
Access via Ashley Road onto Upper Wortley Road, E	Baras Garth Road would regu	uire substantial	
improvement if it were to be considered for access to			5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Ok			5
Mitigation measure			Total sco
			15
Support? Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for partial de	velopment:
yes			
Highways Agency			
n/a			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Am	endment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agenc	y Constraints:	
`			
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Wa	ste Water Treatment We	orks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			
<u>Utilities</u>			
/unuco			

Site Ref: 638	Site Name:	Ashley Road I	LS12	
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)	INO		Iviaybe
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	INU		Iviaybe
site?				
		Т.		
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)		No	
gypsies and travellers	(10/11)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Part conversion and new build re				
sympathetic new build on remain Wortley Road, Baras Garth Road				
of the site.				
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 71	Floorspace s	q m (Non resident	ial):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	E	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not a	ssessed	N	lot assessed

Site Ref: 659 Site Name: Station St, Pudsey

Site Details

432658 Area sq m: 4613.67 Northing: Ward Pudsey 421865 Easting: Area Ha: 0.461367 HMCA: **Outer 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 - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage **V** Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1801.81 Distance to bus stop (metres) 32.97 Nearest Railway Station **New Pudsey** Bus Stop ID 11431 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 Yes 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:

Steep site, currently undeveloped. Set in urban area.

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	Nithin Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes	Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:	Yes	
	Site		Site Type		
	Carlisle Road Pudsey unimplemented		Landfill Sites		

Site Ref: 659 Site Name: Station St, Pudsey

Planning History

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
25/356/02/MIN	Outline application for residential development and site preparation through engineering & landfill works	07/11/2002	10/04/2003	R	97.61
25/37/03/MIN	Outline application for residential development and site preperation through engineering & landfill works	06/02/2003	04/08/2003	AP	99.15
25/56/01/FU	17 two bedroom dwelling houses in 5 blocks	08/03/2001	12/12/2001	W	99.15
06/04647/OT	Renewal of permission ref. 25/356/02/OT for outline residential development	28/07/2006	27/10/2006	Α	99.98
25/22/01/MIN	Tipping of inert waste to disused railway cutting	08/01/2001	11/12/2001	R	97.61
25/237/94/FU	Tipping of inert waste to disused railway cuttings and tunnel m	20/09/1994	04/07/1995	R	83.23
H25/18/81/	Laying out of access and tippi ng of waste material, to disus ed railway cutting. (site area 0.47ha) (county ma	19/01/1981	27/04/1981	R	99.15

Site Ref: 659 Site Name: Station St, Pudsey

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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 659 Site Name: Station St, Pudsey

East Leeds

Gas:

SHLAA Conclusions	
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: Yes Achievability: Sh	ort term (0-5yrs)
Summary of Infrastructure provider comments and other planning	requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	
Accessibility comment Good	Rank (1-5)
Good	5
Access Comments	Rank (1-5)
Access achievable onto Station Street.	5
Local network comment	Rank (1-5)
Ok	5
Mitigation measure	Total scor
	15
Support? Need to combine with 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:	
<u>Education</u>	
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>	
Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints:	:
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatments	atment 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	Assessr	ment			
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe	
managed	(Text)	1		1	
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe	
travellers live on the site?	(Text)				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		1		
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown	
encampments	(Text)				
Conclusion of Asses	sment				
Conclusion summary:					
Site has previously had permission	on for residentia	al development but this ha	s since lapsed. The	steep banked drop from the	
road (a dismantled railway site) is	a constraint or	n the site, but due to previ			
acceptable in principle. Access a	chievable onto	Station Street.			
Site Capacity (dwellings units): 20 Floorspace sq m (Non residential):					
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:	
Green		Not assessed		Not assessed	

Site Name: Station St, Pudsey

Site Ref: 1053A Site Name: Northern part of site Pollard Lane Newlay

Site Details

436454 15107.03 Northing: Area sq m: Ward ramley and Stanningley 423808 Easting: Area Ha: 1.510703 HMCA: **Outer 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 - Waterways

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): 2042.07 Distance to bus stop (metres) 606.67 Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 2601

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: No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Vacant land with no obvious use. Set between the river and canal the site slopes upwards towards the east. Some trees on site and overgrown foliage. To the north the site connects to a newly developed housing estate, but there is no road in place to join the site.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	100.00
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 No Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Site Ref: 1053A Site Name: Northern part of site Pollard Lane Newlay

LS13

Planning History

Site Ref: 1053A Site Name: Northern part of site Pollard Lane Newlay

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	\checkmark				
Would development result in isolated development	\checkmark				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	ea)?				
Would development of the site effectively "rour	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					
	connection of settlements?				
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 en	croachment				
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban are	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?					
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?				
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultura	l 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 feature?	area, listed building or other histori	ical			
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:					
Reasonably well contained by river and canal the north.	reducing potential for sprawl. Links	to residential development to			
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				
·	ated 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: 1053A Site Name: Northern part of site Pollard Lane Newlay

East Leeds

Gas:

Avoilabilit ::	Cuitobilis			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
ummary of Infra	structure provider cor	mments and o	ther planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council H	lighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-
Poor accessbility all rour	d			1
Access Comments			I	Rank (1-5
Poor access along Polla	rd Lane			2
Local network comme	nt		ı	Rank (1-5
Cumulative impact on rin	ng road and kirkstall			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Public transport and roa	d improvements required but un	likely to be achievab	le	7
Support?	Need to combine wit	h other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
No			Possible as part of old already part developed	industrial site
Highways Agency				
No objection				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology	y and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	y Amendment	
Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Floo	ding			
Environment Agency C	omments:	Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comm	ents:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ement:			
<u>Jtilities</u>				

	L	S13	
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)		
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 section adjoud be dependent on the neigh further sprawl.	oins existing residential de abouring site. Site is bour	evelopment and has the po nded by the river and cana	otential to be linked to this. Access II, so reducing the potential for future
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 40	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Co	onclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Red		Red

Site Name: Northern part of site Pollard Lane Newlay

Site Ref: 1053A

Site Details

Northing: 436302 Area sq m: 10765.89 Ward ramley and Stanningley
Easting: 423772 Area Ha: 1.076589 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Transport - Waterways

Neighbouring Use 2: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Neighbouring Use 3: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage□Distance to Rail Station (metres):1893.64Distance to bus stop (metres)497.41Nearest Railway StationBramleyBus Stop ID10279

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:

Vacant land. Set between the river and canal the site slopes upwards towards the east. Some trees on site and overgrown foliage. To the north the site connects to a newly developed housing estate, but there is no road in place to join the site.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	100.00
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 bu	ilt up areas	
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon	development?	✓
Would development result in isolated develop	pment?	\checkmark
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:		
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl		
Prevent neighbouring towns from mergin	g	
Would development of the site lead to physic	cal connection of settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?	existing barrier/boundary to contain	✓
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:		
No merging of settlements		
Assist in safeguarding countryside from e	encroachment	
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	en the site and the existing urban area?	✓
Does the site provide access to the countrys	ide?	✓
Does the site include local or national conse	rvation 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	ultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>on</u>	
The site performs an important role safeguar	rding countryside from encroachment	
Preserve the setting and special characte	r of historic towns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	on area, listed building or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve this char-	acter?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Development of the site would have no effect	et on the setting and special character of his	toric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Reasonably well contained site by river and development.	canal. Relates poorly to settlement, isolated	from residential
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 unr	elated to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:		
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatev	/av: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclus				
Availability:	Suitability:	,	Achievability:	
ummary of Infra	structure provider co	mments and ot	her planning requi	irements
	Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility commen			1	Rank (1-5
Poor accessbility all rou	nd			1
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Poor access along Poll	ard Lane			2
Local network comme	ent		l	Rank (1-5
Cumulative impact on r	ing road and kirkstall			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Public transport and roa	ad improvements required but u	nlikely to be achievable	9	7
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
No			Possible as part of old already part developed	
Highways Agency				
No objection				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecolog	gy and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floo	oding			
Environment Agency (Comments:	Environment Ag	ency Constraints:	
Wandankina VIII ()		Variation was	Wests Wats T	Warder C
Yorkshire Water Comm	nents:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment	vvorks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manaç	gement:			
<u>Jtilities</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 travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe	_
site?	(10/11)			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Fdanaa ofdana	V	NI-	Titleten soon	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown	_
on campinonic	,			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				_
	ern section of site 105	53 and slones steenly maki	ng development difficult. It is removed	1
			poorly to the existing settlement pattern	
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 34	Floorspace sq m (N	Non residential):	0
Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclu		Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion	า :
Red	Red		Red	

Site Name: Southern part of Pollard Lane Newlay LS13

Site Ref: 1053B

Site Details

 Northing:
 433293
 Area sq m:
 26582.05
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 423465
 Area Ha:
 2.658205
 HMCA:
 Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

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

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:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1224.55Distance to bus stop (metres)102.77Nearest Railway StationBramleyBus Stop ID3430

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 currently has agricultural use, consisting of two fields and some grassland. There is a nursey on the site in the north east corner, the northern boundary also has a 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:	
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	
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:	
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?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	
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 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 his	toric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Strong links to built up area. Low potential for further sprawl. Performs well in green beli	t terms.
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

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:	A alata da 1900	
wanabinty.	Suitability.	Achievability:	
ummary of Infrast	ructure provider co	mments and other planning requir	ements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Poor Public Transport, Goo	d health and primary, poor s	secondary	3
Access Comments			Rank (1-
		e extension of footway across site frontage ect existing walls and trees.	5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Local congestion on Ring F	Road, excessive speeds on	Hough Side Road	3
Mitigation measure			Total sco
	ents, footway improvements ffic calming on Hough Side F	on Hough Side Road, poss capacity works on Road	11
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites: Suitability for partial d	evelopment:
Yes with mitigation	No		
Lighways Agency			
No objection			
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Natural England:			
Education			
Drainage/Water/Floodi	<u>ng</u>		
Environment Agency Com	nments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
			/
Yorkshire Water Commen	ts:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment W	orks Comme
orkshire Water Commen		Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment W	VORKS COMME

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)		, , , , , ,
			T
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?	(Text)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	,	
	.,		1
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
encampments	(TOAL)		
	•		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	and frontage and rela	ates well to the existing built u	ip area. It is bounded by a steep gulley
to the west and rising land to the	south, reducing the p		o Green Belt. Poor accessibility, would
be better to combine with 3377A	for access.		
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	70	Floorspace sq m (N	lon residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Houghside Pudsey, LS28

Site Ref: 1060A

Site Details

 Northing:
 433224
 Area sq m:
 9512.91
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 423331
 Area Ha:
 0.951291
 HMCA:
 Outer 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): 1344.24 Distance to bus stop (metres) 148.89

Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 6956

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 slopes steeply, currently grassland. It abuts resdiential development to the east and further open land on all other sides. No road frontage available.

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

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: 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?		
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 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	achment
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	eter?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Development of the site would have no effect of	on the setting and special character of his	toric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Steep site, unsuitable for development. Not we	ell connected to built up area.	
Conformity with Core Strateg	3У	
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:	100.00 West Leeds Gatew	<i>y</i> ay: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider co	mments and other planning req	uirements
Leeds City Council Highy	vays inc Metro		Rank (1-5
Accessibility comment Poor Public Transport, Good h	nealth and primary, poor s	econdary	
•	, , ,	·	3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
No highway frontage - requires acess via site A			3
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Local congestion on Ring Roa	ad, excessive speeds on H	Hough Side Road	3
Mitigation measure			Total scor
Public transport improvement works on local highway, possi	s, footway improvements ible traffic calming on Hou	on Hough Side Road, possible capacity igh Side Road	9
Support?	Need to combine wi	th other sites: Suitability for partia	al development:
Yes with mitigation	Yes		
Highways Agency			
No objection			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Natural England:			
Natural England:			
Education			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comme		Environment Agency Constraints:	
Vaukahira Water Occurrent		Verkehire Weter Wests Wests Tourist	ot Works Committee
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatmen	it Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:		
<u>Utilities</u>			

Electric:						
Telecom:						
Fire and Rescue Services:						
Built Heritage						
Leeds City Council:						
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:					
English Heritage:						
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessme	nt				
Could site be effectively	Yes		No		Maybe	=
managed	(Text)					
Would gypsies and	Yes		No		Maybe	_
travellers live on the	(Text)				1	
site?						
Proximity to housed	Yes			No		_
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			1		_
Experience of previous	Yes		No		Unknown	
encampments	(Text)		110		Cilidiowii	_
Conclusion of Asses	sment					
2						
Conclusion summary: Green Belt site. Steep gulley wit	hin wider valley no	road frontage				
Creen Ben site. Gloop gailey Wit	min wider valley, he	rodd fromage.				
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 30	Floors	spaces	sq m (Non reside	ntial):	(
Residential Conclusion:	Ret	ail Conclusion:			Employment Conclusion:	
Red	Not	assessed			Not assessed	

Site Name: Houghside Pudsey, LS28

Site Ref: 1060B

Site Details

Northing: 433779 Area sq m: 29182.19 Ward Calverley and Farsley Easting: 420942 Area Ha: 2.918219 HMCA: Outer 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: Utilities & Infrastructure - Water Storage and Treatment

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):560.25Distance to bus stop (metres)146.00Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID11611SFRA 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 (%):	97.23
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 %
11/02798/DAG	Agricultural Determination application for replacement storage building	30/06/2011	28/07/2011	ANR	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: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusio	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:	А	schievability:	
Summary of Infras	tructure provider co	omments and oth	ner planning requ	iirements
Leeds City Council Hi	ghways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			1	Rank (1-5
Good accessibility all roun	a			5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Adequate frontages with t	he adopted highway			5
Local network comment	t		·	Rank (1-5
Local capacity, congestion	n in pudsey			4
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Access improvements ma	y be required			14
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
Yes				·
Highways Agency				
No objection				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flood	ing			
Environment Agency Cor	mments:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	nts:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manager	nent:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Site Ref: 1073A	Site Name:	Owlcotes Farm, Pudsey	
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)	110	
Everyiones of provious	Vac	No	Links over
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
•			
0			_
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
The site has been split. Site A is boundary falls away steeply toward	flat, with road acces	s. Part of the site is to the rear of existin	g properties. The northern
boundary fails away steeply towa	ilus wooded alea.		
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 88	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ntial): 0
Residential Conclusion:		l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber Amber		ssessed	Not assessed
		•	

Site Details

Northing: 433911 Area sq m: 15563.44 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 420954 Area Ha: 1.556344 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Nearest Railway Station

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 433.40 Distance to bus stop (metres) 275.18

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

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

New Pudsey

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

11611

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	100.00
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 %
11/02798/DAG	Agricultural Determination application for replacement storage building	30/06/2011	28/07/2011	ANR	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: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provider comments	and other planning r	equirements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Good accessibility all round			5
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Needs 1073A land for access			3
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Local capacity, congestion in p	udsey		4
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Access improvements may be	required		
The second map and map are			12
Support?	Need to combine with other site	s: Suitability for pa	artial development:
Only suitable if if linked with 1117A	Two parts of site may need to be I	inked Yes	
Highways Agency			
No objection			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and I	LCC Ecology Officer:	Soundary Amendment	
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comme	nts: Enviror	nment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorksh	ire Water Waste Water Treati	ment 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:				
5				
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)	110		Mayoo
site?				
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	N	0	
gypsies and travellers	(TOXI)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Site B is more isolated and part is	s steeply sloping. Highways	concerns re acce	ess.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 56 I	Floorspace sq n	n (Non residentia	al):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conclu	ision:	c .	nployment Conclusion:
Red Residential Conclusion.	Red Red	isivii.		ed
	1100		100	

Site Name: Owlcotes Farm, Pudsey

Site Ref: 1073B

Site Ref: 1085 Site Name: Land on the North Side of Coal Hill Lane, Rodley

Site Details

Northing: 435642 Area sq m: 45923.41 Ward ramley and Stanningley
Easting: 422449 Area Ha: 4.592341 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

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

Existing Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Neighbouring Use 3: Community Services - Education

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): 1875.09 Distance to bus stop (metres) 138.73

Nearest Railway Station New Pudsey Bus Stop ID 12021

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 AreasYesAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Currently used as amenity space. Set in urban area, school to the east.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	99.77
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:	52.8	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

Site Ref: 1085 Site Name: Land on the North Side of Coal Hill Lane, Rodley

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
12/04273/FU	2 single storey extensions and recladding of first floor front elevation	08/10/2012	14/12/2012	Α	33.82
H25/385/85/	Laying out of footpaths, playi ng field and public open space with 45 car parking spaces to vacant site. (this item	23/12/1985	17/02/1986	Α	15.86
24/199/98/FU	12m high floodlights to playing pitch and training area	19/06/1998	01/02/1999	А	17.86
H24/724/78/	Detached precast concrete gara ge to school.	11/10/1978	18/12/1978	Α	33.86

Site Ref: 1085 Site Name: Land on the North Side of Coal Hill Lane,Rodley

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	an 🗌
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:	
Overdit Ordinates (17000) Valion Considered.	
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: 1085 Site Name: Land on the North Side of Coal Hill Lane, Rodley

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determ	nine	Achievability:	Medium te	rm (6-10 years)
ummary	of Infrastruct	ture provide	er comment	ts and ot	her plann	ing requ	irements
Leeds City	y Council Highwa	ys inc Metro					
Accessibili	ty comment					į.	Rank (1-5)
Good acces	sibility except poor h	ealth accessibilit	у				4
Access Co	mments						Rank (1-5)
	ection to adopted high d on crossroads	nway - too narrov	v land width, on	bend in Coal	Hill Lane so r	10	1
Local netw	ork comment						Rank (1-5)
Cumulative	impact onto ring roa	d					4
Mitigation	measure						Total scor
Need to pro	ovide access onto Co	al Hill Drive					9
Support?		Nood to comb	oine with other s	niton	Suitabilit	v for portiol	development:
No		Need to comb	ine with other s	sites.	Juitabilit	y ioi partiai	development.
L Highways	Agency						
n/a	<u> </u>						
Network R	tail :						
<u>Biodiversi</u>	<u>ty</u>						
West Yorks	hire Ecology and L	CC Ecology Offi	cer:	Boundary	Amendment		
Unknown Im	pact. Grassland hab	itat needs a bota	nical survey.	Site assess	sment needed	l ???	
Natural Eng	ıland:						
Education	L						
Drainage/\	Water/Flooding						
Environme	nt Agency Commen	ts:	Envi	ironment Ag	ency Constra	aints:	
Yorkshire V	Vater Comments:		York	shire Water	Waste Wate	r Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood	Risk Management:						
Jtilities							

Site Ref: 1085	Site Name:	Land on the North Side of Lane,Rodley	Coal Hill
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Duilt Haritana			
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)	1 - 2	1 27 2
Wastld marks and	V	I NI.	NA - da -
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)	1110	OTIMIOWIT
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
		- Urban Green Corridor and the eastern	
		rts pitches associated with neighbouring greenspace review. See greenspace se	
		not achievable, Highways don't support.	71 3 7 1
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 138	Floorspace sq m (Non residen	tial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	Il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Ref: 1110 Site Name: Land at Rodley, Leeds LS13

Site Details

436222 15560.65 Northing: Area sq m: Calverley and Farsley Ward 421821 Easting: Area Ha: 1.556065 HMCA: **Outer West**

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture Existing Use 2: Other

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses: Nursery Site State: Mixed

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2036.67 Distance to bus stop (metres) 340.77 Nearest Railway Station **New Pudsey** Bus Stop ID 2493 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:

Northern part of the site used for agriculture, southern section has an employment use. Main road runs along the western boundary, which also has a line of trees in place. To the north is residential development, whilst to the south and east are further fields.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	98.40	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 No Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Site Ref: 1110 Site Name: Land at Rodley, Leeds LS13

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
12/03123/FU	Detached house	17/07/2012	25/09/2012	R	54.41
25/47/05/FU	Change of use of nurseries to landscape gardeners	07/02/2005	04/04/2005	R	98.32
07/01548/FU	Alter and widen vehicle entrance to nursery	07/03/2007	30/04/2007	R	58.07
H25/399/75/	Outline application to erect r esidential development, to va cant site. (site area 1.6ha (4 .0 acres).	16/06/1975	29/09/1975	R	96.38
H25/462/74/	Use of land for stationing of residential caravan, to nurse ry premises.	07/11/1974	11/08/1975	Α	96.33

Site Ref: 1110 Site Name: Land at Rodley, Leeds LS13

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: 1110 Site Name: Land at Rodley, Leeds LS13

East Leeds

Utilities

HLAA Conclusion	ns			
Availability: Short term (0-	5yrs) Suitability: LDF	to determine	Achievability: I	Medium term (6-10 years)
ummary of Infrast	ructure provider co	mments and o	other plannin	g requirements
_eeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Average accessbility all rou	nd			3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Frontage with ring road no	suitable for development			2
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Capacity issues on ring roa	ad			3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
	vements, link with other sites close off connection to site			ways 8
Support?	Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for page 1			or partial development:
No	Need to combine with	h 1114 and 2121	Possible	
Highways Agency				
n/a				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Bounda	ry Amendment	
corridor of the beck and ass	o protect and enhance the wisociated woodland along the corridor of minimum 20 met	:		
Natural England:	Consider			
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floodi	ng			
Environment Agency Com	iments:	Environment A	Agency Constrain	ts:
Yorkshire Water Commen	ts:	Yorkshire Wat	er Waste Water T	reatment Works Comme
CC Flood Risk Managem	ent:	1 [

Site Ref: 1110	Site Name: Land	d at Rodley , Leeds L	S13
Gas: Electric: Telecom: Fire and Rescue Services: Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:			
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		
Conclusion summary:			
Site designated as PAS (Protector area and should be considered a and are relatively close to Farsle clear and well defined and this all purposes. The Inspector was clear	longside 1114 & 2121, both a y town centre the UDP Reviev rea forms part of a an importa	also PAS sites. Whilst the sites w Inspector commented that th int tract of open land and could	s have links to the settlement e urban edge of Farsley is contribute to Green Belt
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 47	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conclu	usion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not assessed		Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 435988 Area sq m: 179603.54 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 421888 Area Ha: 17.960354 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Utilities & Infrastructure - Post and Telecom

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage **~** Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1843.89 Distance to bus stop (metres) 366.48 Nearest Railway Station **New Pudsey** Bus Stop ID 5717 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: No Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large site with an agricultural use, there are no bulidings in place but a line of pylons cross the site. The boundaries are well defined with existing resdiential development to the north and south. The site also has road frontage on three sides. There is limited tree cover on the site, mostly around the borders and along the boundaries of fields.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	98.51	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 %
12/04046/OT	Outline application for residential development	21/09/2012	PCO	98.44

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? 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: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: LE	DF to determine Achievability: Medium tel	m (6-10 years)		
ummary of Infrastructure provider of	comments and other planning requi	rements		
annually or initiation actions provided to	John State Carlo Pigning (94)			
eeds City Council Highways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5		
Average public transport. Poor health services access accessibility.	sibility. Good primary / secondary schoold	3		
Access Comments	·	Rank (1-5		
Adequate frontage with adopted highway, possible c footway required on Bagley Lane	connections with Petrie Street and Tower Drive,	4		
Local network comment		Rank (1-5		
Capacity issues on ring road		3		
Mitigation measure		Total scor		
Public transport bus improvements, link with other sit and ring road connections	tes, footway works, improvements to highways	10		
Support? Need to combine	with other sites: Suitability for partial	development:		
Yes but only with public transport improvements, link with other sites, and highway	Need to combine with 1110 and 2121 Possible			
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u> Biodiversity</u>				
Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	: Boundary Amendment			
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance wild corridor function across the site - hedgerow of particu mportance. Bats to consider.				
Natural England:				
Education				
<u> Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>				
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:			
Forkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme		
CC Flood Risk Management:				

Site Ref: 1114	Site Name:	Land at Kirklee	s Knowl, Bag	ley Lane, Bagley
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	N	lo	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Site designated as PAS (Protecte area and should be considered a	ed Area of Search) or	n the existing UDP, not w	vithin the Green Be	It. This is part of a larger
settlement and are relatively clos Farsley is clear and well defined	e to Farsley town cer	ntre the UDP Review Ins	pector commented	that the urban edge of
Belt purposes. The Inspector wa				
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	472	Floorspace sq	m (Non residentia	I):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Em	ployment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	ssessed	No	t assessed

Site Ref: 1117 Site Name: Land East and West of Calverley

Site Details

437202 73961.47 Northing: Area sq m: Calverley and Farsley Ward 420042 Easting: Area Ha: 7.396147 HMCA: **Outer West**

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

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

Neighbouring Use 3:

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): 3096.02 Distance to bus stop (metres) 115.49 Nearest Railway Station **New Pudsey** Bus Stop ID 1274 SFRA Flood Zone: 0.00

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas Yes 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:

Current agricultural use, consisting of open fields, no buildings are located on site. The site is in two sections, split along the middle by a public footpath which is well treed on either side. Broadly well contained by the main road to the south and woodland to the north. Some trees along the field borders.

UDP Designation

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

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?: No Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?: No Site Ref: 1117 Site Name: Land East and West of Calverley

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H25/85/86/	Use of agricultural land as pl aying field.	25/03/1986	17/11/1986	Α	32.53

Site Ref: 1117 Site Name: Land East and West of Calverley

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 performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns **~** Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature? If yes, could development preserve this character?: Overall Character Preservation Conclusion: Development of the site would have marginal effect on the setting & special character of historic features, which c **Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:** In conservation area, would have some effect on character of the area. Site is fairly well contained with low potential for sprawl. Well used footpath provides access to countryside beyond further development. 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: 1117 Site Name: Land East and West of Calverley

East Leeds

Utilities

HLAA Conclusions					
vailability: Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability: L	_DF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (1	1+ years)
ummary of Infrastruct	ure provider	comments an	d other plann	ing require	ements
eeds City Council Highway	s inc Metro				
Accessibility comment Good accessbility all round					Rank (1-5
sood accessbility all found					5
Access Comments					Rank (1-5
Suitable frontage onto Carr Roac part of site due to ransom strip	I for part of site but	t requires works, no	access available for	other	3
Local network comment					Rank (1-5
Cumulative impact into Bradford,	congestion on Ro	dley roundabout			3
					3
Mitigation measure					Total sco
Link through, access works onto	Carr Road, footwa	y improvements on 0	Carr Road, by-way i	mproved	11
Support?	Need to combine	e with other sites:	Suitability	y for partial de	velopment:
Partial, due to part of land accessed through ransom strip not in council control		may need to be linke to be owned by cou			
lighways Agency					
/a					
letwork Rail :					
Biodiversity					
Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LC	C Ecology Office	r: Bou	ndary Amendment		
Supported with mitigation to prote orridor function across the site - nk with adjacent Calverley Wood onsider.	extending woodlan	nd cover to			
latural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
Orainago/Water/Eleoding					
Orainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comment	s:	Environme	ent Agency Constra	nints:	
orkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire '	Water Waste Water	Treatment Wo	orks Comme

Site Ref: 1117	Site Name:	Land East and West of Cal	verley
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)	1110	- Cimaiomi
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:		tiel development to the great control	- A A
section would be required throug	h the existing well tre	ntial development to the north and woodla eed public footpath that splits the site. The	ere is also a line of protected
trees running through the centre impact on the trees and footpath.		te is within a conservation area. Developr	ment would significantly
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	. 0	Floorspace sq m (Non resident	ial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Red	F	Red

Site Name: Site Ref: 1123A Northern side Land off Foxhole Lane, Calverley

Site Details

436431 45290.06 Northing: Area sq m: Ward Calverley and Farsley 420586 Easting: Area Ha: 4.529006 HMCA: **Outer 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 Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2195.21 Distance to bus stop (metres) 121.94 Nearest Railway Station **New Pudsey** Bus Stop ID 4781 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 Yes 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: Yes

Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

0.00

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Agricultural use, there are no buildings on site. Bordered by residential development to the north, the site has a road frontage along the western boundary and a narrow access in the north east corner (currently a footpath that runs along the eastern boundary of the site). A few trees line the field boundaries but the site is reasonably clear.

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 Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?: No 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 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	•	Partial
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?	cisting barrier/boundary 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 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		
The site performs an important role safeguardi	ng countryside from encroachment	
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	eter?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Development of the site would have no effect of	on the setting and special character of his	toric features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Natural tree lined boundary along the eastern rounding off' to settlement.	side contains the site, but potential for sp	rawl to south. Partial
Conformity with Core Strateg	W.	_
Comorning with Core Ctrates	37	
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:	0.00 Airo Vallou	0.00
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatew	<i>y</i> ay: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
ummary of Infras	structure provider co	omments and ot	her planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council H	lighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-
Poor public transport, god	od health and primary / secor	ndary school accessibili	ty.	2
Access Comments			'	Rank (1-
Adequate frontage with Foxhole Lane	Woodhall Road but requires s	peed limit reductions, p	ossible access onto	4
Local network commer	nt		·	Rank (1-
Local congestion on A64	17, Rodley Lane and Ring Roa	ad		2
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Public transport bus imp	rovements, footway on Woodh	nall Road, speed limit re	eductions,	8
improvements in local ca	apacity			0
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
No			Yes	
Highways Agency				
No objection				
Network Rail :				
Diadiramitr.				
<u>Biodiversity</u> West Yorkshire Ecology	y and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
west forkshire Ecology	and Loo Leology Officer.		Amendment	
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
	dina			
<u> Drainage/Water/Floo</u>			ency Constraints:	
Drainage/Water/Flood Environment Agency Co		Environment Ag		
		Environment Ag	one, constraints	
	omments:		· Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
Environment Agency Co	omments:			Works Comme
Environment Agency Co	ents:			Works Commo

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
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 site?	(Text)			
Site:				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		INO	
gypoloo ana navolloro	,			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			•
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Canalusian summanu				
Cross Bolt site. The site has been	n onlit into A and D. Ci	ita A haa a matural t	ree lined bounders als	and the contorn side which
Green Belt site. The site has bee contains the site and developmen	nt of site A only would e			
of site 1123B to achieve visibility	at access point.	-		
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 102	Floorspace	sq m (Non residentia	ı l): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail (Conclusion:	En	nployment Conclusion:
Amber	Red		Re	ed

Site Name: Northern side Land off Foxhole Lane,

Calverley

Site Ref: 1123A

Site Details

Northing: 436333 Area sq m: 66166.12 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 420682 Area Ha: 6.616612 HMCA: Outer 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):2077.95Distance to bus stop (metres)258.18Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID4781SFRA 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:YesConservation AreasYesAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Agricultural use, there are no buildings on site. This section of site 1123 is set away from the settlement to the north, the site has a road frontage along the western boundary and a footpath that runs along the eastern boundary of the site. A few trees line the field boundaries but the site is reasonably clear. Further fields are set to the south and east.

UDP Designation

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

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

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?

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+ be	oundaries with existing built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "roun	d off" the settlement pattern?:	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good exitarea and undeveloped land?	sting barrier between existing urban	\checkmark	
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 contain		
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:			
No merging but there is no defensible boundary	y		
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?		
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion			
The site performs an important role safeguarding	ng countryside from encroachment		
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:			
Development of the site would have no effect of	n the setting and special character of his	storic features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Separated from settlement. High potential for fu	urther sprawl. Would impact on openness	s of countryside.	
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		
·	ated to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:		_	
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	_	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	0.00 West Leeds Gatev	vay: 0	00.0

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:	Ashiovakiliku	
	Guitability.	Achievability:	
ummary of Infras	tructure provider co	omments and other planning requ	uirements
Leeds City Council Hi	ighways inc Metro		Ponk /1 F
Accessibility comment Poor public transport, goo	od health and primary / secor	ndary school accessibility	Rank (1-5
. co. pazno nanopon, god	a nouni and pinnally?	,	2
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Adequate frontage with V Foxhole Lane	Voodhall Road but requires s	peed limit reductions, possible access onto	4
Local network commen	t		Rank (1-5
Local congestion on A64	7, Rodley Lane and Ring Roa	ad	2
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Public transport bus imprimprovements in local ca		hall Road, speed limit reductions,	8
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites: Suitability for partia	I development:
No		Yes	
Highways Agency			
No objection			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
West Yorkshire Ecology Natural England:	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Natural England:	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Natural England:	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Natural England: Education		Boundary Amendment	
Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flood	ling		
Natural England: Education	ling	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flood	ling		
Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flood	<u>ling</u> mments:		t Works Comme
Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flood Environment Agency Co	<u>ling</u> mments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	t Works Comme
Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flood Environment Agency Co	ling omments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	t Works Comme

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 travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	<u> </u>	Maybe
site?	(TOAL)			
Proximity to housed	Yes	N	lo	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	<u>'</u>		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	l	Jnknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Ocholasion of Asses	Silicit			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. The site has be				
form and set a precedent for furth Lane frontage needed for develop			a significant extension	n to Calverley. Foxnole
Site Capacity (dwellings units):		149 Floorspace sq	m (Non residential):	0
	ı		,	
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion:	_	loyment Conclusion:
Red		Red	Red	

Site Name: Southern Land off Foxhole Lane, Calverley

Site Ref: 1123B

Site Ref: 1124 Site Name: Land off Upper Carr Lane, Calverley

Site Details

436603 9261.40 Northing: Area sq m: Ward Calverley and Farsley 420232 Easting: Area Ha: 0.92614 HMCA: **Outer 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): 2468.62 Distance to bus stop (metres) 266.30 Nearest Railway Station **New Pudsey** Bus Stop ID 3108 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

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Greenfield site in agricultural use, no buildings present. The site slopes gently upwards towards the rear (south). It is set between a recently converted residential building to the west and dwellings / employment site to the east. Road frontage runs along the northern boundary of the site. Site consists of a field with a few sporadic trees.

No

UDP Designation

Public Rights of Way:

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 Site Ref: 1124 Site Name: Land off Upper Carr Lane, Calverley

Site Ref: 1124 Site Name: Land off Upper Carr Lane, Calverley

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development? Would development result in isolated development? **~** Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)? Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Yes Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land? Overall sprawl conclusion: Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl Prevent neighbouring towns from merging Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements? Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain 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:** Well contained site with strong links to the settlement, low potential for 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

Site Ref: 1124 Site Name: Land off Upper Carr Lane, Calverley

East Leeds

Gas:

SHLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provide	r comments and ot	her planni	ng requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Poor public transport accessibility. Good school &	health services accessiblit	ty.	2
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Good frontage onto adopted highway			5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Local capacity, cumulative impact onto ring road a	and A647		4
Mitigation measure			Total sco
			11
Support? Need to combi	ne with other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
No due to poor public		Yes	
transport			
Highways Agency			
n/a			
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 Aç	gency Constrai	nts:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water	r Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Biok Monogoment			
LCC Flood Risk Management:			
<u>Utilities</u>			

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:	00111001		
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)		
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:			
	ff the settlement. As the b	oundary does not project	ecently converted flat conversion, t beyond the existing urban area its t access can be achieved.
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 18	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Con	clusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Red		Red

Site Name: Land off Upper Carr Lane, Calverley

Site Ref: 1124

Site Details

Northing: 434328 Area sq m: 35012.67 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 422256 Area Ha: 3.501267 HMCA: Outer 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

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):1122.37Distance to bus stop (metres)164.75Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID3325

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:

Existing employment site.

UDP Designation

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H25/3/92/	Use of vacant site as waste tr ansfer station.	10/01/1992	28/07/1992	R	14.38
H25/301/88/	Detached prefabricated office unit and cement silo, with open storage to storage yard.	09/08/1988	08/09/1988	Α	11.59
H25/22/84/	Detached single storey vehicle maintenance building to ti mber suppliers.	01/02/1984	28/02/1984	W	16.49
H25/10/88/	Alterations to form toilets to existing office and two detac hed prefabricated office units, to warehouse.	07/01/1988	07/03/1988	Α	10.34
H25/349/86/	Change of use, involving layin g out of drainage of wareh ouse to industrial unit.	04/11/1986	22/04/1987	W	20.33
H25/353/87/	Change of use of warehouse and store to roofing craft train ing workshop.	25/11/1987	25/01/1988	Α	10.39

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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Medium term (6-10 y Suitability: Yes	;	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider co	omments and ot	her plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Good accessibility all round			5
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Access onto adopted highway but suitable visibility spl	ays requires third party	/ land	2
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Local Congestion on Outer Ring Road and Pudsey			3
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Access requires third party land take			10
			10
Support? Need to combine w	rith other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
No			
Highways Agency			
n/a			
Network Rail: General asset protection issues			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	/ Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
<u> Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Ag	gency Constra	ints:
Forkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water	r Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			
J tilities			

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessi	ment		
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:				
Site in existing employment use, access would require third party I				s preferable. Visibility at
Site Capacity (dwellings units):		105 Floorspace	sq m (Non residenti	al):
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion:	E	mployment Conclusion:
Red		Not assessed	G	Green

Site Name: Land off Town Street, Stanningley, LS28

Site Ref: 1150

Site Details

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

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover 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:

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 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 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 settlement	. ,	No			
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between	-				
area and undeveloped land?	3				
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 settl	ements?	✓			
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/bound development?	dary to contain				
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:					
Coalescence/merging settlements					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment					
Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the ex	isting urban area?	✓			
Does the site provide access to the countryside?					
Does the site include local or national conservation designated ar	eas?				
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that a significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	are protected, or				
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?		✓			
Does the site contain buildings?	se in agricultural use?				
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion					
The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from	n 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 fill the Green Belt gap between Falcoalescence of the settlements. Release of the site would create					
Conformity with Core Strategy					
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area B	Extension	Brownfield			
Major Settlement Major Settlement B	Extension	Greenfield]		
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlemen	t Extension	Mixed			
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Exter	nsion	_			
Development unrelated to existing dev	elopment				
Regeneration Priority Area:					
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley:		0.00		
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway	y:	0.00		

East Leeds

Utilities Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provider co	omments and other planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
Good accessibility for employm accessibility for secondary and		approximately 50% of site with adequate	4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Good frontage with Whitehall Foother 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 Roa	id and M621		3
			3
Mitigation measure			Total score
Signalisation of access junction	n and Ring Road signal	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 mitigation	on		
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
Natural England.			
Education			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comme	nts:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
<u> </u>			
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	: Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management	:		

	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,

Site Ref: 1171A Site Name: Harpers Farm, South of Whitehall Road, Located to the South of employment area

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:	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> 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:
 432524
 Area sq m:
 22511.63
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 423144
 Area Ha:
 2.251163
 HMCA:
 Outer 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: Industry and business - Storage

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): 2057.42 Distance to bus stop (metres) 145.68 Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 12512 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

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site is set to the east of the settlement. Mainly in agricultural use, fields slope steeply downwards towards the south. There are two storage sheds in the north west corner, access to the site is also from here although the boundary of the site doesn't reach to the road frontage. There is a row of trees running along the northern boundary and a few sporadic trees along the field borders.

No

UDP Designation

Public Rights of Way:

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0.01	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
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 %
H25/695/75/	Outline application to erect o ne pair of semi-detached bunga lows, to part of agricultural holding.	29/10/1975	01/12/1975	Α	42.32
H25/214/83/	Tipping of rubble and excavati on materials, to small holdi ng and agricultural site. (cou nty matter)	14/09/1983	06/12/1983	Α	16.16

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development? Would development result in isolated development? **~** Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)? Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land? Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl Prevent neighbouring towns from merging Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements? Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development? Overall Coalescence Conclusion: No merging but there is no defensible boundary Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area? **~** Does the site provide access to the countryside? Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas? Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover? **~** Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land? Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use? Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from encroachment Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature? If yes, could development preserve this character?: Overall Character Preservation Conclusion: Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features **Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:** Set to east of main urban area, no defensible boundary that could 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

100.00

Aire Valley:

West Leeds Gateway:

Inner South Leeds:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

0.00

0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

Poor public transport. Good health and primary school accessibility, average secondary school accessibility. Access Comments Existing access onto Kent Road but maybe through third party land (i.e. ransom strip) Local network comment Congestion in Pudsey Mitigation measure Total Public transport bus improvements, access and footway improvements on Kent Road, possible local traffic claiming Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial developments No 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	Availability: Short te	rm (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to deterr	mine ,	Achievability: Long to	erm (11+ years)
Access ibility comment Poor public transport. Good health and primary school accessibility, average secondary school accessibility. Access Comments Existing access onto Kent Road but maybe through third party land (i.e. ransom strip) Local network comment Congestion in Pudsey Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, access and footway improvements on Kent Road, possible local traffic claiming Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial developments No Highways Agency 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 Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Summary of Inf	rastructu	re provide	r commen	ts and otl	her planning re	quirements
Poor public transport. Good health and primary school accessibility, average secondary school accessibility. Access Comments Existing access onto Kent Road but maybe through third party land (i.e. ransom strip) Local network comment Congestion in Pudsey Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, access and footway improvements on Kent Road, possible local traffic claiming Support? No Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development No Highways Agency News Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Leeds City Counc	il Highway	s inc Metro				
Access Comments Existing access onto Kent Road but maybe through third party land (i.e. ransom strip) Local network comment Rank Congestion in Pudsey Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, access and footway improvements on Kent Road, possible local traffic claming Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development in the party land (i.e. ransom strip) Access Comment Road, possible local traffic claming Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development in the party land (i.e. ransom strip) Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Accessibility comme	ent					Rank (1-5)
Existing access onto Kent Road but maybe through third party land (i.e. ransom strip) Local network comment Congestion in Pudsey Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, access and footway improvements on Kent Road, possible local traffic claming Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial developments on Kent Road, possible local traffic claming No Highways Agency 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		Good health	and primary sc	hool accessibli	ty, average se	econdary school	3
Local network comment Congestion in Pudsey Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, access and footway improvements on Kent Road, possible local traffic claming Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development No Highways Agency n/a Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Access Comments						Rank (1-5)
Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, access and footway improvements on Kent Road, possible local traffic claming Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development No Highways Agency n/a Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com	Existing access onto	Kent Road b	ut maybe throug	gh third party la	and (i.e. ranso	om strip)	2
Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, access and footway improvements on Kent Road, possible local traffic claming Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial developments on Kent Road, possible local traffic claming Highways Agency n/a 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	Local network com	ment					Rank (1-5)
Public transport bus improvements, access and footway improvements on Kent Road, possible local traffic claming Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial developments on Kent Road, possible local support? No Highways Agency n/a 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 Com	Congestion in Pudse	у					3
Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development No Highways Agency n/a 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	Mitigation measure						Total scor
Highways Agency n/a 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 Com		mprovement	s, access and fo	ootway improve	ements on Ke	nt Road, possible loca	8
Highways Agency n/a 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 Waste Water Treatment Works Com	Support?		Need to combi	ne with other	sites:	Suitability for par	tial 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	No						
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							
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							
Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com	<u>Biodiversity</u>						
Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com		ogy and LC	C Ecology Offic	er:	Boundary	Amendment	
Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com	Supported						
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com	Natural England:						
Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com	Education						
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Com							
	Environment Agency	/ Comments	:	Env	rironment Ag	ency Constraints:	
LCC Flood Pick Management:	Yorkshire Water Cor	nments:		Yor	kshire Water	Waste Water Treatm	ent Works Comme
ECC Flood Nisk Management.	LCC Flood Risk Man	agement:					

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 Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
rounding off of the existing settler	s out into Green Belt to the east of ment, but could set a precedent fo ls meaning development would be	r further unrestricted Gre	en Belt sprawl. Set at the top
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 60 Floo	rspace sq m (Non resid	ential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conclusion	ո։	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Red		Red

Site Name: Land at Turkey Hill, Pudsey LS28

Site Ref: 1183

Site Details

 Northing:
 432856
 Area sq m:
 4440.83
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 423374
 Area Ha:
 0.444083
 HMCA:
 Outer 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: No Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1663.54 Distance to bus stop (metres) 195.90

Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 9845

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 is currently a livery stable consisting of the stable building in the north east corner with the rest of the site used for three paddocks. Roughly square in shape, the site slopes downwards towards the south. The boundary to the site stops just short of the road access to the west. Surrounded by fields on three sides and residential development to the west.

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)

No

Within Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

No

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H25/331/91/	Change of use of stables to dw elling house.	15/11/1991	13/04/1992	R	99.35
H25/150/90/	Detached office located in a c aravan to riding school.	05/06/1990	13/05/1991	R	99.39
H25/566/76/	Detached agricultural and impl ement store, to vacant site (previous application no.76/25 /00362 approved building r	01/09/1976	13/09/1976	R	90.68
H25/151/90/	Change of use of barn and agri cultural site to riding schoo l.	15/05/1990	13/05/1991	Α	98.96
25/74/96/FU	Single storey rear extension to equestrian centre	07/03/1996	01/11/1999	W	99.94

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 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:** Well connected to the existing residential area. Some 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

100.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

East Leeds

Gas:

	0-5yrs) Suitability: LD	OF to determine	Achievability: Long term	(11+ years)
ummary of Infras	tructure provider c	omments and of	ther planning requ	irements
_eeds City Council Hi	ghways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			ı	Rank (1-5
Poor public transport acce	essiblity. Good health and pr	imary / secondary scho	ol accessiblity.	3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
No frontage onto adopted	I highway, requires developi	ment of adjacent land bu	ut not preferred site	2
Local network comment	t			Rank (1-5
Congestion on Outer Ring	Road and Pudsey			3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Public transport bus impro	ovements, possible capacity	/ works on local highway	′	8
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
No	Yes with 1060, 304		Possible	development.
		-,,		
n/a <mark>Network Rail :</mark>				
Biodiversity				
	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	/ Amendment	
		•	Amendment	
West Yorkshire Ecology Supported			Amendment	
			, Americane in	
Supported			, Americane in	
Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flood	ing			
Supported Natural England:	ing		gency Constraints:	
Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flood	<u>ing</u> mments:	Environment Ag		Works Comme

Electric: Telecom: Fire and Rescue Services: Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage: Could site be effectively Mest No Maybe Maybe Managed Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers [Text] Experience of previous encampments Text No Unknown Text No Unknown					
Fire and Rescue Services: Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage: Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment	Electric:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage: Gypsy_Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively managed Yes No Maybe Text Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Text Text Text Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Conclusion summary: Coreen Belt site, to the rear of existing properties on Acres Hall Avenue. The site relates well to the existing residential area and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Telecom:				
Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service: English Heritage: Gypsy _Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively managed Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers (Text) Experience of previous encampments (Text) Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site, to the rear of existing properties on Acres Hall Avenue. The site relates well to the existing residential area and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Fire and Rescue Services:				
Gypsy Traveller Site Assessment Could site be effectively Maybe Text) Would gypsies and travellers Iive on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Froximity to housed Text) Experience of previous encampments Text) Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site, to the rear of existing properties on Acres Hall Avenue. The site relates well to the existing residential area and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
Could site be effectively managed Yes	3				
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Yes No No	Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessmer	nt		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the site? Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Yes No Text) Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Text) Experience of previous encampments Yes No Unknown Text) Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site, to the rear of existing properties on Acres Hall Avenue. The site relates well to the existing residential area and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the site? Text Text		(Text)	1		
travellers live on the site? Text Text					
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers Text		(Text)			
Experience of previous encampments Yes No Unknown (Text) Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site, to the rear of existing properties on Acres Hall Avenue. The site relates well to the existing residential area and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Site :				
Experience of previous encampments Yes No Unknown Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site, to the rear of existing properties on Acres Hall Avenue. The site relates well to the existing residential area and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:				No	
Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site, to the rear of existing properties on Acres Hall Avenue. The site relates well to the existing residential area and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site, to the rear of existing properties on Acres Hall Avenue. The site relates well to the existing residential area and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:					
Conclusion of Assessment Conclusion summary: Green Belt site, to the rear of existing properties on Acres Hall Avenue. The site relates well to the existing residential area and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:			No		Unknown
Conclusion summary: Green Belt site, to the rear of existing properties on Acres Hall Avenue. The site relates well to the existing residential area and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion summary: Green Belt site, to the rear of existing properties on Acres Hall Avenue. The site relates well to the existing residential area and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:					
Conclusion summary: Green Belt site, to the rear of existing properties on Acres Hall Avenue. The site relates well to the existing residential area and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Conclusion of Asses	omont			
Green Belt site, to the rear of existing properties on Acres Hall Avenue. The site relates well to the existing residential area and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	Conclusion of Asses	sment			
and is in close proximity to Pudsey centre. Would need to be combined with site 3050 for access, no highways frontage otherwise. Site Capacity (dwellings units): 14 Floorspace sq m (Non residential): Residential Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:					
Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:	and is in close proximity to Pudse				
. ,	Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 14	Floorspace	sq m (Non residen	tial):
Green Red Red	Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:
	Green	Red			Red

Site Name: Land at Acres Hall Avenue, Pudsey, LS28

Site Ref: 1184

Site Details

Northing: 436681 Area sq m: 315406.02 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 422637 Area Ha: 31.540602 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Waterways

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): 2618.44 Distance to bus stop (metres) 352.41 Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 4220 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: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas Yes No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large flat site bordered by a river to the north and a canal to the south. Currently has an agricultural use, mainly fields but there is a farm set in the south west corner. Single narrow access links the farm to the settlement, there is no road frontage available. Trees line the boundary and are sporadically placed along individual field boundaries throughout the site. The Ring Road is set to the west but is substantially higher than the site with no access linkage.

UDP Designation

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

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? **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? **V** Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain development? Overall Coalescence Conclusion: No merging but would significantly reduce the green belt gap Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment **~** Is there a strong defensible boundary between the site and the existing urban area? Does the site provide access to the countryside? Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas? Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or significant unprotected tree/hedge cover? **~** Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land? **~** Does the site contain buildings? Are these in agricultural use? Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion The site 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:** Relates poorly to the settlement and if developed would considerably reduce the Green Belt between Horsforth and Rodlev 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:	No Achievability:	Unknown
Summary of Infrastructure provid	ler comments and other planni	ng requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment Public transport offer not in walking distance to	half of site and distant from employment educ	Rank (1-5)
health.		2
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Access difficult to achieve		1
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Unsuitable local network and mitigation difficult	to achieve	2
Mitigation measure		Total score
		5
Support? Need to com	bine with other sites: Suitability	for partial development:
No Yes		cess and suitable mitigation
Highways Agency		
Network Rail :		
Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Of	ficer: Boundary Amendment	
Not supported (RED). No site-based designation would result in a large unsympathetic developm of the River Aire/Leeds Liverpool Canal wildlife area is currently semi-improved grassland which survey	ent in the heart corridor. The	
Natural England:	·	
Education		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constrain	nts:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		

Site Ref: 1187	Site Name:	Land at Rodley Fol	d Farm, Rodley L513	
<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 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:				
	ably reduce the Green	Belt between Horsforth and	ess. It relates poorly to the settlement Rodley. The site is also covered by	
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 1085	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):	(
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion	:
Red	Red		Red	

Site Details

 Northing:
 432505
 Area sq m:
 5633.39
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 421648
 Area Ha:
 0.563339
 HMCA:
 Outer 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): 1872.13
Distance to bus stop (metres) 171.84

Nearest Railway Station New Pudsey Bus Stop ID 4606

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:

Small field which has strong tree lined borders on all sides. Set behind residential properties the site has no road frontage and can only be accessed through a narrow footpath. It slopes steeply upwards towards the rear (south) and is surrounded by further fields to the west, south and east. No buildings on the site.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.89	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:	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

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

Check the unrestricted sprawi	or large built up areas						
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?							
Would development result in isolated development?							
Is the site well connected to built							
Would development of the site ef	No						
Do natural/physical features provarea and undeveloped land?	ride a good existing barrier between existing urban	✓					
Overall sprawl conclusion:							
Low potential to lead to unrestric	ted sprawl						
Prevent neighbouring towns fr	om merging						
Would development of the site le	ead to physical connection of settlements?						
Do natural/physical features providevelopment?	vide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain	✓					
Overall Coalescence Conclusion	<u> </u>						
No merging of settlements							
Assist in safeguarding country	vside from encroachment						
Is there a strong defensible bour	ndary between the site and the existing urban area?	✓					
Does the site provide access to t	the countryside?						
Does the site include local or nat	ional conservation designated areas?						
Does the site include areas of we significant unprotected tree/hedg	podlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or ue cover?	✓					
Does the site include grade 1, 2,	or 3a agricultural land?	✓					
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?						
Overall countryside Encroachme	nt Conclusion						
The site does not perform an imp	portant role in safeguarding the countryside from encroa	achment					
Preserve the setting and speci	al character of historic towns						
-	conservation area, listed building or other historical						
If yes, could development preser	ve this character?:						
Overall Character Preservation (Conclusion:						
	ave no effect on the setting and special character of his	toric features					
Greenbelt Assessment Conclu	ů .						
	or sprawl, however, the site does not link well to settlem	nent and has no access					
Tron contained to low potential i	or oprami, nomovor, uno ono acce not mini mon to collicir	ioni and nac no access.					
Conformity with Cor	e Strategy						
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extension	Brownfield					
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extension	Greenfield					
Smaller Settlement							
Villages/Rural	Village/Rural Extension	·	-				
Deve	opment unrelated to existing development						
Regeneration Priority Area:							
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00				
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway:							

East Leeds

Utilities

SHLAA Conclusions						
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to de	termine	Achievability:	Long term (11-	+ years)
Summary of Infrastruct	ure provide	er comm	ents and	other plann	ing require	ments
Leeds City Council Highwa	ys inc Metro					
Accessibility comment	. Cood primarı	/	achaola and l	h o o láb		Rank (1-5)
Poor public transport accessibility	7. Good primary	/ secondary	schools and i	neaim.		3
Access Comments						Rank (1-5)
No access onto adopted highwa	y.					1
Local network comment					·	Rank (1-5)
Local capacity, congestion in Pu	dsey.					4
						-
Mitigation measure						Total score
						8
Support?	Need to comb	nine with oth	nor sitos:	Suitahilit	y for partial dev	elonment:
No	Need to come	Jille With oth	ici sites.	Guitabilit	y for partial dev	сторитети.
Highways Agency						
n/a						
Network Rail:						
<u>Biodiversity</u>						
West Yorkshire Ecology and LC	C Ecology Offi	icer:	Bound	ary Amendment		
Supported with mitigation to ensubetween Leeds and Bradford is resemi-improved grassland to cons	etained. Ridge a		nd			
Natural England:						
Education						
Drainage/Water/Flooding						
Environment Agency Comment	:s:	I	Environment	Agency Constra	aints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:			Yorkshire Wa	ater Waste Wate	r Treatment Woı	rks Comme
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	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:			
Green Belt site. The site extend is no access to the site.	s into Green Belt to the sout	th of Westroyd Hill and de	velopment would be isolated. There
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	20	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Conc Not assesse		Employment Conclusion: Not assessed

Site Name: Land adjoining Green Top, Pudsey LS28

Site Ref: 1192

Site Details

Northing: 436495 Area sq m: 20280.46 Ward Calverley and Farsley Easting: 421543 Area Ha: 2.028046 HMCA: Outer 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): 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:

Greenfield land set between Calverly and Rodley.

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 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 sett	ement pattern?: No					
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier barea 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 o	settlements?					
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/l development?	ooundary 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 t	ne existing urban area?					
Does the site provide access to the countryside?						
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?	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	he countryside from encroachment					
Preserve the setting and special character of historic too	vns					
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed by 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	and special character of historic features					
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Relates well to settlement and is well contained due to tree I separation between Calverley and Rodley.	ned boundaries. Development would reduce					
Conformity with Core Strategy						
Main Urban Area Main Urban A	rea Extension Brownfie	ld 🔲				
Major Settlement Major Settlen	nent Extension Greenfie	ld 🔳				
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settl	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				
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 0.00	West Leeds Gateway:	0.00				

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
summary of Infrastruc	ture provider co	mments and ot	her planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro			David (4
Accessibility comment Good public transport and primacessibility.	ary school accessibility.	Poor health and second	dary school	Rank (1-
Access Comments				Rank (1-
Adequate frontages to Caverle on site side.	y Lane and Rodley Lan	e but requires significan	nt works and footways	4
Local network comment			'	Rank (1-
Direct impact on Rodley round	about			2
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Capacity improvements to ring access works required	road required, footways	s on adtopted highway r	required, significant	9
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
Yes but only with capacity contributions			Yes	
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u> West Yorkshire Ecology and ∣	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
J.	u,			
Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comme	nts:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
		Vaukahina Matan	Waste Water Treatment	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Torkshire water		Works Comme
Orkshire Water Comments:	:	TORSHIP Water		Works Comme

Site Ref: 1193A	Site Name:	Land at Rodley Lane - Calv Calverley LS19	erley Lane,
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)	1110	
			1
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
ondampmonto			
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. This part of the the west. Some of the trees are t	site is related to the enter the subject of a tree p	existing properties in Rodley and has a we reservation order (TPO).	ell defined field boundary to
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 0	Floorspace sq m (Non resident	ial): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 436545 Area sq m: 62589.27 Ward Calverley and Farsley Easting: 421381 Area Ha: 6.258927 HMCA: Outer 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): 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:

Greenfield land set between Calverly and Rodley.

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 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 settlem	nent pattern?:					
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between	ween 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 se	ettlements?					
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/bou development?	ndary to contain					
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:						
Coalescence/merging 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	<u> </u>					
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerows tha 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?	nese in agricultural use?					
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion						
The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from	om encroachment					
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns	š					
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed buildi feature?	ng or other historical					
If yes, could development preserve this character?:						
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:						
Development of the site would have marginal effect on the settir	ng & special character of historic features, which c					
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Development would merge Calverley and Rodley and have a signouth.	gnificant impact. Potential for further sprawl to					
Soun.						
Conformity with Core Strategy						
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area	a Extension Brownfield					
Major Settlement Major Settlemen	nt Extension Greenfield					
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement	ent Extension Mixed					
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Ext	tension	_				
Development unrelated to existing de	evelopment					
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:

Good public transport and primary school accessibility. Poor health and secondary school accessibility. Access Comments Adequate frontages to Caverley Lane and Rodley Lane but requires significant works and footways on site side. Local network comment Brank (Adequate frontages to Caverley Lane and Rodley Lane but requires significant works and footways on site side. Local network comment Capacity improvements to ring road required, footways on adtopted highway required, significant access works required Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development yes but only with capacity contributions Highways Agency No objection Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Finvironment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments		Achievability:	
Access billity comment Good public transport and primary school accessibility. Poor health and secondary school Access Comments Access Comments Adequate frontages to Caverley Lane and Rodley Lane but requires significant works and footways on site side. Local network comment Direct impact on Rodley roundabout Total s Capacity improvements to ring road required, footways on adtopted highway required, significant access works required Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development Yes but only with capacity contributions Highways Agency No objection Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Education Environment Agency Constraints: Finvironment Agency Constraints: Forkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	ummary of Infrastructure provider comm	ents and other planning requ	irements
Access Comments Access Comments Access Comments Access Comments Adequate frontages to Caverley Lane and Rodley Lane but requires significant works and footways on site side. Local network comment Direct impact on Rodley roundabout Mitigation measure Capacity improvements to ring road required, footways on adtopted highway required, significant access works required Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development Yes but only with capacity contributions Highways Agency No objection Network Rail: Biodiversity Nest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Education Environment Agency Constraints: Finvironment Agency Constraints: Finvironment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments Yorkshire Water Comments Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	eeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Good public transport and primary school accessibility. Poor health and secondary school accessibility. Access Comments Adequate frontages to Caverley Lane and Rodley Lane but requires significant works and footways on site side. Local network comment Brank (Adequate frontages to Caverley Lane and Rodley Lane but requires significant works and footways on site side. Local network comment Capacity improvements to ring road required, footways on adtopted highway required, significant access works required Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development yes but only with capacity contributions Highways Agency No objection Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Finvironment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments			Rank (1-
Adequate frontages to Caverley Lane and Rodley Lane but requires significant works and footways on site side. Local network comment Direct impact on Rodley roundabout Aitigation measure Capacity improvements to ring road required, footways on adtopted highway required, significant access works required Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development Yes but only with capacity contributions Highways Agency No objection Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Prainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Comments	Good public transport and primary school accessibility. Poor haccessibility.	nealth and secondary school	3
on site side. Local network comment Direct impact on Rodley roundabout Mitigation measure Capacity improvements to ring road required, footways on adtopted highway required, significant access works required Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development Yes but only with capacity contributions Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Access Comments	I	Rank (1-
Mitigation measure Capacity improvements to ring road required, footways on adtopted highway required, significant access works required Support? Need to combine with other sites: Yes but only with capacity contributions Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments		equires significant works and footways	4
Mitigation measure Capacity improvements to ring road required, footways on adtopted highway required, significant access works required Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development Yes but only with capacity contributions Highways Agency No objection Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments Water Treatment Works Comments	Local network comment	'	Rank (1-
Capacity improvements to ring road required, footways on adtopted highway required, significant access works required Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development Yes Wes Highways Agency No objection Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Direct impact on Rodley roundabout		2
Support? Need to combine with other sites: Yes but only with capacity contributions Highways Agency No objection Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Mitigation measure		Total sco
Yes but only with capacity contributions Highways Agency No objection Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments		dtopted highway required, significant	9
Highways Agency No objection Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Support? Need to combine with oth	her sites: Suitability for partial	development:
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments		Yes	
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Highways Agency		
Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Network Rail :		
Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Commentation of the	Biodiversity		
Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: 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: 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 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			
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comments	Drainage/Water/Flooding		
	Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
LCC Flood Risk Management:	Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LVV I IVVU Man milliguciliciil.	I CC Flood Risk Management		

Site Ref: 1193B	Site Name:	Land at Rodley Lane - Calverley LS19	alverley Lane,
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Accoccmon	<u> </u>	
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
manageu	(12.11)		
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?	(TOXI)		
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 current purposes of Green Belts. Some	ly separates Calverle of the trees are the s	y and Rodley. Preventing coalescend subject of a tree preservation order (T	ce of settlements is one of the PO).
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 0	Floorspace sq m (Non resid	dential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

 Northing:
 433383
 Area sq m:
 11246.57
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 420680
 Area Ha:
 1.124657
 HMCA:
 Outer 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 CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1028.13Distance to bus stop (metres)70.63Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID11093SFRA 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:

Small site consisting of a single field in agricultural use. Strong links to the settlement surrounded by residential development on three sides, road frontage is also available to the north and east. Large amount of trees on the southern boundary contain the site, trees are also in place on the remaining boundaries. The site slopes steeply towards the rear (south).

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?:

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
25/253/97/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	30/09/1997	29/03/2002	W	99.98
H25/279/80/	Outline application to lay out access road and erectionof re sidential development, compris ing 28, one bedroom, aged perso	29/04/1980	09/09/1980	R	44.47

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:** The site is well contained limiting potential for sprawl. Has strong links and is well connected 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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Short term (0-5yr	s) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastru	cture provide	er comments an	d other plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council Highy	vays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Good accessbility all round				5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Frontages to Waterloo Road a	and Bradley Lane			5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Local capacity, congestion in	Pudsey and A647			3
				3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Improvements to Bradley Landimprovements, footway improvequired.				y be 13
Support?	Need to com	oine with other sites:	Suitabilit	y for partial development:
Yes with mitigation				
Highways Agency]			
n/a				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology and		1 1	ndary Amendment	
Unknown Impact - grassland n summer	eeds a botanical s	urvey in the Site	assessment needed	1 ???
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comme		Environme	ent Agency Constra	aints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire	Water Waste Wate	r Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	 t:			
<u>Jtilities</u>				

Site Ref: 119	95	Site Name:	Land at Wate	rloo Road, Pi	udsey LS28
Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue	Services:				
Built Heritage					
Leeds City Coun	cil:				
West Yorkshire A		Service:			
English Heritage	:				
Gypsy Tray	ollor Sito	Assassman	•		
Gypsy _Trave	eller Site	ASSESSITIET			
Could site be e	ffectively	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
managed		(Text)			
Would gypsies		Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live of site?	on the	(Text)			
Proximity to ho		Yes		No	
gypsies and tra	avellers	(Text)			
Experience of p	orevious	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments		(Text)			
Conclusion of	of Assess	sment			
Canalysian symme					
Green Belt site. The		ontained by trees ald	ong the boundary and	I this limits the pote	ential for unrestricted sprawl
into the Green Belt.	The site has	a road frontage. No	Highways issues rais	sed.	γ
		0.5		<u> </u>	4. D
Site Capacity (dwe	llings units):	35	Floorspace	sq m (Non resider	itial):
Residential Conclu	sion:		l Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:
Green		Red			Red

Site Details

Northing: 434382 Area sq m: 73656.38 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 419562 Area Ha: 7.365638 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Residential institution

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1573.83Distance to bus stop (metres)172.41Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID4736

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:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Greenfield site set between Bradford and Leeds.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.96	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	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 %
25/215/93/FU	Use of agricultural land as outdoor activity centre area	16/09/1993	25/01/1994	R	21.04

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 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 existin	ig 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 cottlements?				
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex development?		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 urb	an area?			
Does the site provide access to the countrysid	•	\checkmark			
Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?					
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tree significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	s, hedgerows that are protec	eted, or			
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?	\checkmark			
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agric	cultural use?			
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion					
The site does not perform an important role in	safeguarding the countryside	e from encroachment			
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 feat	tures		
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:					
Relates well to settlement. Fairly well containe	d but would reduce gap betw	een Leeds and Bradf	ford.		
				J	
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 V	alley:		0.00	
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	100.00 West	Leeds Gateway:		0.00	

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LC	F to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
summary of Infrastructure provider c	omments and o	ther plann	ing requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment		- 9- 996 -	Rank (1-5
Average public transport. Good health and primary / s	econdary school acces	SIDIIITY.	3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Good frontage with adopted highway			5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Congestion on the A647			3
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Local capacity improvements required. Footway impr	ovements on Gain Lan	е	11
Support? Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability	y for partial development:
Yes			
lighways Agency			
n/a			
Network Rail :			
<u> Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Supported with mitigation provided that a strategic will corridor between Leeds and Bradford is retained throup providing an undeveloped north-south corridor that also the pond in the south.	ıgh		
Natural England:			
Education			
<u> Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	gency Constra	aints:
Orkshire Water Comments:	Vorkshiro Wate	ar Wasta Wata	r Treatment Works Comme
TOTASTITE WATER COMMITTEELS.	TOTASTITIE WATE	er vvaste vvater	Treatment Works Comme
.CC Flood Risk Management:			

Utilities

Site Ref: 1201	Site Name:	Land adjoining Woodhall Thornbury BD3	Road - Gain 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	(Text)		
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	INO	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
cheampments	(10,4)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site, situated on the b		d council and with existing residential us	
south east, so relatively well consite. Achievable access, modera		ent would not set a precedent for further	Green Belt sprawl. Flat
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 196	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 436250 Area sq m: 20070.86 Ward ramley and Stanningley
Easting: 424048 Area Ha: 2.007086 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space

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): 1836.02 Distance to bus stop (metres) 310.27 Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 2601 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

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site slopes steeply downwards from the road frontage (east to west). The western section has a large amount of trees that border the site at the bottom of the slope. Sporadic trees are also in place throughout the site and the boundaries. Pylons run along the souther border. A narrow road is in place along the northern boundary with some dwellings beyond. Playing pitches are located to the east of the site, and further dwellings to the south.

No

UDP Designation

Public Rights of Way:

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	100.00
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 %
H24/802/78/	Outline application to erect d etached farm dwelling to grazi ng site.	02/11/1978	15/01/1979	R	98.27
H24/330/80/	Outline application to erect d etached house to vacant site.	05/06/1980	04/08/1980	R	99.42
H24/363/77/	Use of vacant site as golf cou rse. (site area 1.8ha (4.4 acres)).	27/06/1977	05/09/1977	R	97.98
H24/716/75/	Use of vacant site as pets cem etery.	13/10/1975	01/12/1975	R	99.88

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? 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 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:** Set away from the main settlements between Bramley and Horsforth. Would impact on openess of the green belt and reduce gap. 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:

mmary of Infrastructure provider comme eds City Council Highways inc Metro cessibility comment od public transport links, and primary / seconday school accessibility. ccess Comments oor access along Pollard Lane ocal network comment umulative impact on ring road and Kirkstall. itigation measure ublic transport and road improvements required but unlikely Need to combine with oth	ents and othe		
eds City Council Highways inc Metro cessibility comment od public transport links, and primary / seconday school accessibility. ccess Comments our access along Pollard Lane ocal network comment unulative impact on ring road and Kirkstall. itigation measure ublic transport and road improvements required but unlikely upport? Need to combine with oth			
cessibility comment od public transport links, and primary / seconday school accessibility. cess Comments or access along Pollard Lane ceal network comment umulative impact on ring road and Kirkstall. itigation measure ublic transport and road improvements required but unlikely upport? Need to combine with oth	cessiblity. Poor hea	lth sarvices	
cessibility. cess Comments cor access along Pollard Lane coral network comment communicative impact on ring road and Kirkstall. itigation measure color access and road improvements required but unlikely support? Need to combine with oth	cessiblity. Poor hea	lth sarvices	
cessibility. ccess Comments cor access along Pollard Lane ccal network comment umulative impact on ring road and Kirkstall. itigation measure ublic transport and road improvements required but unlikely upport? Need to combine with oth	cessiblity. Poor hea	Ith sarvices	Rank (1
poor access along Pollard Lane pocal network comment umulative impact on ring road and Kirkstall. itigation measure ublic transport and road improvements required but unlikely upport? Need to combine with oth		iui seivides	4
cal network comment umulative impact on ring road and Kirkstall. itigation measure ublic transport and road improvements required but unlikely upport? Need to combine with oth			Rank (1
itigation measure ublic transport and road improvements required but unlikely upport? Need to combine with oth			2
itigation measure ublic transport and road improvements required but unlikely upport? Need to combine with oth			Rank (1
ublic transport and road improvements required but unlikely upport? Need to combine with oth			4
upport? Need to combine with oth			Total so
••	to be achievable		10
••			
			for partial development
		Possible	
ghways Agency			
twork Rail :			
<u>odiversity</u>			
est Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Am	nendment	
pported			
tural England:			
ucation			
ainage/Water/Flooding			
vironment Agency Comments:	Environment Agend	y Constrai	ints:
rkshire Water Comments:	orkshire Water Wa	aste Water	Treatment Works Comm
C Flood Risk Management:			
ilities			

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)		mayaa	
-				
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe	
travellers live on the	(Text)			
site?				
Proximity to housed	Yes (Text)	No		
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown	
encampments	(Text)	INU	UIKIIOWII	
	,			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
			ide the river and canal. Developm	
			of this area running from the city of this area running from the city of this area running from the city of the ci	
that can't be improved.	locoss to the site and t	quality of the riighway, harre	ow carriageway beyond site froma	gc
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 63	Floorspace sq m (N	Ion residential):	63
Residential Conclusion:	Retail (Conclusion:	Employment Conclus	sion:
Red	Red		Red	

Site Name: Land at Pollard Lane, Bramley, LS13

Site Ref: 1212

Site Details

 Northing:
 433081
 Area sq m:
 87466.00
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 423497
 Area Ha:
 8.7466
 HMCA:
 Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Utilities & Infrastructure - Water Storage and Treatment

Existing Use 2: Agriculture

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1410.28 Distance to bus stop (metres) 316.32 Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 3430 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:

Old water treatment works with some evidence of previous use still on site, mainly water tanks and fencing. Limited amount of trees throughout the site, mainly along the boundaries, woodland abuts the site to the east and partly to the south. A single narrow access extends from the site to the north that links to the main road. Also to the north are fields and a nursery whilst to the west is residential development. The levels vary undulating throughout the site.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.95	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	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 %
25/310/01/MIN	Landscaping of redundant works with dredged silt deposits	05/10/2001	15/02/2002	Α	65.34
H25/36/75/	New electricity sub-station to water pollution control works .	22/01/1975	03/03/1975	Α	65.34

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	Would development result in isolated development? ✓							
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ be	oundaries with existing built up area)?							
Would development of the site effectively "roun	d 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 ex development?	isting barrier/boundary to contain							
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:								
No merging but there is no defensible boundary	y							
Assist in safeguarding countryside from end	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	ural land?	✓						
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?							
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion								
The site performs an important role safeguarding	ng countryside from encroachment							
Preserve the setting and special character of								
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation reature?	area, listed 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 historic features								
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:								
Doesn't link well to settlement, potential for furt	her sprawl.							
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:	100.00 West Leeds Gatew	av: 0.00						

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider	comments and	l other plannin	g requirements
_eeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-
Poor public transport accessibility. Good health ser secondary school accessibility.	vice and primary school	ol accessibility. Poor	3
Access Comments			Rank (1-
No frontage onto adopted highway, requires develo	opment of adjacent lan	nd but not preferred s	ite 2
Local network comment			Rank (1-
Local Congestion on Outer Ring Road and Pudsey	,		3
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Public transport bus improvements, footway improvements on local highway.	vements on Hough Sic	de Road, possible cap	pacity 8
Support? Need to combin	ne with other sites:	Suitability f	or partial development:
No Yes with 1060 ar	nd 3048	Possible	
<u>Highways Agency</u> n/a <mark>Network Rail :</mark>			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	er: Boun	dary Amendment	
Not supported (RED). No site-based designations bareas of semi-improved grassland, ponds, scrub, he and is adjacent to Post Hill LNA in the east. Bats ar Vole to consider.	edgerows excludence RM/12 impac	ded and the boundary 213. Mitigation will sti ts on adjacent habita	f Red hatched areas are r is amended as per drawi Il be required to ensure ts are addressed, and enhanced. Bats and Wate
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environmen	nt Agency Constrain	its:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire W	Vater Waste Water T	reatment 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:

		Court	
Utilities Gas: Electric: Telecom: Fire and Rescue Services: Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:			
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:			
Green Belt site. Development we unrestricted sprawl into Green Be			d could set a precedent for further in site boundary.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 232	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail C	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Red		Red

Site Name: Pudsey Houghside, off Tong Road, East Side

Site Ref: 1213

Site Details

 Northing:
 434367
 Area sq m:
 8701.10
 Ward
 Armley

 Easting:
 424844
 Area Ha:
 0.87011
 HMCA:
 Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Storage

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:

Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):894.05Distance to bus stop (metres)148.90Nearest Railway StationBramleyBus Stop ID6369

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:

Existing employment site in urban area.

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 %
H24/530/80/	Change of use of part of wareh ouse to diy shop.	13/10/1980	17/11/1981	Α	22.31
H24/67/81/	3 non-illuminated fascia signs , size of one 8.83m x 2.44m, height above ground 3.05m (underside), size of on	25/02/1981	05/05/1981	Α	87.09
H24/221/74/	Landscaping & tree planting to warehouse site	05/07/1974	09/09/1974	Α	99.49
H24/751/75/	Change of use of warehouse uni t to cutting and fabri cation of packaging materials.	27/10/1975	01/12/1975	Α	13.28
H24/276/90/	Change of use of warehouse to warehouse and business.	03/08/1990	05/10/1990	Α	96.95
H24/426/79/	2m high plastic coated chain I ink boundary fence, to wareh ouse unit.	22/06/1979	16/07/1979	А	95.44
H24/68/81/	One non-illuminated, pole moun ted sign, size 3.66m x 1.22m, one externally illum inated, pole mountedsign, size	25/02/1981	21/09/1981	R	87.09
H24/63/74/	Change of use of 2 warehouse u nits, to industrial premi ses.	03/05/1974	24/06/1974	А	99.43
H24/230/75/	Change of use of warehouse to a class iii (town and count ry (used classes) order 1972) light industrial unit.	25/03/1975	21/04/1975	А	13.28
PREAPP/08/00376		13/11/2008	13/01/2009	PREEXP	95.37

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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	Yes	Achievability:	Short term (0-5yrs)
Summary of Infrastructure provider	comments and o	ther plannin	g requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Good accessibility all round			5
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Good frontage with multiple adtoped highways			5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Congestion on Stanningley Road			4
Mitigation measure			Total scor
Footway required on Back Lane			14
Support? Need to combin	ne with other sites:	Suitability f	or partial development:
Yes			
Highways Agency			
n/a			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	er: Boundary	y Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
Education			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	gency Constrain	its:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water T	reatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			
<u>Utilities</u>			

Site Ref: 1250	Site Name:	1 Elmfield Way, Bra	amley, LS13 4UD
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Serv	vices:		
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Arch	aeology Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypey Travelle	er Site Assessmer	n#	
			,
Could site be effect	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
managed	(TOXI)		
Would gypsies and		No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	ne (Text)		
Proximity to house		No	
gypsies and travel	lers (Text)		
Experience of prev	vious Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
	<u>'</u>		
Conclusion of A	Assessment		
Conclusion summary:			
Site is in existing employ		ontage) plot for small industrial	estate. Recently vacant but in a good
location and would be pro	eferable for employment.		
Site Capacity (dwelling	s units): 31	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion	Reta	ail Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red		assessed	Green

Site Details

Northing: 436450 Area sq m: 26757.70 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 422623 Area Ha: 2.67577 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Transport - Waterways

Neighbouring Use 3: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor amenity & open space

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): 2429.06 Distance to bus stop (metres) 248.95 Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 10573 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: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas Yes No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Small flat site consisting of twin fields in agricultural use. Site is clear except for trees that line the boundary and a further few that are sporadically placed along the central line of the site. Cricket pitch adjoins the site to the east, further fields to the north and west (along with a farm) whilst a canal runs along the southern boundary.

UDP Designation

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

LS13

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large b	uilt up areas					
Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development?						
Would development result in isolated devel	opment?	\checkmark				
Is the site well connected to built up area (2	2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?					
Would development of the site effectively "r	round off" the settlement pattern?:	No				
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	d existing barrier between existing urban	✓				
Overall sprawl conclusion:						
High potential to lead to unrestricted spraw	I					
Prevent neighbouring towns from mergi	ng					
Would development of the site lead to phys	sical connection of settlements?					
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?	d existing barrier/boundary to contain					
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:						
No merging but there is no defensible boun	dary					
Assist in safeguarding countryside from	encroachment					
Is there a strong defensible boundary betw	een the site and the existing urban area?	✓				
Does the site provide access to the country	vside?					
Does the site include local or national cons	ervation designated areas?					
Does the site include areas of woodlands, significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	trees, hedgerows that are protected, or					
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agri-	cultural land?	✓				
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?					
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclus	sion_					
The site does not perform an important role	e in safeguarding the countryside from encro	pachment				
Preserve the setting and special charact						
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservat feature?	ion area, listed building or other historical					
If yes, could development preserve this cha	aracter?:					
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion	:					
	- ect on the setting and special character of hi	storic features				
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
	y a canal and has no road frontage for acce gh potential for further sprawl into the Green					
Conformity with Core Strate	tegy					
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 ur	nrelated 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				

East Leeds

SHLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: I	Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructu	re provide	er comments ar	nd other plannin	g requirements
Leeds City Council Highways	s inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Poor accessbility all round				1
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
No adopted highway access				1
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Cumulative or direct impact onto R	ling Road			3
Mitigation measure				Total score
Access over river required and lan	d take			5
Support?	Need to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitability f	or partial development:
No				
Highways Agency				
n/a				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC	Ecology Offic	cer: Bou	ndary Amendment	
Not supported (RED). No site-speci important wildlife corridor between that should be left undeveloped. Pro	the River Aire a otected species	and the canal s including		
Otters will use the land between the Voles and bats will benefit from the Rodley Fold Farm, immediately to tincreases disturbance to this area. help protect/buffer other nearby will Nature Reserve to the east.	continuity of vertile the continuity of this he north of this Lack of develor	egetation. s site, already pment will		
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u> Environment Agency Comments:		Environme	ent Agency Constrain	ıts:
	·			
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Va dad ba	Matau Maata Matau T	reatment Works Comme

Site Ref: 1253	Site Name:	Land adjoining Ro LS13	odley Fold Farm, Rodley,
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	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. The site is separa would result in an isolated develo			and frontage for access. Development the Green Belt.
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 67	Floorspace sq m (N	lon residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:

Red

Red

Site Details

Northing: 436130 Area sq m: 19283.88 Ward ramley and Stanningley
Easting: 422928 Area Ha: 1.928388 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Transport - Waterways

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

Neighbouring Use 3: Agriculture

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1996.36Distance to bus stop (metres)121.83Nearest Railway StationBramleyBus Stop ID13362SFRA 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:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Brownfield site that is currently vacant and cleared, previously used for employment. Sites sits between a canal to the south and river to the north. A narrow access road runs along the northwest boundary, there is a bridge over the canal that links the site to the settlement, but this is a single lane swing bridge rather than a permanent structure. There are some trees on site along the boundaries.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.01	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	100.00
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 %
PREAPP/07/00270	Redevelopment of employment site for residential	16/07/2007		PRECAG	99.65
H24/230/83/	Alterations and extension, to form electricity sub- stati on, to mills.	08/08/1983	31/08/1983	Α	99.65
H24/60/80/	Detached single storey office with corridor link, to engin eering works.	01/02/1980	17/03/1980	Α	98.65
H24/13/76/	Two single-storey warehouse un its, for storage and check ing of tyres, to tyre depot.	09/01/1976	22/03/1976	Α	99.62
H24/645/78/	Alterations, including new roo f to existing stores and machi ne shop, and extension, to for m loading bay and store, wit	15/09/1978	06/11/1978	Α	99.62
H24/318/89/	Extension to form factory unit , to existing mill with layin g out of car park.	19/09/1989	04/12/1989	Α	99.34
H24/674/76/	Outline application, to erect extensions, to works premi ses.	15/09/1976	15/11/1976	А	99.62
H26/77/74/	X	23/04/1974	17/09/1974	W	99.65

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: 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	
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine Achievability: Medium term (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastructure provid	ler comments and other planning requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro	
Accessibility comment	Rank (1-
Good accessbility all round except average for h	nealth. 4
Access Comments	Rank (1-
Bridge access works required as per previous d	development proposals 4
Local network comment	Rank (1-
Cumulative impact on ring road	4
	4
Mitigation measure	Total sc
Local capacity works possible, suitable bridge c	constructed, footway works 12
Support? Need to com	bine with other sites: Suitability for partial development:
Yes with mitigation	Possible
g	
Highways Agency	
n/a	
Network Rail :	
Biodiversity	
Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Of	fficer: Boundary Amendment
Not supported (RED). No site-specific designation located within an important wildlife corridor betwee Aire and the canal – current industrial development.	ons but is reen the River ent acts as a
barrier to this wildlife corridor function. Residenti- will increase the direct and indirect disturbance to location. Any previous development should be re- land allowed to provide an improved wildlife func-	to wildlife in this emoved and the ction (potential
Leeds Habitat Network) - lack of development wi protect/buffer Rodley Nature Reserve immediate	
Natural England:	
Education	
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>	
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency Constraints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Commo

Site Ref: 1322	Site Name:	Airedale Mills, Ro	dley
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	<u>it</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:			
	ge is constructed. A	small part of the area neare	e swing bridge - inadequate for large st the canal is within floodzones 2 ted to the existing settlement.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 69	Floorspace sq m (l	Non residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:

Not assessed

Red

Amber

Site Ref: 1328 Site Name: Land south of Roker Lane, Pudsey, LS28

Site Details

 Northing:
 432171
 Area sq m:
 11221.53
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 422900
 Area Ha:
 1.122153
 HMCA:
 Outer 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 - Storage

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): 2479.40
Distance to bus stop (metres) 138.63

Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 4953

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:

Small site consisting of a single field, currently with an agricultural use. No buildings on site, though there is residential development to the north and a storage yard to the east. To the south and west are further fields. Reasonably flat site with a few trees sporadically in place throughout the site and along the boundaries.

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: 1328 Site Name: Land south of Roker Lane, Pudsey , LS28

Site Ref: 1328 Site Name: Land south of Roker Lane, Pudsey, LS28

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 marginal effect on the setting & special character of historic features, which c **Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:** Site relates poorly to the settlement and has no defensible boundary on three sides presenting a high risk 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

100.00

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Site Ref: 1328 Site Name: Land south of Roker Lane, Pudsey , LS28

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: Long term	(11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provide	er comments and	other planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Poor public transport. Good primary school acces accessibility.	sibility. Average health ar	nd secondary school	2
Access Comments		·	Rank (1-5
No frontage to the adopted highway			1
Local network comment		·	Rank (1-5
Congestion in Pudsey			3
Mitigation measure	_		Total sco
			6
Support? Need to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
No No			шотогоригони
Highways Agency			
n/a			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Offi	cer: Bound	ary Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment	Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wa	ater Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			
<u>Utilities</u>			

Site Ref: 1328	Site Name:	Land south of Roker	Lane, Pudsey , LS28
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Service	es:		
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeo	logy Service:		
English Heritage:			
O T	014 - 4		
Gypsy _Traveller	Site Assessmen	ıt	
Could site be effective		No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Sito :			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	s (Text)		
Experience of previous	u s Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		•
Conclusion of Ass	sessment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. The site rela	ates poorly to the settleme	ent, extending out into the Green	Belt. It has no road frontage to the
adopted highway for access sprawl.	and has no defensible be	oundary on three sides presentin	g a high risk for further Green Belt
Site Capacity (dwellings u	nits): 35	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Red		Red

Site Details

Northing: 437613 Area sq m: 27395.08 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 419491 Area Ha: 2.739508 HMCA: Outer 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: Transport - Waterways

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3693.88Distance to bus stop (metres)137.27Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID13747SFRA 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:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Existing employment site that sits between the Leeds and Bradford boundary. Only access is from the west, within the Bradford district where there is a road frontage that runs along the western boundary. To the north the site abuts a canal, to the east and south are fields. Trees line a large part of the site boundary.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.01	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	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)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
25/195/94/OT	Outline application to erect 2 storey extension to warehouse	03/08/1994	13/09/1994	W	22.92
H25/93/79/	Outline application to erect 2 storey extension to wareh ouse. (part of the site of thi s application lies within bra	20/02/1979	08/05/1979	Α	32.68
H25/162/90/	Outline application to erect 2 storey extension to rearof wa rehouse.	15/05/1990	01/10/1990	Α	23.59
0-25/32/95/MOD	Two storey rear extension to warehouse	04/08/1995	22/08/1995	M01	98.67
H25/347/78/	Outline application to erect e xtension to warehouse. (part of the site of this applicati on lies within bradford m	22/05/1978	16/10/1978	W	32.90
25/27/95/FU	Two storey rear extension to warehouse with car parking and landscaping	13/02/1995	06/04/1995	Α	98.67
H25/179/84/	Outline application to erect 2 storey extension with 46 ca r parking spaces, to warehouse.	05/07/1984	17/09/1984	Α	98.78
25/201/94/FU	2.78m high boundary fence to warehouse	09/08/1994	03/10/1994	А	46.69
13/00571/CA	Conservation Area Application for the demolition of offices and warehouses	04/02/2013		APPRET	98.80
13/00572/OT	Outline Application for residential development including the laying out of access road	04/02/2013		PCO	98.80

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 d	evelopment?						
Would development result in isolated development	nent?						
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b							
Would development of the site effectively "rour							
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 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	eter?:						
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:							
O TO THE COLOR OF							
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:							
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 Valley:	0.00					
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	66.73 West Leeds Gatew	ay: 0.00					

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDI	to determine	Achievability:	Medium term (6-10 years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider co	omments and o	ther plann	ing requirements
eeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Poor public transport. Average secondary school accessive accessibility.	ssibility. Poor primary s	school and heal	th 3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Existing accesses to the site which would need slight	changes.		4
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Congestion in Bradford, cumulative impact into Leeds.			
			4
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Access works			11
Support? Need to combine w	vith ather sites.	Cuitabilit	, for portion dovelopment.
Yes	nun otner sites.	Sultability	for partial development:
lighways Agency			
/a			
letwork Rail :			
<u>siodiversity</u>			
Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment	
supported with mitigation to protect and enhance the L iverpool Canal SEGI, and to deculvert the Carr Beck to ith provision of a 20 metre buffer either side of the be- rovide a wildlife corridor. Bats and Otters to consider.	ogether		
latural England:			
Education			
Orainage/Water/Flooding	Environment A	anne Constra	into
invironment Agency Comments:	Environment A	gency Constra	ints:
orkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
CC Flood Risk Management:			

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 1337	Site Name:	Stylo House, Harrogate R Bridge Bradford BD10	oad, Apperley
Gas:			
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
O T U Oit		•	
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessmen		
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		
Canalusian summary			
Conclusion summary: The site is currently in employments.	ent use and half the si	te is within Bradford council area. The	re is a current application in for
		iple. Capacity revised to reflect part of	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 24	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 433129 Area sq m: 5355.69 Ward Farnley and Wortley
Easting: 426303 Area Ha: 0.535569 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Storage

Existing Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

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:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2597.81Distance to bus stop (metres)78.64Nearest Railway StationBurley ParkBus Stop ID7892

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:

Brownfield site, currently untidy with a single dwelling surrounded by large amount of scrap metal. Set within the main urban area, the site is surrounded by development. A road frontage runs along the southern and eastern boundaries. The east and west abut residential development and there is also a playing pitch and school to the east/north. Trees line the boundaries.

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)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H24/327/76/	Alterations to existing store rooms and first floor exten sion to form 2 additional stor e rooms and toilet to road ha	05/05/1976	05/07/1976	А	33.56
H24/222/77/	Outline application to lay out access road and erect 6 ter race houses with a block of 6 detached garages, and 6 semi	28/04/1977	08/08/1977	R	61.40
H24/71/76/	Replacement 2-form entry-first school, comprising hall, 2 dining areas, 8 classrooms, general purpose room, kitc	06/02/1976	22/03/1976	А	61.72
H24/176/77/	Outline application to layout new access road and erect haulage contractor's garage a nd workshop, with store and	06/04/1977	04/07/1977	R	74.61

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl of	large built up areas	
Would development lead to/constitu	ute ribbon development?	
Would development result in isolate	ed development?	
Is the site well connected to built up	area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)?	
Would development of the site effect	ctively "round off" the settlement pattern?:	
Do natural/physical features provide area and undeveloped land?	e a good existing barrier between existing urban	
Overall sprawl conclusion:		
Prevent neighbouring towns from	n merging	
Would development of the site lead	I to physical connection of settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide development?	e a good existing barrier/boundary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:		
Assist in safeguarding countrysic	de from encroachment	
Is there a strong defensible bounda	ary between the site and the existing urban area?	
Does the site provide access to the	countryside?	
Does the site include local or nation	nal conservation designated areas?	
Does the site include areas of wood significant unprotected tree/hedge of	dlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or 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 cofeature?	onservation area, listed building or other historical	
If yes, could development preserve	this character?:	
Overall Character Preservation Cor	nclusion:	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion	on:	
	-	
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	IVIIAGU
	oment unrelated to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:		
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	100.00 West Leeds Gatew	yav: 100.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
vailability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: Yes	,	Achievability:	Short term (0-5	Syrs)
ummary of Infrastructure provider co	mments and ot	her plann	ing require	ments
_eeds City Council Highways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment			1	Rank (1-5
Good accessibility all round.				5
Access Comments			"	Rank (1-5
Good frontage with Tong Road and Albany Street, prefe	erred access off Alban	/ Street.		5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Congestion on Outer Ring Road and M621.				4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Improvements to accesss radii and traffic calming on A financial contributions from cumulative planning applica		unded througl	h	14
Support? Need to combine wi	ith other sites:	Suitability	y for partial dev	elopment:
Yes			<u> </u>	<u> </u>
lighways Agency				
n/a				
Network Rail :				
<u> Biodiversity</u>				
Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment		
Supported				
latural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
<u> Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>				
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Ag	ency Constra	ints:	
orkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water	Treatment Wor	ks Comme
CC Flood Risk Management:				
Jtilities .				

		Road, Farnley	/	
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 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:				
Brownfield site situated within the would improve the appearance or				
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 19	Floorspace s	sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion: Green		Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion: Not assessed

Site Name: Adjacent to Whingate Primary School, Tong

Site Ref: 1341

Site Details

Northing: 433021 Area sq m: 6126.80 Ward Farnley and Wortley
Easting: 427095 Area Ha: 0.61268 HMCA: Outer 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2301.63Distance to bus stop (metres)73.12Nearest Railway StationBurley ParkBus Stop ID2769

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:

Historically, part of the site appears to have been a row of terraced housing but has since been cleared and is currently an area of green space. This section slopes downwards towards the north. The rest of the site (the northern part) consists of a road and beyond this a row of dense trees that mask the railway line to the north. Residential development surrounds the site on three sides (except the north).

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:	52.13	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)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
08/02603/FU	3 storey block of 10 one bedroom and 2 two bedroom flats and 2 three bedroom houses, with car parking	29/04/2008	15/08/2008	W	19.39
H24/398/80/	Laying out of public open spac e to cleared site.(site area 0.44ha) (this item is also not ice under regulation4(1) of th	15/07/1980	02/09/1980	Α	52.96
09/00707/FU	3 storey block of 10 one bedroom and 2 two bedroom flats and 2 three bedroom houses, with car parking	17/02/2009	07/05/2009	W	16.04
24/150/93/FU	2 blocks each of 1 workshop with flat over	12/05/1993	01/08/1994	Α	16.13

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 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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 100.00

East Leeds

<u>Utilities</u> Gas:

HLAA Conclusions			
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitabi	ility: LDF to determine	Achievability:	Medium term (6-10 years)
Summary of Infrastructure prov	/ider comments and	other planni	ing requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Me	<u>tro</u>		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
Good accessibility all round			5
Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Good frontage with multiple adtoped highwa	uys.		5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Local network capacity, likely cumulative im	pact on Inner Ring Road and	Outer Ring Road.	1
			4
Mitigation measure			Total score
Footway required on Thornhill Road and Kill	ourn Road, possible cumulativ	ve fund required.	14
Support? Need to c	combine with other sites:	Suitability	for partial development:
Yes			
Highways Agency			
n/a			
Network Rail:			
NR land opposite side of Thornhill Road - ne	w site? General asset protect	ion issues	
Biodiversity	000	J A J	
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Supported	/ Officer: Bound	dary Amendment	
зирропец			
Natural England:			
Education			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environmen	t Agency Constra	ints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire W	ater Waste Water	Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Company Transcling City			
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	
Functions of provious	Vaa	Nie	Halmanna
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
	,		
	,		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Main section of site is designated considered through the greenspa section is currently well treed and	ce review - see Greens	pace section, page 32, ques	tion G10. The remaining smaller
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 10	Floorspace sq m (Nor	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail C	onclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Red		Red

Site Name: Kilburn Road, Wortley

Site Ref: 1342

Site Details

 Northing:
 432022
 Area sq m:
 91563.53
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 419388
 Area Ha:
 9.156353
 HMCA:
 Outer 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):2874.63Distance to bus stop (metres)252.63Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID6663

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:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Reasonably flat site with an agricultural use consisting of several fields. Open site with no trees or other features to note. To the south a road runs along the boundary with residential development beyond. A green buffer is in place to the west before further residential properties. A farm also adjoins the site to the south east. To the north and east are further fields.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.04	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	0.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
25/129/97/OT	Outline application to erect industrial warehouse and business centre	03/06/1997	30/07/2002	Α	98.44
25/174/05/RE	Renewal of outline permission to erect industrial warehouse and business centre	12/05/2005	03/01/2006	А	99.98

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

Check the unrestricted sprawl	of large built up areas						
Would development lead to/const	titute ribbon development?						
Would development result in isola	ated 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 prov area and undeveloped land?	ide a good existing barrier between existing urban						
Overall sprawl conclusion:							
Prevent neighbouring towns from	om merging						
Would development of the site le	ad to physical connection of settlements?						
Do natural/physical features prov development?	ide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain						
Overall Coalescence Conclusion	<u>:</u>						
Assist in safeguarding country	side from encroachment						
Is there a strong defensible boun	dary between the site and the existing urban area?						
Does the site provide access to t	he countryside?						
Does the site include local or nati	ional conservation designated areas?						
Does the site include areas of wo significant unprotected tree/hedg	odlands, trees, hedgerows that are protected, or e cover?						
Does the site include grade 1, 2,	or 3a agricultural land?	✓					
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?						
Overall countryside Encroachme	nt Conclusion						
Preserve the setting and specia	al character of historic towns						
Is the site within or adjacent to a feature?	conservation area, listed building or other historical						
If yes, could development preserve	ve this character?:						
Overall Character Preservation C	Conclusion:						
Greenbelt Assessment Conclus	sion:						
Conformity with Cor	e 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						
Devel	opment unrelated to existing development						
Regeneration Priority Area:							
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:			0.00			
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	100.00 West Leeds Gatev	vay:		0.00			

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
wanasiny.	Guitability.	Achievability.	
ummary of Infrastruc	ture provider co	mments and other planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Highwa Accessibility comment	ays inc Metro		Rank (1-
Poor accessbility all round.			Nalik (1-
, ,			1
Access Comments		·	Rank (1-
Good frontage onto Tyersal Lar	ne.		5
Local network comment			Rank (1-
Spare local capacity, further ne	twork impacts more like	ly in Bradford.	4
			•
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Public transport improvements, Tyersal Lane.	may need local capacit	ty improvements, footway improvements on	10
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites: Suitability for partial	development:
Partial Yes but only with public transport improvements		Yes	
Highways Agency			
No objection - Potential impact of	on M606 - needs looking	g at in relation to Bradford Holme Wood proposals	3.
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
West Yorkshire Ecology and L	.CC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Commer	nts:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:			
<u>Jtilities</u>			

Telecom: Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
gg			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	ļ	1 2 2
_			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)		
site?			
D 1 2 4 1 1			
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)	INU	Olikilowii
on ampinomo	,		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
would be suitable in this location	as it is connected to exi	sting housing to the west an	during the plan period. Housing d south. There are no physical Poor public transport accessibility. The
site has been split in two, as part			roor public transport accessionity. The
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	206	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail C	onclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Red		Not assessed

Site Name: Harper Gate Farm, Tyersal Lane, Bradford

BD4 0RD

Site Ref: 1343A

Electric:

Site Details

 Northing:
 432062
 Area sq m:
 99112.10
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 419653
 Area Ha:
 9.91121
 HMCA:
 Outer 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:No Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2687.62Distance to bus stop (metres)496.36Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID6663

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:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site consists of several fields and has an agricultural use. A single lane narrow track runs through the centre of the site, there is also a road frontage along the southern boundary. Site has no features of note, there are no trees along the boundaries which are poorly defined. A farm abuts the site in the south west corner but no other development borders the site, which instead links to further fields.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	72.95	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 Plaving Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H25/372/74/	Laying out of new access and f ormation of radio stationcompr ising single storey transmitte r building, with equipment	02/10/1974	18/11/1974	Α	40.86
25/129/97/OT	Outline application to erect industrial warehouse and business centre	03/06/1997	30/07/2002	Α	43.06
25/174/05/RE	Renewal of outline permission to erect industrial warehouse and business centre	12/05/2005	03/01/2006	А	55.56

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 ex	xisting built up area)?						
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlem	ent 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 se	ettlements?						
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/bourdevelopment?	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	existing urban area?						
Does the site provide access to the countryside?	\checkmark						
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?	t are protected, or						
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	✓						
Does the site contain buildings?	nese in agricultural use?						
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion							
The site performs an important role safeguarding countryside from	om encroachment						
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns	S						
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:							
The site is in an isolated position, relates poorly to the settlemer significantly into the countryside.	nt, has no defined boundary and would encroach						
Conformity with Core Strategy							
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area	a Extension Brownfield						
Major Settlement Major Settlemen	t Extension Greenfield						
Smaller Settlement Extension Mixed							
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Ext	tension						
Development unrelated to existing de	evelopment						
Regeneration Priority Area:							
Inner South Leeds: 0.00	Aire Valley: 0.00						
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 74.40	West Leeds Gateway: 0.00						

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
		Achievability.	
ummary of Infrastru	cture provider co	omments and other planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Highy	vays inc Metro		Donk (4
Accessibility comment Poor accessbility all round.			Rank (1-
oor accessining an rounar			1
Access Comments		·	Rank (1-
Good frontage onto Tyersal La	ane.		5
Local network comment			 Rank (1-
Spare local capacity, further n	etwork impacts more like	ely in Bradford.	4
Mitigation measure			Total sco
	s, may need local capaci	ity improvements, footway improvements on	
Tyersal Lane			10
Support?	Need to combine w	vith other sites: Suitability for partial	development:
Partial Yes but only with public transport improvements		Yes	
Highways Agency]		
	on M606 - needs looking	g at in relation to Bradford Holme Wood proposals	S.
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Natural England:			
vaturai Erigianu.			
<u>Education</u>			
Orainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comme	ents:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
orkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
.CC Flood Risk Managemen	t:		

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessi	nent		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)	140		Ividybo
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)			
Site?				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		INO	
gyperee and marenere				
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	omont			
Conclusion of Asses	Sment			
Conclusion summary:				
The majority of the site is within t		Site B is not well related to	the settlement and	d would result in a significant
encroachment into the countrysic	e.			
Site Capacity (dwellings units):		223 Floorspace	sq m (Non residen	tial): 0
		·		,
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:
Red		Red		Red

Site Name: Harper Gate Farm, Tyersal Lane, Bradford

BD4 0RD

Site Ref: 1343B

Site Details

Northing: 433965 Area sq m: 26829.17 Ward Calverley and Farsley Easting: 420676 Area Ha: 2.682917 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 2: Other

Existing Use 3: Utilities & Infrastructure - Post and Telecom

Neighbouring Use 1 Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses: Garages
Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

✓

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 570.23 Distance to bus stop (metres) 162.14

Nearest Railway Station New Pudsey Bus Stop ID 13162

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:

Vacant land sandwiched between residential development.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	100.00
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)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H25/260/91/	Change of use, involving layin g out of access of agric ultural buildings to two dwell ing houses.	05/09/1991	23/12/1991	R	10.62

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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Medium term (6-10	y Suitability: LD	F to determine	Achievability: Medium to	erm (6-10 years)
ummary of Infrastruct	ure provider c	omments an	d other planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council Highwa	ys inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-
Good accessibility all round.				
				5
Access Comments				Rank (1-
Adequate frontage with adopted junctions on B6154.	highway, may need a	access improveme	ent works as local close to	4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Local capacity, congestion in Pu	dsey.			5
				3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Access improvement works may	be required.			14
Support?	Need to combine v	with other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
Yes with mitigation.				
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
Railway tunnels under site				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology and LO	CC Ecology Officer:	Bou	ndary Amendment	
Supported	0,		•	
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comment	is:	Environme	ent Agency Constraints:	
		Pylon in the	e middle of site	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	_	Yorkshire	Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:				
<u>Jtilities</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?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	1,12	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:	o of land within racid	ontial area. Now regidential de	evelopment has recently been built on
	ne runs along wester	n side of site (capacity reduce	d to reflect this). Electricity pylon in
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 70	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Hill Foot Farm, Pudsey

Site Ref: 2120

Site Details

Northing: 435828 Area sq m: 27549.08 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 421551 Area Ha: 2.754908 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Utilities & Infrastructure - Post and Telecom

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): 1579.19 Distance to bus stop (metres) 424.90 Nearest Railway Station **New Pudsey** Bus Stop ID 1151 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: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: Conservation Areas Yes No 0.00 Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%): Listed Buildings: No Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Triangular shaped site consisting of a single field currently with an agricultural use. Road frontage on the northern and eatern sides, to the south the site links to residential development. There is a pylon on the north east boundary with wires that run across the site. Some trees line the boundaries of the site but there are no other features of note.

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:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H25/252/77/	Outline application to erect s how house to form nurse ry garden with car park for 10 0 cars, to grazing land. (sit	09/05/1977	25/07/1977	R	99.42
H25/411/74/	Outline application to erect r esidential development, to va cant site, (site area 2.1ha (5 acres)).	16/10/1974	10/02/1975	R	98.78

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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro Accessibility comment Poor public transport. Good accessibility to health services and primary /secondary schools. Access Comments Good frontage onto adopted highway, requires footways. Local network comment Congestion on Ring Road. Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, link with other sites, footway works, improvements to highways and ring road connections. Need to combine with other sites: Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Possible Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England: Education Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Constraints:	HLAA Conclusions			
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro Accessibility comment Poor public transport. Good accessibility to health services and primary /secondary schools. 3 Access Comments Good frontage onto adopted highway, requires footways. 4 Local network comment Congestion on Ring Road. 3 Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, link with other sites, footway works, improvements to highways and ring road connections. Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: Possible Highways Agency Na Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England: Education Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme	Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Medium term (6-10 years)
Access Comments Poor public transport. Good accessibility to health services and primary /secondary schools. Access Comments Good frontage onto adopted highway, requires footways. 4 Local network comment Congestion on Ring Road. 3 Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, link with other sites, footway works, improvements to highways and ring road connections. Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: Vas but only with public transport improvements, link with other sites, ink with other sites, and highway Highways Agency Va Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England: Education Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Comme	Summary of Infrastructure provider	comments and o	ther plannin	g requirements
Poor public transport. Good accessibility to health services and primary /secondary schools. Access Comments Good frontage onto adopted highway, requires footways. Local network comment Congestion on Ring Road. Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, link with other sites, footway works, improvements to highways and ring road connections. Support? Need to combine with other sites: Yes but only with public transport myrovements, link with other sites; Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Possible Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Comme	Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Access Comments Good frontage onto adopted highway, requires footways. Local network comment Congestion on Ring Road. Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, link with other sites, footway works, improvements to highways and ring road connections. Need to combine with other sites: Support? Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Possible Highways Agency Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Constraints: Finvironment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Treatment Works Comme	Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5)
Good frontage onto adopted highway, requires footways. Local network comment Rank (1-5 Congestion on Ring Road. 3 Mitigation measure Total sco Public transport bus improvements, link with other sites, footway works, improvements to highways and ring road connections. Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: Possible Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 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 Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: LCC Flood Risk Management:	Poor public transport. Good accessibility to health s	services and primary /seco	ondary schools.	3
Local network comment Congestion on Ring Road. Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, link with other sites, footway works, improvements to highways and ring road connections. Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: Possible Possible Highways Agency New Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Environment Agency Constraints: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Possible Total sco 10 Boundary Suitability for partial development: Possible Possible	Access Comments			Rank (1-5)
Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, link with other sites, footway works, improvements to highways and ring road connections. Need to combine with other sites: Support? Need to combine with other sites: Suitability for partial development: Possible Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Possible	Good frontage onto adopted highway, requires foo	tways.		4
Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, link with other sites, footway works, improvements to highways and ring road connections. Support? Need to combine with other sites: Yes but only with public transport improvements, link with other sites. Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Possible Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Possible Possible Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amendment Supported Natural England: Education Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	Local network comment			Rank (1-5)
Mitigation measure Public transport bus improvements, link with other sites, footway works, improvements to highways and ring road connections. Need to combine with other sites: Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Possible Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Possible West vorks and highway Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	Congestion on Ring Road.			3
Public transport bus improvements, link with other sites, footway works, improvements to highways and ring road connections. Need to combine with other sites: Yes but only with public transport improvements, link with other sites, and highway Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Possible Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Possible Need to combine with 1114 and 1110 Possible 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 Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme				
Support? Need to combine with other sites: Yes but only with public transport improvements, link with other sites, and highway Highways Agency 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 Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	Mitigation measure			Total scor
Yes but only with public transport improvements, link with other sites, and highway Highways Agency In/a 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 LCC Flood Risk Management:		sites, footway works, impr	ovements to high	ways 10
transport improvements, link with other sites, and highway Highways Agency India 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 LCC Flood Risk Management:	Support? Need to combin	ne with other sites:	Suitability f	or 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 Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	transport improvements, link	with 1114 and 1110	Possible	
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 LCC Flood Risk Management:	Highways Agency			
Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	n/a			
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comment: Yorkshire Water Management:	Network Rail :			
Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Forkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	<u>Biodiversity</u>			
Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office	er: Boundary	y Amendment	
Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Environment Agency Constraints: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	Supported			
Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	Natural England:			
Environment Agency Comments: Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	<u>Education</u>			
Yorkshire Water Comments: Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment Works Comme LCC Flood Risk Management:	<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>			
LCC Flood Risk Management:	Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	gency Constrain	ts:
LCC Flood Risk Management:				
	Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water T	reatment Works Comme
	LCC Flood Risk Management:			
	-			

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)		1 2 2 2
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
Site i			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	110	
•••			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	amant.		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
and should be considered alongs are relatively close to Farnley tow and well defined and this area for	side 1114 & 1110, both als vn centre the UDP Review rms part of a an important	so PAS sites. Whilst the so Inspector commented the tract of open land and co	Green Belt. This is part of a larger area ites have links to the settlement and at the urban edge of Farnley is clear uld contribute to Green Belt purposes. art of a comprehensive assessment of
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	. 72	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Cor	nclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not assess	sed	Not assessed

Site Name: Calverley Lane, Farsley

Site Ref: 2121

Site Ref: 2123 Site Name: Low Moor Side, New Farnley

Site Details

Northing: 430894 Area sq m: 57250.75 Ward Farnley and Wortley
Easting: 424553 Area Ha: 5.725075 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

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):2949.07Distance to bus stop (metres)184.87Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID4741

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:

Mix of fields and scrubland with an agricultural use. The site is surrounded on three sides by residential development, whilst to the west a road frontage runs along the site. Some trees are sporadically positioned around the site, also informal walkways are visible.

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)

Site Ref: 2123 Site Name: Low Moor Side, New Farnley

Site Ref: 2123 Site Name: Low Moor Side, New 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:** 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: 2123 Site Name: Low Moor Side, New Farnley

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA C	Conclusions				
Availability:	Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Medium term (6-10 years
Summary	of Infrastructu	re provide	er comments and	other plann	ing requirements
Leeds City	/ Council Highway	s inc Metro			
	ty comment				Rank (1
Poor					2
Access Co	mments				Rank (1
Access ach	ievable, better to use l	₋ow Moor Sdie	Lane than Walsh Lane		4
Local netw	ork comment				Rank (1
A58 conges	stion				3
Mitigation	measure				Total s
					9
Support?		Need to comb	oine with other sites:	Suitabilit	y for partial development
Yes					
Highways Comments A					
Network R	ail :				
<u>Biodiversi</u>	<u>ty</u>				
West Yorks	hire Ecology and LC0	CEcology Offi	icer: Bound	dary Amendment	
Natural Eng	ıland:				
<u>Education</u>					
Drainage/\	Nater/Flooding				
Environmer	nt Agency Comments	:	Environmen	t Agency Constra	aints:
Yorkshire W	Vater Comments:		Yorkshire W	ater Waste Wate	r Treatment Works Comn
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	• Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	-	,
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?	(10/11)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of provious	Yes	No	Unknown
Experience of previous encampments	(Text)	INU	Olikilowii
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	rea of Search) on the e	existing UDP not within the	Green Belt. Strong links to settlement,
road frontage and well contained			ter to use Low Moor Sdie Lane than
Walsh Lane, poor accessibility.			
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	129	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail (Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not ass	sessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Low Moor Side, New Farnley

Site Ref: 2123

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 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?:

No

Site Ref: 2159 Site Name: Craven Park, Whitehall Road, Farnley

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:				
Education				
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	.	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: 430084 Area sq m: 109025.16 Ward Farnley and Wortley
Easting: 424216 Area Ha: 10.902516 HMCA: Outer 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 amenity & open space

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Poorly defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3168.05Distance to bus stop (metres)281.94Nearest Railway StationCottingleyBus Stop ID6177

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 AreasYesAncient Monument/Battlefield(%):0.00Listed Buildings:Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Large site consisting of several fields currently with an agricultural use. Set between Gildersome and New Farnley the site links poorly with both settlements. To the north there is a narrow road frontage set inbetween residential properties. The bulk of the site is to the south near Gildersome, here there is no road frontage or connection to the settlement. Few features on site, it is flat with some sporadic trees dotted along the field boundaries. Site is surrounded by further fields on all sides.

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:	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

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 development? Overall Coalescence Conclusion: Coalescence/merging 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 marginal effect on the setting & special character of historic features, which c **Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:** Performs poorly in green belt terms. Development of site would merge two settlements, also it is poorly related to built up area and could 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

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

Regeneration Priority Area:

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability:	LDF to determine Achievability: Long to	erm (11+ years)
ummary of Infrastructure provide	er comments and other planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		D
Accessibility comment Access point makes site remote from most faciliti	ies	Rank (1-5
		2
Access Comments		Rank (1-5
No safe access possible at location that the site Gildersome Lane junction.	meets the highway at the Whitehall Road /	1
Local network comment		Rank (1-5
A58 congestion		3
Mitigation measure		Total sco
		6
Support? Need to comb	bine with other sites: Suitability for par	tial development:
No		
INO		
NO .		
Highways Agency		
Highways Agency Network Rail :		
Highways Agency Network Rail : Biodiversity		
Highways Agency Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Offi	1.1	
Highways Agency Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office Supported with mitigation. The southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood in the southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood in the southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood in the southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood in the southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the southern boundary proposed allocation lie	y of this Beck. This is	
Highways Agency Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office Supported with mitigation. The southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood I an important wildlife corridor and UK BAP priority	y of this Beck. This is habitat which	
Highways Agency Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office Supported with mitigation. The southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood I can important wildlife corridor and UK BAP priority should be protected and enhanced by providing a puffer from development of 20 metres. There are	y of this Beck. This is habitat which a minimum a number of	
Highways Agency Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office Supported with mitigation. The southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood I can important wildlife corridor and UK BAP priority should be protected and enhanced by providing a puffer from development of 20 metres. There are needgerows that should be protected and enhance	y of this Beck. This is habitat which a minimum a number of	
Highways Agency Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office Supported with mitigation. The southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood I an important wildlife corridor and UK BAP priority should be protected and enhanced by providing a buffer from development of 20 metres. There are the degerows that should be protected and enhance	y of this Beck. This is habitat which a minimum a number of	
Highways Agency Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office Supported with mitigation. The southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood I can important wildlife corridor and UK BAP priority should be protected and enhanced by providing a puffer from development of 20 metres. There are needgerows that should be protected and enhanced Natural England:	y of this Beck. This is habitat which a minimum a number of	
Highways Agency Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office Supported with mitigation. The southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood I can important wildlife corridor and UK BAP priority should be protected and enhanced by providing a buffer from development of 20 metres. There are the degrows that should be protected and enhanced Natural England:	y of this Beck. This is habitat which a minimum a number of	
Highways Agency Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office Supported with mitigation. The southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood I are important wildlife corridor and UK BAP priority should be protected and enhanced by providing a puffer from development of 20 metres. There are needgerows that should be protected and enhanced Natural England: Education	y of this Beck. This is habitat which a minimum a number of	
Highways Agency Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office Supported with mitigation. The southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood I can important wildlife corridor and UK BAP priority should be protected and enhanced by providing a puffer from development of 20 metres. There are needgerows that should be protected and enhanced Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding	y of this Beck. This is habitat which a minimum a number of	
Highways Agency Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office Supported with mitigation. The southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood It an important wildlife corridor and UK BAP priority should be protected and enhanced by providing a buffer from development of 20 metres. There are the degerows that should be protected and enhanced Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding	y of this Beck. This is y habitat which a minimum a number of ed.	
Highways Agency Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Office Supported with mitigation. The southern boundary proposed allocation lies along the Farnley Wood I an important wildlife corridor and UK BAP priority should be protected and enhanced by providing a buffer from development of 20 metres. There are hedgerows that should be protected and enhanced Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:	y of this Beck. This is y habitat which a minimum a number of ed.	

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:

<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 Assessn	nent				
Could site be effectively	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	Yes		No		Unknown	
encampments	(Text)					
Conclusion of Asses	sment					
Conclusion summary:						
Green Belt site. The site is isolate Development would represent a safe access possible where the s	significant incurs	sion into Green Belt	, contri	buting to the coaleso	cence of the settlement	:s. No sibility
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 2	245 Floors	space	sq m (Non resident	ial):	(
Residential Conclusion:	I	Retail Conclusion:		E	Employment Conclusi	on:
Red	I	Red		F	Red	

Site Name: Whitehall Road, Gildersome, LS12

Site Ref: 3001

Site Details

Northing: 433163 Area sq m: 16273.54 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 419375 Area Ha: 1.627354 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Storage
Existing Use 2: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Vacant and derelict - Vacant land
Neighbouring Use 3: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Other uses:

Site State: Mix

Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage **~** Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2097.82 Distance to bus stop (metres) 89.54 Nearest Railway Station **New Pudsey** Bus Stop ID 4242 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: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 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:

The southern section of the site is an occupied employment site, currently used as a garage and for vehicle strorage. Past this to the north is vacant scrub land. The northern section borders more unused land but this is raised higher than the site creating a natural boundary. Road frontage runs along the western border with residential development on the other side, opposite to the east is a row of trees with a railway line beyond. To the south is more employment.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	72.28	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:	16.29		

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 %
25/299/92/FU	Single storey car showroom and 4 pump islands with canopy	25/11/1992	18/06/1993	Α	100.00
H25/190/79/	Laying out of culvert with oil interceptor, to proposedhotel . (outline a	02/04/1979	25/06/1979	W	98.38
25/253/92/FU	Amendment to planning permission ref 91/25/00156 relating to final contour levels to landfill site m	17/09/1992	22/12/1992	Α	62.20
H25/156/91/	Tipping of inert material to f ormer railway. (site area 4.12ha) m	03/07/1991	11/11/1991	Α	73.84
25/299/94/FU	Use of vacant site as cable company compound and erection of detached workshop	07/12/1994	10/01/1995	R	14.05
PREAPP/09/00026		13/03/2009	01/06/2009	PRECAG	100.00
25/37/98/RE	Extension of permission for single storey showroom and 4 petrol pump islands with canopy	17/02/1998	08/09/1999	Α	100.00
H25/434/78/	Outline application to layout access and erect 2-storeyhotel, car showroom, and garage wit h workshop, and office, an	27/06/1978	15/01/1979	А	98.24
25/81/95/FU	Detached prefabricated office unit to garage	20/04/1995	30/06/1995	А	21.38
H25/117/84/	Tipping operations and regradi ng of contours to form green and landscaping, to golf cour se.	19/06/1984	03/06/1986	Α	63.52
H25/446/75/	Demolition of existing garage buildings and alterationsand e xtension, to form new car show room, comprising showroom,	07/07/1975	01/03/1976	Α	14.32
H25/18/75/	Laying out, filling, levelling a nd landscaping of vacant land.	10/01/1975	24/03/1975	А	61.06
H25/441/76/	Tipping of excavated material, to existing ravine.	07/07/1976	21/12/1976	А	20.52
H25/178/79/	Laying out of access and erect ion of 2 storey, 51 bedro om, hotel and restaurant, and single storey car showroom a	13/03/1979	25/06/1979	А	98.85
H25/441/76/1	Extension of permission to car ry out tipping of excav ated material to existing ravi ne. (previous applicatio	22/05/1979	04/02/1980	Α	20.97
H25/117/84/1	Renewal of permission for tipp ing operations and regra ding of contours to form green and landscaping to golf cours	29/06/1989	13/06/1990	A	63.35

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 of	levelopment?		
Would development result in isolated development	ment?		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	poundaries with existing built up area)?	✓	
Would development of the site effectively "round development develop	nd off" the settlement pattern?:	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	kisting 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	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 en	ncroachment		
Is there a strong defensible boundary between	the site and the existing urban area?	✓	
Does the site provide access to the countrysid	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 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 of	on the setting and special character of his	toric features	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Site is part brownfield, well contained and well	connected to the built up area.		
Conformity with Core Strate	Э 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 unrel	ated to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:			
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	100.00 West Leeds Gatev	vay:	0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF to	determine	Achievability: Short term	n (0-5yrs)
ummary of Infrastructure provider com	ments and c	ther planning requ	iirements
_eeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment		i.	Rank (1-5
Average public transport accessibility. Good access to hea education.	Ith services, prima	ary and secondary	4
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Access achievable on Dick Lane but with signals or acces	s works		4
Local network comment		l	Rank (1-5
Local spare capacity, cumulative congestion likely on A64	7		4
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Access works, possible public transport improvements, po	ssible capacity co	entributions.	12
Support? Need to combine with	other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
Yes		Yes as only part of sit transport	e has good public
Network Rail: General asset protection issues Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported	Boundar 	ry Amendment	
Natural England:			
Education			
<u> Drainage/Water/Flooding</u>			
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Torkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wat	er Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme

Site Ref: 3011	Site Name:	Dick Lane Garage, Dic Bradford, BD3	k Lane, Thornbury,
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 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	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
(protected playing pitch). It is con	nsidered that the site rould prevent develor	use and partly Green Belt and design could be developed without encroad ment. The site is well contained but in the site is well as we	aching into the pitch area. There
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 51	Floorspace sq m (Non re	sidential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not a	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Details

 Northing:
 433525
 Area sq m:
 11890.31
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 420556
 Area Ha:
 1.189031
 HMCA:
 Outer 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:

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 971.01 Distance to bus stop (metres) 166.12 Nearest Railway Station **New Pudsey** Bus Stop ID 11093 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

Boundaries:

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

Public Rights of Way: No

Flat

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Northern most part of a larger collection of sites. Small site consisting of half a field that slopes east to west, roughly triangular in shape. To the east are the rear gardens of a row of houses, though there is no road access from the site to the highway. The southern section of the site borders a collection of trees whilst the western part cuts through the field with no visible boundary on the ground. No buildings or feature of note on site.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.12	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

Poorly defined

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
08/06471/FU	Detached stable block and detached single storey tractor shed and store with tack room	24/11/2008	03/03/2009	R	95.94
09/01759/FU	Detached stable block and tack room	23/04/2009	14/07/2009	R	95.97

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 d	evelopment?					
Would development result in isolated development?						
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	oundaries with existing buil	t up area)? \Box				
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: No						
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	isting barrier between existi	ing 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 c	ontain				
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 ur	ban 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 prote	ected, or				
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?	✓				
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agr	icultural use?				
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion						
The site does not perform an important role in	safeguarding the countrysic	le from encroachm	ent			
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic towns					
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or othe	r 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 ch	naracter of historic	features			
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Relates poorly to settlement, high potential for	further sprawl into the gree	n belt.		7		
	sp 9					
Conformity with Core Strateg	Т					
Main Urban Area	Main Urban Area Extensio	n 🔳	Brownfield			
Major Settlement	Major Settlement Extensio	n 🔳	Greenfield			
Smaller Settlement	Smaller Settlement Extens	ion 🔲	Mixed			
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension						
Development unrela	ated to existing developmer	nt 🔳				
Regeneration Priority Area:						
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire	Valley:		0.00		
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	100.00 West	Leeds Gateway:		0.00		

East Leeds

Utilities

HLAA Conclusions					
Availability: Unknown	Suitability: LE	OF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+	years)
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider c	omments and	other plann	ing requiren	nents
Leeds City Council High	vays inc Metro				
Accessibility comment	iona access to boolth	acriicae and primari	advantion Avera	~ ~	Rank (1-5)
Good public transport connect accessibility to secondary educ		services and primary	education. Avera	ge	4
Access Comments					Rank (1-5)
Requires 1195 and 3124 to co	ome forward.				3
Local network comment					Rank (1-5)
Local capacity, congestion in	pudsey and A647.				3
Mitigation measure					Total score
Improvements to Bradley Lan improvements, footway impro required.				be	10
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability	y for partial deve	lopment:
Yes with mitigation.	1195 and 3124		Yes		
Highways Agency					
n/a					
Network Rail :					
<u>Biodiversity</u>					
West Yorkshire Ecology and		1. 1	lary Amendment		
Supported but with mitigation t connectivity in the north area v bats from a nearby roost.					
Natural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
Drainage/Water/Flooding					
Environment Agency Commo		Environment	Agency Constra	ints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire W	ater Waste Water	Treatment Work	s Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t·				

Site Ref: 3039	Site Name:	Land behind 115-127 Wate LS28 8LQ	rloo Road, Pudsey,
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:			<u> </u>
	n existing houses or b	ties on Waterloo Road. There is no directly development of the site to the south. The south of the for further Green Belt sprawl.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 37	Floorspace sq m (Non resident	ial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Red	ı	Red

Site Details

 Northing:
 433187
 Area sq m:
 34785.73
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 420599
 Area Ha:
 3.478573
 HMCA:
 Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1239.16 Distance to bus stop (metres) 281.93 Nearest Railway Station **New Pudsey** Bus Stop ID 11093 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: Strategic Employment Buffer: 0.00 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:

South western part of a larger collection of sites. Long thin site that is set away from the settlement. Sloping east to west, the site is heavily treed on the eastern side and cuts through parts of open fields to the west. Site boundary relates poorly to what is on the ground, with no clear defined boundaries to the south.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	100.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	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 %
25/65/02/CLU	Certificate of lawfulness for use of land for stabling of horses and retention of one residential caravan	12/03/2002	17/01/2003	Α	44.14

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 develop	ment?	\checkmark
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+	boundaries with existing built up area)?	
Would development of the site effectively "rou	and off" the settlement pattern?:	No
Do natural/physical features provide a good e area and undeveloped land?	xisting barrier between existing urban	✓
Overall sprawl conclusion: High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl		
Prevent neighbouring towns from merging	ı	
Would development of the site lead to physica	al connection of settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good e development?	existing barrier/boundary to contain	
Overall Coalescence Conclusion:		
No merging but there is no defensible boundary	ary	
Assist in safeguarding countryside from e	ncroachment	
Is there a strong defensible boundary betwee	n the site and the existing urban area?	✓
Does the site provide access to the countrysic	de?	✓
Does the site include local or national conservation	vation 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 agricul	ltural land?	✓
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>n</u>	
The site performs an important role safeguard	ling countryside from encroachment	
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic towns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	n 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	storic features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:		
Isolated site that is set away from the settlem countryside. High potential for further sprawl.	ent. Relates poorly to the built enviroment	and would impact on 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	
Development unre	elated to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:		
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	100.00 West Leeds Gate	way: 0.00

East Leeds

Availability: Unknown	Suitability: LDF to	o determine Achievability: Long term ((11+ years)
ummary of Infrastru	ucture provider con	nments and other planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment	_		Rank (1-
Good public transport connect accessibility to secondary educations and secondary educations are secondary educations.		h services and primary education. Average	4
Access Comments		<u>'</u>	Rank (1-
Requires 1195 and 3124 to	come forward.		3
Local network comment		l	Rank (1-
Local capacity, congestion in	n pudsey and A647.		3
Mitigation measure			Total sco
		Road, public transport bus stop d, local capacity improvements may be	10
Support?	Need to combine with	h other sites: Suitability for partial of	development:
Yes with mitigation	1195 and 3124	Yes	
Highways Agency			
n/a <mark>Network Rail :</mark>			
Biodiversity			
Nest Yorkshire Ecology an	d LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Not supported (RED). No site Beck and well wooded strip a potential Leeds Habitat Netw species such as bats.	nd scrub, UK BAP Priority H	labitat	
Natural England:			
<u>Education</u>			
Orainage/Water/Flooding	<u>a</u>		
Environment Agency Comn	nents:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments	::	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment \	Norks Comme
			3

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 3040	Site Name:	Land Adjacent to (Leeds Ma Gibralter Mills, Gibralter Ro	-
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:			
		oment would represent a significant incursi	
unrelated to the existing settleme	int form, separated by	y a dense line of trees with no access to th	e sile of road frontage.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 91	Floorspace sq m (Non residentia	al):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	mployment Conclusion:
Red	Red	R	ed

Site Name: Site Ref: 3041 Land at Bramley Lane/Gibralter Lane Junction, Pudsey, LS28 8

Site Details

29405.07 433183 Area sq m: Northing: Ward Pudsey 420804 Easting: Area Ha: 2.940507 HMCA: **Outer 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: Mixed

Site Detail

SFRA Flood Zone:

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1170.17 Distance to bus stop (metres) 204.85 7443

Nearest Railway Station **New Pudsey** Bus Stop ID

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:

No

1.00

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site can be split into two broad sections. The north west section contains existing residential development. This is separated from the rest of the site by a narrow road which runs through the centre of the site and then along the western boundary. The other section (to the south of the road) consists of scrub land set on a steep slope. Trees are prominent on the slope, especially just above the road.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	62.61	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?:

Site Name: Land at Bramley Lane/Gibralter Lane Junction, Pudsey, LS28 8 Site Ref: 3041

Site Ref: 3041 Site Name: Land at Bramley Lane/Gibralter Lane Junction, Pudsey, LS28 8

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	ment?			
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	oundaries with existing built up are	ea)?		
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?	sisting barrier between existing urba	an 🗌		
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 ex development?	kisting barrier/boundary 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 urban are	ea?		
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?	es, hedgerows that are protected, o	r 🗆		
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricult	ural land?	✓		
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultura	l use?		
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	<u>!</u>			
The site performs an important role safeguardi	ng countryside from encroachment	İ		
Preserve the setting and special character	of historic towns			
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?	area, listed building or other histori	ical		
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:				
Part green belt site. This section performs poo countryside, doesn't relate well to settlement.	rly in GB terms. High potential for s	sprawl as it extends into the		
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			
Development unrela	ated to existing development			
Regeneration Priority Area:			0.00	
Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley:				
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	100.00 West Leeds	Gateway:	0.00	

Site Ref: 3041 Site Name: Land at Bramley Lane/Gibralter Lane Junction, Pudsey, LS28 8

East Leeds

HLAA C	Conclusions	;			
Availability:	Unknown	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+ years)
ummary	of Infrastru	cture provide	r comments a	nd other plann	ing requirements
Leeds City	/ Council Highy	vays inc Metro			
	ty comment				Rank (1-5)
Jood acces	sibility all round.				4
Access Co	mments				Rank (1-5)
Requires 1 ^r Road.	195 and 3124 to co	ome forward, unsuit	able to have access	on private road of Gib	oraltar 3
Local netw	ork comment				Rank (1-5)
Local capad	city, congestion in	pudsey and A647.			3
Mitigation	measure				Total score
Improveme improveme	nts to Bradley Lan nts, footway impro	vements on Waterlo	nterloo Road, public too Road, private ped capacity improvemen	estrian/cycle route	10
Support?		Need to comb	ine with other sites	: Suitability	y for partial development:
Yes with mi	tigation	1195 and 3124		Yes	
Highways n/a Network R					
<u> Biodiversi</u>	<u>ty</u>				
Not supporte grassland or	ed (RED). No site-	LCC Ecology Offices pecific designation and grassland present will differ corridor.	s but acidic Su ent and also exc dra	wing RM/3041. Mitiga	
Natural Eng	ıland:		ens	sure impacts on aujac	ent nabitats are addressed.
<u>Education</u>					
Drainage/\	Nater/Flooding				
Environmer	nt Agency Commo	ents:	Environn	nent Agency Constra	aints:
Vorkehiro M	Vater Comments:		Vorkobi:	o Water Waste Water	r Treatment Works Comme
I DI KSHILE V	vater Comments:		TOTKSHIF	e vvalei vvaste vvatei	Treatment Works Comine
00 Fland	Risk Managemen	4 -			

<u>Utilities</u>

Site Ref: 3041	Site Name:	Land at Bramley Lane/Gibi Junction, Pudsey, LS28 8	ralter 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	(Text)	<u> </u>	1		
site?					
Proximity to housed	Yes	No			
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	1338			
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown		
encampments	(Text)	140	OTIKITOWIT		
Conclusion of Asses	sment				
Conclusion summary:					
Part of the site is within the urban area and has existing houses on it. The rest is set in the Green Belt, on steep sloping					
	ment would represer	nt a significant incursion into Green Belt,			
octionion form. Olbrana reduce	and an about	•			
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 77	Floorspace sq m (Non resident	tial):		
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:		
Red	Red	1	Not assessed		

9EY

Site Details

 Northing:
 433124
 Area sq m:
 19691.94
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 423284
 Area Ha:
 1.969194
 HMCA:
 Outer 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: Agriculture

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Undulating Boundaries: Poorly defined Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1454.53 Distance to bus stop (metres) 249.91

Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 6956

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:

Small square site that is currently vacant scrub land. Single dwelling on site in the north west corner, this is also the only part of the site that links to an acess road (narrow, single track). The rear gardens of residential properties abut the western boundary, three other sides adjoin further fields. Sporadic trees on site, mainly along the borders but there are a few within the field.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.50	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?: No

9EY

9EY

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 exiarea and undeveloped land?	isting 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 settlement	ts?					
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to development?	o 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?	\checkmark					
Does the site include local or national conservation designated areas?						
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?	agricultural use?					
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion						
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the country:	side from encroachment					
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 no effect on the setting and special character of historic features						
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Site would extend into green belt. Doesn't relate particularly well to the sconnected on one side.	settlement, no road frontage and only					
Conformity with Core Strategy						
Main Urban Area Main Urban Area Extens	sion Brownfield					
Major Settlement Extens	sion Greenfield					
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement Exte	ension Mixed					
Villages/Rural Village/Rural Extension						
Development unrelated to existing development	nent					
Regeneration Priority Area:						
Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Air	re Valley: 0.00					
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 100.00 We	est Leeds Gateway: 0.00					

9EY

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	s			
Availability: Unknown	Suitability: LDF	to determine	Achievability: Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastru	ucture provider co	mments and c	ther planning requi	rements
Loodo City Council High	waya ina Matra			
Leeds City Council High Accessibility comment	ways inc wetro			Rank (1-5
Poor public transport accessi	blity. Good access to healt	h services and prima	ry / secondary education.	3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
No frontage onto adopted high	ghway, requires developme	ent of adjacent land b	out not preferred site.	2
Local network comment			1	Rank (1-5)
Local congestion on Outer R	ing Road and Pudsey.			3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Public transport bus improve works on local highway.	ments, footway improvements	ents on Hough Side F	Road, possible capacity	8
Support?	Need to combine wi	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial d	evelopment:
No	Yes with 1060 and 12	213	Possible	
Highways Agency				
_{n/a} <u>Network Rail :</u>				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	d LCC Ecology Officer:	Bounda	ry Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding		Environment 4	Agency Constraints:	
Environment Agency confin	ionia.		.g	
Yorkshire Water Comments	 ::	Yorkshire Wat	er Waste Water Treatment V	Vorks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	nt:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessme	nt		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Would gypsies and	Yes	No		Maybe
travellers live on the	(Text)	110		IMAYDO
site?				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)	140		OTIKITOWIT
•				
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. Development wo	uld extend out eas	stwards from the existing	a settlement form ar	nd not relate well to the
existing settlement. The site has				
with SHLAA ref 1060 and 1213.				
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	62	Floorspace	sq m (Non resident	ial):
Residential Conclusion:	Ret	ail Conclusion:	E	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Red	b	F	Red

Site Ref: 3048

Site Name: Land behind 23-41 Kent Close, Pudsey, LS28

9JT

Site Details

 Northing:
 432753
 Area sq m:
 32212.93
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 423394
 Area Ha:
 3.221293
 HMCA:
 Outer 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: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1754.97 Distance to bus stop (metres) 106.71

Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 9845

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:

Majority of site is has an agricultural use consisting of several fields. The site slopes downwards north to south. In the south west corner is an old farmhouse and other outbuildings, no other buildings are located on the site. Roads run along the southern and western boundary. To the north the site abuts some residential development, and to the east of this it wraps around an existing livery stables which also links to a further access point. The eastern boundary is poorly defined cutting across existing fields.

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:	0.34	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

9JT

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
25/326/96/FU	Single storey rear extension to residential home	03/12/1996	28/01/1997	R	10.32
25/327/96/LI	Listed building application for single storey rear extension to residential home	03/12/1996	28/01/1997	R	10.32

9JT

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	rith 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 barrier area and undeveloped land?	r 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 existing barrie development?	r/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?	the existing diban area:	✓				
Does the site include local or national conservation design.	ated areas?					
Does the site include areas of woodlands, trees, hedgerow significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?						
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?		✓				
	Are 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						
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed		✓				
feature?						
If yes, could development preserve this character?:						
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:						
Development of the site would have marginal effect on the	setting & special character of	historic features, which c				
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:						
Site has good links to the built up area. Well contained by may lead to further sprawl to the east as there is no defens		, however, development				
Conformity with Core Strategy						
Main Urban Area Main Urbar	Area Extension	Brownfield				
	ement Extension	Greenfield				
Smaller Settlement Smaller Set	ttlement Extension	Mixed				
Villages/Rural Village/Rur	al Extension	MINOG				
Development unrelated to exist						
Regeneration Priority Area:						
Inner South Leeds: 0.0	00 Aire Valley:	0.00				
Loads Bradford Carridor: 100 (Meet Leads Catewa	0.00				

9JT

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Unknown	Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability: Long terr	n (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provide	er comments and	other planning requ	uirements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Poor public transport accessibli	ty. Good access to	o health services and prir	mary/ secondary education.	3
Access Comments			'	Rank (1-5
Good frontage onto adopted hi	ghway from two si	ides		5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Local congestion on Outer Ring	g Road and Pudse	ЭУ		3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Public transport bus improvement	ents, possible cap	acity works on local high	way.	11
				''
Support?	Need to comb	ine with other sites:	Suitability for partia	I development:
Partial Yes with mitigation and improvements in public transport.	Yes with 1060,	3048, 1213, 3050	Yes	
Highways Agency				
n/a				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology and I	₋CC Ecology Offi	cer: Bound	lary Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comme	nts:	Environment	t Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire W	ater Waste Water Treatmen	t Works Comme
LCC Flood Bioli Monocono				
LCC Flood Risk Management	1			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
rife and Nescue 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)		Maybo
J			
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. The site is well r	elated to the existing u	rban area. There is a Liste	ed Building on site which would need to
be taken into consideration at def	ailed design stage. Go	ood access from Troydale	Lane.
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 85	Floorspace sq m (N	Non residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail (Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Red		Red

Site Name: Troydale Farm, Troydale Lane, Pudsey, LS28

Site Ref: 3050

Site Details

 Northing:
 433049
 Area sq m:
 8810.59
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 419782
 Area Ha:
 0.881059
 HMCA:
 Outer 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: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1845.78Distance to bus stop (metres)198.94Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID12780

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:

Grassland that adjoins residential development to south and west. No constraints on site.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.05	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 %
H25/460/76/	Renewal of existing outline pe rmission to erect resid ential development, to vacant site, (site area 1.36ha (3.	13/07/1976	25/10/1976	А	84.43
25/88/02/OT	Outline application to erect residential development	28/03/2002	06/06/2002	R	100.00
H25/228/77/	Outline application to layout roads and erect resid ential development, to vacant allotments. (site area	28/04/1977	16/05/1977	W	94.35

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 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 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: 100.00 West Leeds Gatew	yay: 0.00					

East Leeds

Gas:

		Achievability: Medium ter	m (6-10 years)
ummary of Infrastructure provider co	mments and o	ther planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment		1	Rank (1-5
Poor public transport and health service connection. Go	ood access to primary	/ secondary education.	3
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Access onto Tyersal Close acheivable but requires foc	otway works.		4
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Local spare capacity, cumulative congestion likely on A	A647.		4
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Footway works.			11
Support? Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial o	development:
No due to poor 15 min public transport and health accessbility.		Yes as bus stop nearby	
<u> lighways Agency</u>			
1/2			
Network Rail :			
Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Network Rail : Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England: Education	Boundar	y Amendment	
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported		y Amendment gency Constraints:	
Network Rail: Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Natural England: Education Orainage/Water/Flooding	Environment A		Works Comme
Riodiversity Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer: Supported Ratural England: Education Orainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	gency Constraints:	Works Comme

Site Ref: 3121	Site Name:	Land at rear of 41 Tyre Bradford, BD4 8HJ	sal Avenue, Tyersal,
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 (Text)	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of previous	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
encampments			
	(1211)		
	(15)		
Conclusion of Asses			
Conclusion of Asses Conclusion summary:			
	sment	t, not within the Green Belt.	
Conclusion summary:	sment I within the settlemen	t, not within the Green Belt. Floorspace sq m (Non re	sidential):
Conclusion summary: The site is an area of vacant land	sment I within the settlemen		sidential): Employment Conclusion:

Site Details

 Northing:
 433304
 Area sq m:
 35663.44
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 420631
 Area Ha:
 3.566344
 HMCA:
 Outer 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 CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1120.16Distance to bus stop (metres)162.13Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID11093

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:

Steep sloping site.

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

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
25/65/02/CLU	Certificate of lawfulness for use of land for stabling of horses and retention of one residential caravan	12/03/2002	17/01/2003	Α	96.70
H25/45/79/	Tipping, to raise bank of beck , to vacant site.	24/01/1979	05/11/1979	W	12.65

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	development?	<u>✓</u>
Would development result in isolated development	ment?	✓
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	poundaries with existing built up area)?	
Would development of the site effectively "round	No	
Do natural/physical features provide a good ex area and undeveloped land?	kisting 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	al 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	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	ration 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 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:		
Site is slightly isolated from main urban area be sprawl.	out is well contained by trees, limiting the p	potential for further
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	
·	ated to existing development	
Regeneration Priority Area:	2.22 A: V/ II	2.22
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	100.00 West Leeds Gatew	<i>r</i> ay: 0.00

East Leeds

<u>Utilities</u> Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
vailability: Unknown Suitability:	LDF to determine	Achievability:	Long term (11+	years)
ummary of Infrastructure provide	er comments and ot	her planni	ing requiren	nents
eeds City Council Highways inc Metro				
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Good access to public transport, health and primeducation.	ary education. Average acces	ssibility to seco	ondary	4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Requires 1195 to come forward.				3
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Local capacity, congestion in pudsey and A647.				3
				3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Improvements to Bradley Lane and access to W improvements, footway improvements on Water required.			be	10
Support? Need to com	oine with other sites:	Suitability	for partial deve	lopment:
Yes with mitigation 1195		Yes		
Highways Agency		J L		
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
Vest Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Off	icer: Boundary	Amendment		
Supported with mitigation to protect and enhance seck to the south west - providing a 20 metre but	the Tyersal			
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Orainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Ag	ency Constra	ints:	
orkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water	Treatment Wor	ks Comme
.CC Flood Risk Management:				

Site Ref: 3124	Site Name:	Tyersal Beck East, Bradley Road, Pudsey	/ Lane/Gibraltar
Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:	Comico		
West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	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)	, -	1 2 2 2
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	INO	
			
		L	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
encampments	(TOM)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			-
Green Belt site. The site is set in settlement by site 1195. Whilst t	he site is slightly isola ducing the potential fo	ber of sites. It has a road frontage but is a lated it has the advantage of being natural or further sprawl. If it were developed alo	ly well contained by trees
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 94	Floorspace sq m (Non resident	tial):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Red	1	Red

Site Details

 Northing:
 433321
 Area sq m:
 28388.09
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 423633
 Area Ha:
 2.838809
 HMCA:
 Outer 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: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

 Natural Landscape:
 Limited Tree Cover
 Road Frontage
 ✓

 Distance to Rail Station (metres):
 1140.60
 Distance to bus stop (metres)
 89.55

 Nearest Railway Station
 Bramley
 Bus Stop ID
 13961

 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:

Greenfield site in agricultural use. Road frontage along northern boundary.

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:	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 %
H25/141/85/	Levelling and laying out of la nd for planting bed, formi ng vehicular access and car pa rking areas, in connection	26/04/1985	29/07/1985	R	95.36
H25/135/83/	Levelling and laying out of la nd for planting bed, formi ng vehicular access and car pa rking areas, in connection	28/06/1983	11/03/1985	R	95.31
H25/473/79/	Outline application to erect 4 bedroom detached bunga low and extensions, to form st ores and pig sty to existing b	09/07/1979	05/11/1979	R	95.51

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?: 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:** Site has strong links to the settlement and is well contained as it is surrounded by trees on the southern 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

Leeds Bradford Corridor: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Aire Valley:

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclus	sions			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infra	astructure provider c	comments and	other planning req	uirements
Leeds City Council	Highways inc Metro			
Accessibility commer				Rank (1-
No public transport or I	ocal services within walking dis	stance.		1
Access Comments				Rank (1-
Adequate frontage/s fo	or suitable access/es and visibi	ility splays within site /	adopted highway.	5
Local network comm	ent			Rank (1-
Possible cumulative in	npact in local area.			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
None None				
IVOITO				10
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for partia	al development:
no	no		no	
Highways Agency				
Comments Awaited				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecolo	gy and LCC Ecology Officer:	Bounda	ary Amendment	
Natural England:		I L		
Education _				
Drainage/Water/Flo	oding			
Environment Agency	Comments:	Environment	Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Com	ments:	Yorkshire Wa	ter Waste Water Treatmer	nt Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Mana	gement:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment	t		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe	
managed	(Text)	+ +	11100	
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe	
travellers live on the	(Text)	110	Mayoo	
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 has stro				
southern boundary. Could be de	veloped with SHLAA s	site 1060A with a combined acc	cess, poor accessibility.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 75	Floorspace sq m (Non	residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclus	sion:
Green	Red		Red	

Site Name: South of Hough Side, Pudsey

Site Ref: 3377A

Site Details

 Northing:
 433167
 Area sq m:
 45775.36
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 423753
 Area Ha:
 4.577536
 HMCA:
 Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

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

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1265.57

Distance to bus stop (metres) 273.19

Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 13961

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:

Heavily treed. No links to 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:	1.00
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?:

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? **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: 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 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:** Heavily wooded. Relates poorly to main urban area, slightly isolated position and performs an important role in safeguarding 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

Leeds Bradford Corridor: 100.00 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:

	Suitability:		Achievability:	
ummary of Infras	structure provider com	ments and o	ther planning re	quirements
-	•			•
Leeds City Council H Accessibility comment	ignways inc metro			Rank (1-5
	al services within walking distand	ce.		
	-			1
Access Comments				Rank (1-
Needs 3377A for access				
				3
Local network commen	nt			Rank (1-
possible cumulative impa	act in local area.			
·				4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
none				8
				0
Support?	Need to combine with	other sites:	Suitability for par	tial development:
no	no		no	
Highways Agency				
Comments Awaited				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	y Amendment	
Natural England:				
_				
Natural England: Education				
_				
<u>Education</u>				
_		Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Education Drainage/Water/Flood		Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Education Drainage/Water/Flood Environment Agency Co	omments:		<u> </u>	
Education Drainage/Water/Flood	omments:		gency Constraints: or Waste Water Treatm	ent Works Comme
Education Drainage/Water/Flood Environment Agency Co	omments:		<u> </u>	ent Works Comme
Education Drainage/Water/Flood Environment Agency Co	omments:		<u> </u>	ent Works Comme

Electric:					
Telecom:					
Fire and Rescue Services:					
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:				
English Heritage:					
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessm	nent			
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	Yes		No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)				
Conclusion of Asses	sment				
Conclusion summary:					
Green Belt site. Site B is heavily	wooded, has n	o road frontage an	d relate	s poorly to the exis	ting settlement.
Site Capacity (dwellings units):		Floorspace sq m (Non residential):		ntial):	
Residential Conclusion:	ı	Retail Conclusion	:		Employment Conclusion:
Red	F	Red			Red

Site Name: South of Hough Side, Pudsey

Site Ref: 3377B

Site Details

 Northing:
 432610
 Area sq m:
 5725.22
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 421637
 Area Ha:
 0.572522
 HMCA:
 Outer 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: 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):1767.61Distance to bus stop (metres)171.52Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID4606

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:

Brownfield site in urban area. Vacant building over half of the site.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
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 %
25/170/96/FU	Extension to side and laying out of car park to factory	02/07/1996	03/12/1996	Α	56.13
25/237/94/FU	Tipping of inert waste to disused railway cuttings and tunnel m	20/09/1994	04/07/1995	R	14.95

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 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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

SHLAA Conclusions					
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs)	Suitability:	Yes	Achievabilit	y: Short term	(0-5yrs)
Summary of Infrastructo	ure provide	er comments	s and other plan	ning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Highway	/s inc Metro				
Accessibility comment				1	Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy accessibility	standards, loca	I services ok.			5
Access Comments					Rank (1-5)
Green Lane narrow, narrow footv equivalent movement to current to		lity at junctions, o	nly support developme	nt with	1
Local network comment					Rank (1-5)
Limited development so spare ca	pacity.				5
Mitigation measure					Total score
none					11
Support?	Need to comb	ine with other si	tes: Suitabi	lity for partial o	levelopment:
no highway frontage	yes		no		
Highways Agency					
Network Rail :					
<u>Biodiversity</u>					
West Yorkshire Ecology and LC	C Ecology Offi	cer:	Boundary Amendme	nt	
Supported					
Natural England:					
<u>Education</u>					
Drainage/Water/Flooding					
Environment Agency Comments	s: 	Envir	onment Agency Cons	traints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorks	shire Water Waste Wa	ter Treatment \	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	• Assessment		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)	1.10	····ayac
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 (Text)	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:		tore that we should be about	and a second like in a single Consequence
			oment acceptable in principle. Green ent equivalent in movement terms to
existing use possible.	, , ,	,	·
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 18	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail (Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not ass	sessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Green Lane, Pudsey, LS28 8JN

Site Ref: 3379

Site Ref: 3388 Site Name: **Butterbowl Works, Ring Road Lower Wortley, LS12 5AJ**

Site Details

432537 Area sq m: 16511.65 Northing: Farnley and Wortley Ward 425763 Easting: Area Ha: 1.651165 HMCA: **Outer 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways Neighbouring Use 3: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

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): 2610.56 Distance to bus stop (metres) 100.60 Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 10333 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:

1.00

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Existing employment site.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	0.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
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 No Within 100m of Minerals Safeguarding Site?:

Site Ref: 3388 Site Name: Butterbowl Works, Ring Road Lower Wortley, LS12 5AJ

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
24/34/95/RE	Renewal of permission for the erection of detached warehouse industrial unit with offices to engineering works	25/01/1995	28/03/1995	Α	78.92
H24/310/83/	Outline application to erect I ight industrial and wareh ouse unit to vacant site. (s ite area 0.32ha)	07/11/1983	20/02/1984	А	20.51
24/221/04/SI	4 internally illuminated signs to workshops	29/04/2004	21/05/2004	А	20.51
12/02166/FU	Retrospective application for electric fence within the perimeter fencing	16/05/2012	24/07/2012	А	99.47
24/48/00/RE	Renewal of permission for the erection of detached warehouse industrial unit with offices to engineering works	22/02/2000	18/04/2000	Α	78.89
24/465/05/FU	Laying out of overflow car parking area to car body workshop	19/09/2005	16/12/2005	Α	19.17
H24/58/89/	Erection of detached industria I unit with offices and bound ary fence to engineering works.	16/02/1989	12/04/1989	Α	71.80
24/509/03/FU	Change of use of warehouse to car body workshop and paint spraying centre	21/10/2003	20/01/2004	Α	17.79
11/04188/DEM	Determination for demolition of industrial buildings	04/10/2011	31/10/2011	NR	78.89
H24/108/84/	Laying out of access and erect ion of detached single store y light industrial and warehou se unit with toiletsand with 2	19/04/1984	22/05/1984	Α	20.29
H24/364/88/	Laying out of enlarged access, to plant hire depot.	12/12/1988	17/01/1989	А	71.41
H24/58/89/1	Amendment to previous applicat ion involving the condi tion regarding the use for the erection of a detached i	15/01/1990	06/02/1990	Α	72.92

Site Ref: 3388 Site Name: Butterbowl Works, Ring Road Lower Wortley, LS12 5AJ

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	ı)?
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?:	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urbar 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? $\hfill\Box$ 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 historic feature?	al 🗌
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	0 (11)
Smaller Settlement Smaller Settlement Extension	Mi l
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 0	Rateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 3388 Site Name: Butterbowl Works, Ring Road Lower Wortley, LS12 5AJ

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	ns			
Availability: Short term (0-	5yrs) Suitability: Ye	es Physical	Achievability:	Short term (0-5yrs)
Summary of Infrasti	ructure provider c	omments and o	ther plannir	g requirements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Meets Core Strategy access	sibility standards but lackir	ng in local services		4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Ring Road only access, mi	tigation required.			4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Possible cumulative impac	t but brownfield site mitiga	tion possible.		4
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Signal junction but may not	be justified.			12
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability 1	or partial development:
yes with mitigation	no		yes with mit	gation
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floodir				
Environment Agency Com		Environment A	gency Constrair	its:
Yorkshire Water Commen	ts:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water 1	reatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managem	ent:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Site Ref: 3388	Site Name:	Butterbowl Works, Ring LS12 5AJ	Road Lower Wortley,
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:			
	ining main road. Site	e should be retained as employment.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 59	Floorspace sq m (Non resi	dential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Red		Green

Site Details

 Northing:
 432403
 Area sq m:
 12739.98
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 421802
 Area Ha:
 1.273998
 HMCA:
 Outer 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 CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2015.63Distance to bus stop (metres)172.15Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID4606

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:

Long thin strip of land in agricultural use. Residential development to north and east.

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?: Yes

Site Ref: 3403 Site Name: Land to the west of Bankhouse Lane, Pudsey

Site Ref: 3403 Site Name: Land to the west of Bankhouse Lane, Pudsey

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 u area and undeveloped land?	ırban 🗌
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 conta development?	in 🗆
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 significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	l, or
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agricultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings?	ural use?
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion	
The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from	om encroachment
Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other his feature?	torical
If yes, could development preserve this character?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:	
Development of the site would have no effect on the setting and special characteristics.	cter of historic features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	
Northern section well connected to residential development but southern section boundary. No defined boundary to south giving high potential for further spraw	
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 Valle	ey: 0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor: 100.00 West Lee	eds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 3403 Site Name: Land to the west of Bankhouse Lane, Pudsey

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusio	ns						
Availability: Short term (0)-5yrs) Suita	ability: LE	OF to determine		Achievability:	Long term (1	1+ years)
Summary of Infrast	tructure pro	ovider c	comments	and otl	ner plann	ing require	ements
Leeds City Council Hi	ghways inc M	<u>letro</u>					
Accessibility comment						1	Rank (1-5
No public transport or loca	ıl services within	walking dis	stance.				1
Access Comments							Rank (1-5
Stone wall adjacent to nar across frontage by wideni Fartown.	rrow carriageway ing Bankhouse L	/, footway a .ane, also v	and extra carria visibility improve	geway wid ements red	oth would be required at junct	equired ion with	4
Local network comment	t						Rank (1-5
Possible cumulative impa	ct in local area.						4
Mitigation measure							Total sco
N/A							10
Support?		combine	with other site	s:		y for partial de	velopment:
No	No				Yes with s	uitable access	
Network Rail :							
Biodiversity		Office	_		A a al a t		
West Yorkshire Ecology a Supported	and LCC Ecolo	gy Officer:	: :	oundary	Amendment		
Capported							
Natural England:							
<u>Education</u>							
Drainage/Water/Flood	ing						
Environment Agency Cor	mments:		Enviror	nment Ag	ency Constra	ints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	nts:		Yorksh	ire 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	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessn	nent		
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 defensible G Bankhouse Lane requires wideni works to improve visibility. Poor p	ng into site to pr	rovide footway and visibilit		
Site Capacity (dwellings units):		30 Floorspace	sq m (Non resider	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:	ļ	Retail Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:
Red	ı	Not assessed		Not assessed

Site Name: Land to the west of Bankhouse Lane, Pudsey

Site Ref: 3403

Site Details

Northing: 435251 Area sq m: 12454.46 Ward ramley and Stanningley
Easting: 424740 Area Ha: 1.245446 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Retail - Shops

Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Wholesale distribution

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Retail - Shops

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 Cover Road Frontage

☑

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1147.42 Distance to bus stop (metres) 48.55

Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 8757

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:

Brownfield site adjacent to Bramley town centre.

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:	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:	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 %
H24/361/81/	Change of use of service garag e to warehouse.	30/09/1981	23/11/1981	Α	15.00
H24/345/80/	Outline application to erect I ight industrial devel opment, to vacant site. (site area 0.18ha)	16/06/1980	14/07/1980	Α	14.70
H24/48/80/	Detached single storey vehicle service garage includingoffic e, toilets, stores, canteen an d paint bay, with car wash a	25/01/1980	14/04/1980	Α	14.95
H24/346/80/	Outline application to erect w arehouse development, to vacan t site. (site area 0.18ha)	16/06/1980	22/09/1980	W	14.70
H24/11/79/	Alterations, to form enlarged raised storage and work area, to warehouse.	12/01/1979	08/05/1979	Α	15.16
H24/48/80/1	Detached single storey vehicle service garage includingoffic e, toilets, stores, canteen an d paint bay, with car wash a	21/05/1980	16/06/1980	Α	14.81
H24/120/89/	Detached prefabricated office block to rear of store.	27/04/1989	24/07/1989	Α	14.78

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

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability: Medium term (6-	10 y Suitability: Yes		Achievability: Medium terr	n (6-10 years)
ummary of Infrastru	cture provider co	mments and ot	ther planning requir	ements
_eeds City Council Highv	ways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Meets Core Strategy accessib services.	ility standards with good for	ootway network and w	valking distance to local	5
Access Comments			I	Rank (1-5
Adequate frontage/s for suitab	ole access/es and visibility	/ splays within site / ad	dopted highway.	5
Local network comment			1	Rank (1-5
Possible cumulative impact in	local area.			4
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Access improvements.				14
Support?	Need to combine wi	th other sites:	Suitability for partial d	evelopment:
Yes	No		Yes	
Highways Agency	J [
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity_				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Orainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comme		Environment Aç	gency Constraints:	
Orkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water Treatment V	orks Comme
_CC Flood Risk Managemen	ıt:			
<u>Jtilities</u>				

		LS13 2, Leed	S	
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessme	nt		
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 (Text)		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
This is a brownfield site set on th extension site to the existing cen				
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 39	Floorspace	sq m (Non residentia	al):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	ail Conclusion:	Eı	mployment Conclusion:
Amber	Gree	en	Ne	ot assessed

Site Name: Site at Waterloo Lane and Waterloo Way,

Site Ref: 3412

Site Details

Northing: 433733 Area sq m: 12177.62 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 421029 Area Ha: 1.217762 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Utilities & Infrastructure - Water Storage and Treatment

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

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):581.42Distance to bus stop (metres)101.54Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID1975

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:

Covered reservior.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	100.00
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 %
H25/223/91/	Service reservoir with site wo rks and landscaping to exist ing reservoir and vacant site.	29/07/1991	11/11/1991	А	60.12

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

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

100.00

0.00

0.00

Development unrelated to existing development

Regeneration Priority Area:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

Utilities Gas:

SHLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Short term (0-5yrs) Suitability: LDF t	o determine Achieva	ability: Long term (11+ years)
Summary of Infrastructure provider cor	nments and other p	lanning requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment Meets Core Strategy accessibility standards but lacking i	n local services.	Rank (1-5)
and the control of th		4
Access Comments		Rank (1-5)
Adequate frontage/s for suitable access/es and visibility	splays within site / adopted l	nighway. 5
Local network comment		Rank (1-5)
Possible cumulative impact in local area.		4
Mitigation measure		Total score
Access improvements		13
Support? Need to combine wit	h other sites: Sui	tability for partial development:
Yes	Yes	3
<u>Highways Agency</u>		
Network Rail :		
Biodiversity		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amend	dment
Supported		
Natural England:		
Education		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment Agency C	onstraints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Water Waste	Water Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		

Site Ref: 3440	Site Name:	Reservoir, No LS28	rth of Owlco	oates Road, Pudsey
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Cyron Trovellor City	Accessmen	.4		
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessmen			
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
manageu	(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	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
The site is a covered Yorkshire V development. No highway conce	Vater reservoir, within	n existing settlement.	Acceptable in prin	ciple for residential
дет сторительного торительного поделения и поделения				
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 38	Floorspace s	sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not a	ssessed		Not assessed

Site Details

Northing: 433102 Area sq m: 44508.90 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 424407 Area Ha: 4.4508.90 HMCA: Outer 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):1391.47Distance to bus stop (metres)356.55Nearest Railway StationBramleyBus Stop ID3074

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:

Single field in agricultural use. No buildings / contraints on 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:	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

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?		
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ b	• , ,	\checkmark	
Would development of the site effectively "round	•	Partial	
Do natural/physical features provide a good exarea and undeveloped land?	sisting 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 physical	I 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	croachment		
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	rural land?	✓	
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:			
Site reasonably well contained. Strong links to	urhan area		\neg
one reasonably went contained. Othering mine to	disan area.		
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		
·	ated to existing development		
Regeneration Priority Area:	Aire Valley		0.00
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:	(O.)	0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	100.00 West Leeds Gatew	ay.	0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	Suitability:			
wanabinty.	Sultability.	Ach	nievability:	
Summary of Infras	structure provider co	mments and othe	r planning requ	irements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			5
Accessibility comment	ool oorvigge within welking digt	2000	I	Rank (1-5
No public Hallsport of loc	cal services within walking dista	arice.		1
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Narrow country road no f Tong Road required.	ootways/lighting and trees/stor	ne walling each side, new	direct access onto	3
Local network commer	ıt			Rank (1-5
Congestion Ring Road F	arnley			3
				3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
n/a				7
				_
Support?	Need to combine wi	th other sites:	Suitability for partial	development:
no	no		yes	
Highways Agency				
Comments Awaited				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Am	nendment	
Natural England:				
Education				
	-			
Drainage/Water/Flood		Environment Agend	cy Constraints:	
Environment Agency Co	mments.	Lifvironment Agent	by Constraints.	
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Water Wa	aste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ment:			
<u>Jtilities</u>				

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessm	ent		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)	,		•
		1		1
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
site?	(10%)			
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		1	
Experience of previous	Yes (Text)	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
	L			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green belt site. There is some p contained by woodland. Sloping accessibility.				
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 17	70 Floorspace s	sq m (Non resident	ial):
Residential Conclusion:	R	etail Conclusion:	E	Employment Conclusion:
Amber	R	ed	F	Red

Site Name: Gamble Lane, Farnley, LS12 5LN

Site Ref: 3455A

Site Details

Northing: 43288 Area sq m: 76019.04 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 424545 Area Ha: 7.601904 HMCA: Outer 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 CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1639.56Distance to bus stop (metres)393.73Nearest Railway StationBramleyBus Stop ID3074

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:

Fields with dwellings in the centre surrounded by two roads, residential development to the east.

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

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 pattern?:	Partial	
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 physical	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 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 agricult	ural land?	✓	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use?	✓	
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusion			
The site performs an important role safeguardi	ng countryside from encroachment		
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:	·		
Site is contained by roads eliminating potential	for further sprawl. Well connected to urba	an area.	7
,	·		
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:			2.25
Inner South Leeds:	0.00 Aire Valley:		0.00
Leeds Bradford Corridor:	99.60 West Leeds Gatew	ay:	0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability:	Suitability:	А	chievability:	
Summary of Infrastruc	cture provider con	nments and oth	er planning require	ements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro			Donk (4. f
Accessibility comment No public transport or local services.	vices within walking distan	ce	1	Rank (1-
.,	3			2
Access Comments				Rank (1-
Narrow country road no footwa Tong Road required.	ays/lighting and trees/stone	e walling each side , n	ew direct access onto	3
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Congestion Ring Road Farnley	(3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
n/a				8
Support?	Need to combine with	h other sites:	Suitability for partial de	velopment:
no	no		yes	
Highways Agency Comments Awaited				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comme	nts:	Environment Age	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment Wo	orks 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 (Text)	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)		
ono.			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	1.10	
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampments	(Text)		
	<u> </u>		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
	omone		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. Existing main ro preventing further sprawl into Gre			
preventing further spraw into Ore	en beit. Access direc	cily from Fong Road, poor acce	sooibility.
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 170	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Potoi	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Red	i conclusion.	Red
Orodii	r.eu		Neu

Site Name: Gamble Lane, Farnley, LS12 5LN

Site Ref: 3455B

Site Details

 Northing:
 432461
 Area sq m:
 28962.92
 Ward
 Pudsey

 Easting:
 419676
 Area Ha:
 2.896292
 HMCA:
 Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Agriculture

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Agriculture

Neighbouring Use 2: Community Services - Education

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): 2350.75 Distance to bus stop (metres) 277.46

Nearest Railway Station New Pudsey Bus Stop ID 11771

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:

Single field. Residential development to north, school to east.

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 Wit

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?: 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:** Links to settlement along northern boundary. High potential for further sprawl 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 Regeneration Priority Area: 0.00 Inner South Leeds: 0.00 Aire Valley: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusio				
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
ummary of Infras	structure provider co	mments and o	ther planning red	quirements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
No public transport or loc	al services within walking dista	nce.		1
Access Comments				Rank (1-
No highway frontage.				1
Local network commen	ut			Rank (1-5
Thornbury gyratory cong	estion.			3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
n/a				5
Support?	Need to combine wi	th other sites:	Suitability for part	ial development:
no	no		no	<u> </u>
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flood	ling			
Environment Agency Co	mments:	Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water Treatme	ent Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ement:			
<u>Jtilities</u>				

Site Ref: 3464	Site Name:	Land off Tyers	sal Court, Ty	ersal BD4 8
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)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			- Children
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary: Green Belt site, relates relatively	well to the existing s	ettlement Developme	ant of the site woul	d also provide an opportunity
for expansion of the school if cap accessibility.	pacity was required. F	lighways issues re acc	cess. No highway t	rontage and poor
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 65	Floorspace s	sq m (Non resider	ntial):
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:		Employment Conclusion:
Amber	Not a	ssessed		Not assessed

Site Ref: 4007 Site Name: Wortley High School

Site Details

Northing: 432767 Area sq m: 66485.40 Ward Farnley and Wortley
Easting: 426051 Area Ha: 6.64854 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

Existing Use 2: Community Services - Education

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 2: Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Mix

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2669.26Distance to bus stop (metres)272.44Nearest Railway StationBramleyBus Stop ID10333SFRA 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:

Former school site (now demolished). Playing pitches cover western section. Site slopes steeply.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	49.09
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:	4.61	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:	44.46		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Site Ref: 4007 Site Name: Wortley High School

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
24/208/03/MIN	Laying out and levelling to form sports pitch to school	25/04/2003	29/08/2003	Α	72.22
H24/421/74/	Laying out of delivery access area and paved footways, and e rection of prefabricated class room units, to school pre	08/10/1974	28/10/1974	Α	14.85
11/04482/DEM	Demolition of former school	24/10/2011	25/11/2011	Α	23.87
24/417/03/FU	Laying out of 2 multi sports pitches with floodlighting and detached changing rooms to school	29/07/2003	30/10/2003	W	99.49
H24/60/92/	Alterations and extension to f orm library, 2 storey exten sion, to form drama block with offices and 3 storey ext	10/02/1992	13/04/1992	Α	93.46

Site Ref: 4007 Site Name: Wortley High School

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:

95.31

98.71

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Site Ref: 4007 Site Name: Wortley High School

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions	8			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider co	mments and o	ther planning red	quirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			Danie (4.5
Accessibility comment Meets Core Strategy accessib	vility standards but lacking	in local services.		Rank (1-5
3,	,			4
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Possible access Blue Hill Wa	y, possible gradient issue.			4
l				
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Local congestion issues.				3
Mitigation measure Access improvements				Total sco
Access improvements				11
Support?	Need to combine wi	ith other sites:	Suitability for part	ial development:
Yes with mitigation	No		Yes	
1				
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u> Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Not supported (RED). 0.34ha or oposed allocation lies over Fill LNA. The area is a mixture contributes toward the overall	Farnley Reservoir and Silve of acid grassland and sc	er Royd		
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comm	ents:	Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:	:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water Treatme	ent Works Comme
.CC Flood Risk Managemer				

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)	110	
Experience of provious	Van	No	Hokowa
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	INU	Unknown
·			
Conclusion of Acces			•
Conclusion of Asses	Sment		
Conclusion summary:			
			N6 (protected playing pitches) on the ced by 50% to reflect developable area.
Planning brief being prepared. S			
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 100	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Co	onclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Red		Red

Site Name: Wortley High School

Site Details

Northing: 432872 Area sq m: 5044.48 Ward Farnley and Wortley
Easting: 426998 Area Ha: 0.504448 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Residential - Residential institution

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):2475.32Distance to bus stop (metres)47.98Nearest Railway StationBurley ParkBus Stop ID8092

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:

Brownfield site surrounded by residential development.

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	0.00	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.01
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 %
12/00544/DEM	Determination for demolition of former care home	03/02/2012	28/03/2012	Α	99.86
24/290/95/FU	Two single storey extensions and 2.1 metre high boundary fence to residential home	06/09/1995	17/10/1995	А	99.86

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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 100.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusi	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infra	structure provider co	mments and of	ther planning red	quirements
Leeds City Council H	lighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Distance to public transp	ort, employment, health and ed	ducation all good.		5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Access possible from Th	ornhill Road only			5
Local network comme	nt.			Pank (4.6
Kk for level of developm				Rank (1-5
rk for level of developing	ent			5
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				15
Support?	Need to combine w	rith other sites:	Suitability for part	ial development:
Yes	No	Titl Other Sites.		iai acvelopinent.
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u> Biodiversity</u>				
	y and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	/ Amendment	
Supported	, aa _00 _00.0g, 000		, ,	
Notural England				
Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Floo	<u>ding</u>			
Environment Agency Co	omments:	Environment Aç	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comm	ents:	Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water Treatme	ent Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manage	ement:			
<u>Jtilities</u>				

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)		maybo
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 situated in resider The site is acceptable for resider			t building (residential institution) on site. cerns.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 18	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	l Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Thornhill Road, Upper Wortley, LS12 4LG

Site Details

Northing: 433570 Area sq m: 5181.56 Ward Farnley and Wortley
Easting: 425362 Area Ha: 0.518156 HMCA: Outer 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3:

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): 1645.00
Distance to bus stop (metres) 108.69

Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 4496

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:

Currently used as amenity space.

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:	59.75	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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 60.86

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	ns		
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastr	ucture provider co	mments and other planning	requirements
Leeds City Council Hig Accessibility comment	hways inc Metro		Rank (1-5
Distance to public transport.	employment, health and ed	ducation good.	
			5
Access Comments			Rank (1-5
Only viable access from He	ights Drive probably level is	sues require retaining structures.	3
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Ok for level of development	t.		5
Mitigation measure			Total sco
			13
Support?	Need to combine wi	ith other sites: Suitability for	partial development:
Yes with mitigation	No		
Highways Agency			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology a	nd LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
Education			
Drainage/Water/Floodin	 1a		
Environment Agency Com		Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comment	es:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Trea	atment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	ent:		
<u>Utilities</u>			

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessment			١
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe	╡
managed	(Text)	110	Iviaybe	-
3				
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe	
travellers live on the	(Text)			
site?				
Duanimito ta haccad	Vac	l Na		4
Proximity to housed gypsies and travellers	Yes (Text)	No		-
gypsics and travellers				
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown	1
encampments	(Text)	,	<u> </u>	Ī
				J
				L
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				_
The site is designated as N1 prot	ected green space on the	existing UDP. Loss of gre	eenspace would need to be	٦
considered through the greenspa	ice review - see Greenspa	ace section, page 32, ques	tion G13. Highways concerns re	
access (no road frontage). Direct	access from neights Driv	re over grassed area only o	option.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 18	Floorspace sq m (Nor	residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Cor	nclusion:	Employment Conclusion:	
Red	Red		Red	

Site Name: Land to rear of Heights Drive, Armley

Site Ref: 4039 Site Name: Regina House, Ring Road, Bramley

Site Details

Northing: 433829 Area sq m: 17898.18 Ward Farnley and Wortley
Easting: 424570 Area Ha: 1.789818 HMCA: Outer 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography: Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

☑
Distance to Rail Station (metres): 853.46 Distance to bus stop (metres) 121.33

Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 1277

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:

Existing employment use.

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:	0.03	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 %
H24/53/88/	Alterations and extension, to form entrance lobby to offic es.	02/03/1988	25/04/1988	А	89.64
H24/229/86/	Laying out of access road and erection of retail d i y store with offices, canteen and toi lets and with 184 car parkin	17/09/1986	18/11/1986	W	87.93
H24/103/87/	Laying out of access road and alterations, including new s taircase, and to form 5 light industrial units, 2 each with	14/04/1987	15/06/1987	Α	88.15
24/171/94/FU	2.4m high boundary fence to works	17/06/1994	02/09/1994	Α	92.81
H24/226/87/	Two internally illuminated wal I signs, size of each 2.43m x 0.61m, height of each above ground 5.48m (underside	02/10/1987	23/10/1987	А	88.00
24/75/00/FU	Alterations and new windows to factory	28/03/2000	16/05/2000	Α	25.25
H24/194/85/	Change of use of factory and w arehouse to retail unit.	17/07/1985	17/12/1986	W	88.04
H24/86/86/	Change of use of factory unit to retail unit.	15/04/1986	14/11/1986	W	87.92
24/157/01/FU	Addition of 40 car parking spaces to existing car park	24/04/2001	17/07/2001	R	94.48
24/388/01/FU	Addition of 19 car parking spaces to existing car park	19/10/2001	05/03/2002	Α	90.22
H24/239/88/	Outline application to lay out access road and erect 10semi- detached houses, each with det ached garage, to vacant sit	10/08/1988	03/01/1989	R	25.53
H24/444/91/	Alterations and first floor ex tension to form offices and t oilets to works.	15/11/1991	19/12/1991	Α	13.36
H24/217/75/	One externally illuminated ind ividual letter wall sign, size 12.8m (42ft) x 0.91m (3ft) hei ght above ground 3.35 (11ft	18/03/1975	21/04/1975	Α	93.53

Site Ref: 4039 Site Name: Regina House, Ring Road, Bramley

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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 4039 Site Name: Regina House, Ring Road, Bramley

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions	3			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider c	omments and o	ther planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Distance to public transport. e	mployment, health and o	education good.		5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Existing access position wou	ld be suitable.			5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Local congestion issues.				4
				4
Mitigation measure				Total scor
None				14
				'-
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for pa	rtial development:
Yes	No			
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comm		Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments	:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water Treatm	nent Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemer	nt:			
<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 travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?	(10/11)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	·	
F	V	NI-	I Halmania
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
oneumpmente.	,		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
	Site is suitable for hou	using or continued employm	ent use. In residential area. Existing
access position would be suitable			on use. In residential area. Existing
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 64	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retail (Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Red		Green

Site Name: Regina House, Ring Road, Bramley

Site Details

 Northing:
 434676
 Area sq m:
 10718.34
 Ward
 Armley

 Easting:
 425780
 Area Ha:
 1.071834
 HMCA:
 Outer 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 Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1540.07 Distance to bus stop (metres) 188.91

Nearest Railway Station Headingley Bus Stop ID 12125

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:

Environment Agency Flood Zone:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:

Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:

Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):

O.00

Agricultural Land Class:

Strategic Employment Buffer:

O.00

Conservation Areas

No

Listed Buildings:

Yes

Public Rights of Way: Yes

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Currently amenity space set between houses providing links across the residential estate.

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 %
24/347/93/FU	187 dwelling houses and 38 flats	28/10/1993	24/05/1994	Α	100.00
24/78/93/FU	136 dwellings	19/03/1993	14/10/1993	Α	98.50
24/63/93/OT	Outline application to erect 360 dwellings with public open space	05/03/1993	11/04/2002	W	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 Conclusions	3			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider c	omments and otl	ner planning red	quirements
Leeds City Council High	vays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Poor access to public transporprimary education.	t, employment, health a	and secondary education.	Good access to	2
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Access potential from a numb	per of existing routes.			5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Ok for level of development				5
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Local Traffic Management me	easures may be necessa	ary		12
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for part	ial development:
Yes with mitigation	No			
L				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding		F ords 4.5		
Environment Agency Commo	ents:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatme	ent Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemen	t:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

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	Ī
managed	(Text)		+		1
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)		No	Maybe	4
site?	(10/4)				
Proximity to housed	Yes		No		1
gypsies and travellers	(Text)				1
Experience of previous	Yes (Text)		No	Unknown	_
encampments	(16%)				
Conclusion of Asses	sment				ì
Conclusion summary:					
Site in existing urban area, acceptive greenspace on existing UDP. Acceptive and acceptive areas acceptive.	table in princip	ole for resident from a number	ial use. Currently open space of existing routes, poor acces	, but not designated as	
g p a				,	
Site Capacity (dwellings units):		34	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ential):	0
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclu		Employment Conclusion:	
Green		Red	usion.	Red	
VIV.		1.00		Nou	

Site Name: Wyther Park Hill, Bramley

Site Details

 Northing:
 434971
 Area sq m:
 34864.31
 Ward
 Armley

 Easting:
 425537
 Area Ha:
 3.486431
 HMCA:
 Outer 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: Undulating Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1528.36Distance to bus stop (metres)86.48Nearest Railway StationHeadingleyBus Stop ID5829

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:

Amenity space surrounded by residential development.

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:	99.42	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 %
H24/746/79/	Outline application to erect c ommunity centre to schoolplayi ng fields. (site area 0.42ha) (this item is also notic	25/10/1979	25/02/1980	Α	11.73
H24/468/80/	Laying out of access and erect ion of community centre, with hall, lounge, toilets, kitchen , office, interview room and s	29/08/1980	13/10/1980	Α	14.49

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	ns		
Availability:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
ummary of Infrast	ructure provider co	mments and other planning requ	uirements
Leeds City Council Hi	ghways inc Metro		
Accessibility comment			Rank (1-5
Poor access to public transeducation and health.	sport, employment and secon	ndary education. Good access to primary	2
Access Comments			Rank (1-
Potential access from Ray	ynville Road and Raynville Cr	rescent.	5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Ok for level of developme	nt.		5
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Local Traffic Management	t measures may be necessar	y.	12
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites: Suitability for partia	al development:
Yes with mitigation.	No.		
Highways Agency			
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:			
Naturai Erigianu.			
Education _			
Drainage/Water/Flood		Environment Agency Constraints:	
Environment Agency Cor	illients.	Environment Agency Constraints.	
Yorkshire Water Comme	nts:	Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatmen	nt Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manager	nent:		
<u>Utilities</u>			

Electric:			
Telecom:			
Fire and Rescue Services:			
Built Heritage			
Leeds City Council:			
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:		
English Heritage:			
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessmen	it	
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed	(Text)		1 - 7
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
Experience of provious	Voc	No	Unknown
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	INO	Offiction
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
			on previously developed section of nville Road and Raynville Crescent,
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	92	Floorspace sq m (Nor	n residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Red		Red

Site Name: Raynville Road, Raynville Crescent, Bramley

Site Details

Northing: 433375 Area sq m: 56932.56 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 419498 Area Ha: 5.693256 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

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

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Office

Neighbouring Use 2: Community Services - Education

Neighbouring Use 3: Residential - Dwellings

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1881.90Distance to bus stop (metres)177.13Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID9298

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 (%):	98.38	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:	98.15		

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 %
25/198/02/FU	3 storey office block and extension of site boundary to office park	10/07/2002	10/12/2002	Α	15.95
25/3/03/FU	2m high boundary fence and five 8m high cctv camera columns	23/12/2002	13/02/2003	Α	15.95
H25/421/89/	Change of use, involving layin g out of drainage of vacan t site to school playing field s, with 50 car parking sp	27/11/1989	30/09/1991	Α	78.76

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?: 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. Well contained by railway line eliminating 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: Leeds Bradford Corridor: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability:	Suitability:	A	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provider con	nments and otl	ner planning requir	rements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment			1	Rank (1-5
Good access to public transpor	t, employment, health and	d education.		4
Access Comments			l	Rank (1-5
Access ok onto Dick Lane. Con	uld be combined with adja	cent sites.		5
Local network comment			'	Rank (1-5
Local congestion issues.				3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
				12
Support?	Need to combine with	h other sites:	Suitability for partial d	evelopment:
Yes with mitigation	No			
<u> Highways Agency</u> <u>Network Rail :</u>				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Not supported (RED). This land wildlife habitat network betweer includes a section of the Tyersa grassland and scrub. Curlew (2	n Leeds and Bradford. The al Beck as well as semi-im	e site porved		
Natural England:	ood) on DAI species, lee	curiy.		
Education_				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comme	nts:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
Vorkobiro Water Campania		Vorkshire Weter	Woote Weter Treetmant M	Norka Carrer
Yorkshire Water Comments:		TOTKSHIFE WATER	Waste Water Treatment V	vorks comme

Utilities

Gas:						
Electric:						
Telecom:						
Fire and Rescue Services:						
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:	Service:					
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assess	sment				
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	Yes		No		Unknown	_
encampments	(Text)					
Conclusion of Asses	sment					
Conclusion summary:						
Green Belt site and greenspace a considered through the greenspa suitable.						e
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	:	200	Floorspace sq m	(Non residentia	1):	0
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conc	lusion:	En	nployment Conclusion	:
Amber		Not assesse	d	No	t assessed	

Site Name: Dick Lane, Pudsey

Site Ref: 4045 Site Name: Daleside Road, Pudsey

Site Details

Northing: 433387 Area sq m: 119353.84 Ward Calverley and Farsley Easting: 419801 Area Ha: 11.935384 HMCA: Outer 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: Undulating Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1618.94Distance to bus stop (metres)378.70Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID9298

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:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.76	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:	10.60		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Site Ref: 4045 Site Name: Daleside Road, Pudsey

Planning History

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H25/193/89/	Outline application to lay out access and egress roads and e rect recreational complex cons isting of alteration	22/05/1989	12/12/1990	А	94.88
H25/340/88/	Outline application to lay out access and egress roads and e rect recreation complex compri sing main building with indoo	01/09/1988	05/04/1989	R	94.82
25/253/92/FU	Amendment to planning permission ref 91/25/00156 relating to final contour levels to landfill site m	17/09/1992	22/12/1992	Α	19.63
H25/156/91/	Tipping of inert material to f ormer railway. (site area 4.12ha) m	03/07/1991	11/11/1991	Α	19.32
25/137/96/MIN	Landscaping mounds using imported waste material to golf course	31/05/1996	11/07/1996	W	10.22
H25/117/84/	Tipping operations and regradi ng of contours to form green and landscaping, to golf cour se.	19/06/1984	03/06/1986	Α	94.22
H25/117/84/1	Renewal of permission for tipp ing operations and regra ding of contours to form green and landscaping to golf cours	29/06/1989	13/06/1990	А	22.01
H25/89/92/	Laying out of access and erection of sports and leisure complex with hotel and restaurants	06/04/1992	08/02/1992	R	94.88
H25/491/88/	Application for established us e certificate for the use of premises by sports club memb ers and the public as sports,	05/12/1988	01/02/1989	R	87.09

Site Ref: 4045 Site Name: Daleside Road, Pudsey

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 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:** Relates well to settlement. Well contained by railway line to south reducing potential for further sprawl. Would reduce gap between Leeds and Bradford. 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

100.00

0.00

0.00

Regeneration Priority Area:

Leeds Bradford Corridor:

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

HLAA Conclusio	ns			
Availability:	Suitability:	Ac	chievability:	
Summary of Infrast	ructure provider co	mments and oth	er planning requ	uirements
Leeds City Council Hig	hways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Poor access to public trans education and health.	port, employment and second	dary education. Good ac	ccess to primary	2
Access Comments			·	Rank (1-5)
No obvious means of acce	ess without being combined w	ith adjacent site.		1
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Local congestion issues.				3
Mitigation measure				Total score
				6
Support?	Need to combine wit	h other sites:	Suitability for partia	I development:
No	Yes			
<u>Highways Agency</u>				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology a	and LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	mendment	
wildlife habitat network betwincludes a section of the Ty	land lies at a pinch point in th veen Leeds and Bradford. Th ersal Beck as well as semi-in w (2008) UK BAP species, fe	e site nporved		
Natural England:	(=====, ==			
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Floodi	na			
Environment Agency Con		Environment Ager	ncy Constraints:	
Vorkohiro Water Communi	.	Vorkohira Water V	Nacto Water Treature	t Works Commo
Yorkshire Water Commen	us.	TOTKSHIFE Water V	Vaste Water Treatmen	t works comme
LCC Flood Risk Managem	nent:	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	Assess	ment	
Could site be effectively managed	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
Would gypsies and	Yes	No	Maybe
travellers live on the site?	(Text)	1.00	
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)	l Ni	
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
Green Belt site. Slopes steeply to obvious means of access without		y. Development would represent a significant incled with adjacent site.	cursion into Green Belt. No
Site Capacity (dwellings units):		313 Floorspace sq m (Non residenti	al): 0
Residential Conclusion:		Retail Conclusion: E	mployment Conclusion:
Red		Not assessed N	ot assessed

Site Name: Daleside Road, Pudsey

Site Ref: 4045

Site Details

Northing: 433676 Area sq m: 33742.83 Ward Calverley and Farsley Easting: 419901 Area Ha: 3.374283 HMCA: Outer 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:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1384.66Distance to bus stop (metres)347.60Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID3248

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:

UDP Designation

Greenbelt - N32 (%):	99.87	Urban Green Corridor - N8 (%):	0.00
Protected Area of Search site - N34 (%):	0.00	Rural Land - RL1:	0.00
City Centre Primary Shopping Quarter - CC27 (%):	0.00	Town Centre - S2:	0.00
Greenspace - N1:	0	Special Landscape Area - N37:	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 %
H25/193/89/	Outline application to lay out access and egress roads and e rect recreational complex cons isting of alteration	22/05/1989	12/12/1990	Α	99.89
H25/340/88/	Outline application to lay out access and egress roads and e rect recreation complex compri sing main building with indoo	01/09/1988	05/04/1989	R	99.58
H25/491/88/	Application for established us e certificate for the use of premises by sports club memb ers and the public as sports,	05/12/1988	01/02/1989	R	99.74
H25/117/84/	Tipping operations and regradi ng of contours to form green and landscaping, to golf cour se.	19/06/1984	03/06/1986	Α	99.76
H25/89/92/	Laying out of access and erection of sports and leisure complex with hotel and restaurants	06/04/1992	08/02/1992	R	99.89

Green Belt assessment - only completed where site is within Green Belt Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas Would development lead to/constitute ribbon development? Would development result in isolated development? **~** Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existing built up area)? Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement pattern?: Yes Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between existing urban area and undeveloped land? Overall sprawl conclusion: Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl Prevent neighbouring towns from merging Would development of the site lead to physical connection of settlements? Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundary to contain 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:** Site has strong links to urban area and is well contained. Would reduce the separation between Leeds / Bradford, although there are already existing links directly to the 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

Leeds Bradford Corridor: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Aire Valley:

0.00

0.00

Development unrelated to existing development

Regeneration Priority Area:

Inner South Leeds:

East Leeds

Availability:	Suitability:		A als the control of the	
Availability.	Sultability.	A	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provider co	omments and oth	her planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Highwa	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Good access to health and primeducation and public transport.	ary education only, pa	rt of site has good acces	ss to secondary	3
Access Comments			,	Rank (1-5
Access possible from Daleside a number of trees.	Road but would requir	e extension of existing fo	potway and removal of	4
Local network comment			"	Rank (1-5
Local congestion issues.				3
Mitigation measure				Total sco
Local traffic management meas	ures may be necessar	y.		10
Support?	Need to combine v	vith other sites:	Suitability for partial d	evelopment:
Yes with mitigation.	No.			
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology and L	CC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	Amendment	
Not supported (RED). This land wildlife habitat network between includes a section of the Tyersal grassland and scrub.	lies at a pinch point in Leeds and Bradford. 7	the The site		
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Commen	ts:	Environment Age	ency Constraints:	
orkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatment V	Vorks Comme
_CC Flood Risk Management:		i I		

Utilities

Gas:				
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council: West Yorkshire Archaeology English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessme	nt		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			
Warddannala and	V	l NI-		March -
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
site?	(TOAL)			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No)	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			
Experience of previous	Yes	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
0 1 1 (1				
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				
Green Belt site. Development of surrounded on three sides by exientension of existing footway and	sting residential de	velopment. Access possible	e from Daleside Ro	oad but would require
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	89	Floorspace sq m	n (Non residential)): C
Residential Conclusion:	Ret	ail Conclusion:	Em	ployment Conclusion:
Amber	Not	assessed	Not	assessed

Site Name: Daleside Road, Pudsey

Site Ref: 4046

Site Details

Northing: 434127 Area sq m: 5970.93 Ward Calverley and Farsley Easting: 419804 Area Ha: 0.597093 HMCA: Outer 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: Recreation & Leisure - Outdoor sport facility

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):1342.38Distance to bus stop (metres)47.78Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID3404

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:

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 %
25/9/01/FU	Reroofing and part recladding and 2.4m high boundary fence to factory	05/01/2001	30/07/2001	Α	99.82

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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions	3			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider co	omments and o	ther planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment Good access to public transport	ort employment heath a	nd education		Rank (1-5
Cood access to public transpo	on, omploymont, nodur d	na oddodion.		5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Access is achievable from Su	unnybank Lane only.			5
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Local congestion issues.				3
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Local Traffic Management me	easures may be necessa	ıry.		13
Support?	Need to combine v	vith other sites:	Suitability for par	tial development:
Yes with mitigation.	No			
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
Biodiversity				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	/ Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education				
<u>Drainage/Water/Flooding</u> Environment Agency Comm		Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Environment Agency Comm	ents.	Environment A	gency constraints.	
Yorkshire Water Comments	:	Yorkshire Wate	r Waste Water Treatme	ent Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Managemer	nt:			

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)	1 2 2	, may to
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:		and death and October to	and a state from a set that the later along a set
Access is achievable from Sunny		residential area. Sultable in	principle for residential development.
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 22	Floorspace sq m (N	on residential):
Residential Conclusion:	Retai	I Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Green	Not as	ssessed	Not assessed

Site Name: Sunnybank Lane, Pudsey

Site Ref: 4047

Site Details

Northing: 435512 Area sq m: 6461.51 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 421608 Area Ha: 0.646151 HMCA: Outer 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: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Partially well-defined

Natural Landscape: Significant Tree Cover Road Frontage

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1296.46 Distance to bus stop (metres) 204.30

Nearest Railway Station New Pudsey Bus Stop ID 13311

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 AreasYesAncient 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:	1.00		
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

Planning History

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
12/02644/FU	Extended parking area	14/06/2012	14/08/2012	W	12.81

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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusion	ons			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infras	tructure provider o	comments and ot	her planning req	uirements
Leeds City Council H	ighways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment		and advantage		Rank (1-5
Good access to public tra	nsport, employment, health	and education.		5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
No access to highway.				1
Local network commen	t			Rank (1-5
Ok for level of developme	ent.			5
				J
Mitigation measure				Total scor
None with level of develo	pment.			11
Support?	Need to combine	with other sites:	Suitability for parti	al development:
No.	Yes.			
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
	and LCC Ecology Officer:	: Boundary	Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education				
D				
<u>Drainage/Water/Flood</u> Environment Agency Co		Environment Ac	jency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comme	ents:	Yorkshire Water	Waste Water Treatme	nt 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:				
3				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessme	ent		
Could site be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe
managed	(Text)			1
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No		Maybe
site?	(Text)			
Proximity to housed	Yes		No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		1	
Experience of previous	Yes (Text)	No		Unknown
encampments	(Text)			
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				the been the control
South Eastern portion of site take remainder of the site is extremely			conversion. Access to	the neavily wooded
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 23	Floorspace :	sq m (Non residentia	nl): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Re	tail Conclusion:	Er	nployment Conclusion:
Red	No	t assessed	No	ot assessed

Site Name: Bryan Street, Farsley

Site Ref: 4048

Site Details

Northing: 436614 Area sq m: 5869.36 Ward Calverley and Farsley Easting: 421196 Area Ha: 0.586936 HMCA: Outer 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 CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2310.01Distance to bus stop (metres)147.60Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID5157

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 AreasYesAncient 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:	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 History

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
H25/38/77/	Detached pre-cast concrete dou ble garage, to side of of fice premises.	25/01/1977	14/02/1977	Α	98.86
H25/259/81/	Detached stable block, to vaca nt site.	08/07/1981	21/09/1981	R	97.86
H25/250/81/	Outline application to erect d etached stable block to vacan t site. (site area 0.56ha).	24/06/1981	09/07/1981	W	98.97
H25/156/79/	Outline application to erect 5 bedroom, detached house to vacant site. (site area 0. 6ha).	15/03/1979	25/06/1979	R	98.67
H25/246/82/	Detached block of 4 stables with tack room and barn to va cant site.	29/10/1982	13/12/1982	Α	98.17
H25/453/78/	Outline application to erect d etached house, to form nursery garden, to vacant site . (site area 0.57ha (1.	12/07/1978	25/09/1978	R	97.38
H25/380/76/	Outline application to erect s inglestorey agriculturaldwell ing, to vacant site. (site are a 0.57ha (1.41 acre	14/06/1976	26/07/1976	R	92.39
H25/390/74/	Outline application to layout service road and erect 8 detac hed dwelling houses with garag es, to vacant site, (site area	08/10/1974	18/11/1974	R	99.37
H25/442/80/	Laying out of access road to v acant site.	20/08/1980	13/07/1981	W	98.77

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

Check the unlestricted sprawr or large bu	iiit up areas	
Would development lead to/constitute ribbor	n development?	
Would development result in isolated development	pment?	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2-	boundaries with existing built up area)?	✓
Would development of the site effectively "ro	ound off" the settlement pattern?:	Partial
Do natural/physical features provide a good area and undeveloped land?	existing barrier between existing urban	
Overall sprawl conclusion:		
Low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl		
Prevent neighbouring towns from mergin	g	
Would development of the site lead to physi	cal connection of settlements?	
Do natural/physical features provide a good development?	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	en the site and the existing urban area?	
Does the site provide access to the countrys	side?	
Does the site include local or national conse	ervation designated areas?	
Does the site include areas of woodlands, tr significant unprotected tree/hedge cover?	ees, hedgerows that are protected, or	
Does the site include grade 1, 2, or 3a agric	ultural land?	
Does the site contain buildings?	Are these in agricultural use	?
Overall countryside Encroachment Conclusi	<u>on</u>	
The site does not perform an important role	in safeguarding the countryside from encro	pachment
Preserve the setting and special character	er of historic towns	
Is the site within or adjacent to a conservation feature?		
If yes, could development preserve this char	racter?:	
Overall Character Preservation Conclusion:		
Development of the site would have no effect	et on the setting and special character of hi	storic features
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:	or on the county and openial character or the	
Well contained site with strong links to settle	ament. Tree lined boundary to east prevent	e further enrawl
Well contained site with strong links to settle	sment. Tree linea boundary to east prevent	s futitiet sprawi.
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 uni	related 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

East Leeds

Gas:

Availability:			
	Suitability:	Achievability:	
ummary of Infrastru	ucture provider co	mments and other planning requ	uirements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro		David (4
Accessibility comment	ansport No rail Good acco	ess to local services and primary school.	Rank (1-
Access to secondary schools			2
Access Comments			Rank (1-
Site located on 60 mph highvalignment.	way. Visibility splays not ac	chievable - poor horizontal and vertical	1
Local network comment			Rank (1-
Local congestion issues.			3
			3
Mitigation measure			Total sco
None			
			6
Support?	Need to combine wi	ith other sites: Suitability for partia	al development:
No	No	No	
Highways Agency			
Network Rail :			
Biodiversity			
	d LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Biodiversity West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported	d LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported	d LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported	d LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported Natural England:	d LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported Natural England:	d LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported Natural England:	d LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported Natural England: Education		Boundary Amendment	
West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding	9	Boundary Amendment Environment Agency Constraints:	
West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding	9		
West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comm	<u>Q</u> nents:	Environment Agency Constraints:	A Montes 2 and
West Yorkshire Ecology and	<u>Q</u> nents:		nt Works Comme
West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comm	<u>Q</u> nents:	Environment Agency Constraints:	nt Works Commo
West Yorkshire Ecology and Supported Natural England: Education Drainage/Water/Flooding Environment Agency Comm	Q nents:	Environment Agency Constraints:	nt Works Comm

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 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			
effectively 'round off' the existing north east and by the main road t	settlement pattern ar to the west. Site loca	nd be well contained by existing	e site. Development of the site would ng development to the north west and sility splays not achievable - poor	
horizontal and vertical alignment.				0
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 18	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential):	U

Site Name: Calverley Lane, Calverley

Site Ref: 4049

Site Details

Northing: 436530 Area sq m: 2538.61 Ward Calverley and Farsley Easting: 420291 Area Ha: 0.253861 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Storage

Existing Use 2: Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Neighbouring Use 2: 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):2379.52Distance to bus stop (metres)192.39Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID3108

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 (%):	0.01	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:	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 %
H25/135/74/	Single storey extension to wor kshop, alterations to exist ing toilets and 6 additional a nd parking spaces. to works.	10/06/1974	19/08/1974	А	95.54
H25/50/90/	Outline application to erect I ight industrial warehouseunits , to vacant site. (site ar ea 0.22ha)	15/02/1990	15/02/1990	0	99.33
25/306/95/FU	Block of 2 light industrial units with car parking	31/10/1995	23/04/1996	Α	98.72
H25/711/75/	Alterations, and single storey extension to form assem bly workshop, with 6 additiona I car parking spaces to	06/11/1975	09/02/1976	А	98.55
25/251/00/RE	Extension of permission for block of 2 light industrial units with car parking	27/09/2000	06/03/2001	Α	99.91

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 Conclusion	S			
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	ucture provider co	mments and o	ther planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council High	ways inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
The site is outside bus/rail re	quirements and local centre	e distant but health/ed	ducation reasonable.	2
Access Comments			·	Rank (1-
The site is a car park for a m surface street which become				1
Local network comment				Rank (1-5
Ok for level of development.				5
Mitigation measure				Total sco
None				
				8
Support?	Need to combine wit	th other sites:	Suitability for partial o	levelopment:
No	No		No	
Highways Agency	_			
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology an	d LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundar	y Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education _				
	_			
Drainage/Water/Flooding		Environment A	gency Constraints:	
Environment Agency Comn	ients:		gency constraints.	
Yorkshire Water Comments		Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water Treatment \	Vorks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Manageme	nt:			
<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 travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe
site?	(10,11)		
Proximity to housed	Yes	No	
gypsies and travellers	(Text)		
			1
Experience of previous encampments	Yes (Text)	No	Unknown
encampments	(10/11)		
Conclusion of Asses	sment		
Conclusion summary:			
			ed suitable for development. Could only street which becomes a narrow private
access at the end of the turning h			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	8	Floorspace sq m (No	on residential): 0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red	Red		Not assessed

Site Name: Upper Carr Lane,

Site Ref: 4050

Site Ref: 4051 Site Name: Hill Top Road, Armley

Site Details

Northing: 433766 Area sq m: 7865.52 Ward Armley 425916 Easting: Area Ha: 0.786552 HMCA: **Outer 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

Natural Landscape:

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Road Frontage

~ Distance to Rail Station (metres): 2069.36 Distance to bus stop (metres) 60.30 Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 8500

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: 0.00 Strategic Employment Buffer: No Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline: **Conservation Areas** No 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:	99.98	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: 4051 Site Name: Hill Top Road, Armley

Planning History

Site Ref: 4051 Site Name: Hill Top Road, Armley

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: 100.00 West Leeds Gateway: 0.00

Site Ref: 4051 Site Name: Hill Top Road, Armley

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability:	Suitability:		Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastru	cture provider c	omments and ot	ther planning re	quirements
Leeds City Council Highw	vays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5
Good access to public transpo	rt, employment, health a	and education.		5
Access Comments				Rank (1-5
Mature trees on frontage, cres possible access on to Hill Top		elocation and junction sp	pacing difficult but	4
Local network comment				Rank (1-5)
Ok for level of development.				5
Mitigation measure				Total scor
None				14
				14
Support?	Need to combine v	with other sites:	Suitability for par	rtial development:
Yes				
Highways Agency	J			
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary	/ Amendment	
Supported				
Natural England:				
Education				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comme	ents:	Environment Ag	gency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water	r Waste Water Treatm	ent Works Comme
TORIGINE Water Commence.		Torkering water	Truste trater freath	THE WORKS COMMISSION
LCC Flood Risk Management	 t:			
<u>Utilities</u>				

Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	Assessmen	nt		
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			
Designated as N1 greenspace in	the existing LIDP I	oss of greenspace would be	ed to be considered through the	
	pace section, page 3	32, question G14. Mature tre	es on frontage, crest of a hill, bus shel	ter
Site Capacity (dwellings units):	: 28	Floorspace sq m (l	Non residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Reta	il Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion	n:
Red	Not a	assessed	Not assessed	

Site Name: Hill Top Road, Armley

Site Ref: 4051

Site Details

Northing: 437621 Area sq m: 11114.34 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 419648 Area Ha: 1.111434 HMCA: Outer 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 - Waterways

Other uses:

Site State: Greenfield

Site Detail

Topography: Sloping Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):3634.04Distance to bus stop (metres)263.66Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID13747

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 (%):	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:	1.00
Allotments - N1A:	0.00	Other?:	
Proposed Greenspace - N5:	0.00		
Nature Conservation Area - N50:	1.00		
Protected Playing Pitch - N6:	0.00		

Natural Resources and waste DPD (if applicable)

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

Planning History

Planning App No.	Proposal	Received	Decision	Status	Site %
08/06896/FU	Ramped slipway and associated working area adjacent to the Leeds and Liverpool Canal including 2.4m high boundary fencing and gates	22/12/2008	30/03/2009	R	14.04

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?			
Would development result in isolated development?	V	•	
Is the site well connected to built up area (2+ boundaries with existir	ng built up area)?		
Would development of the site effectively "round off" the settlement	pattern?: N	lo	
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier between	n 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 settler	ments?		
Do natural/physical features provide a good existing barrier/boundadevelopment?	ry 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	ting urban area?		
Does the site provide access to the countryside?			
Does the site include local or national conservation designated area	is?		
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 marginal effect on the setting &	special character of his	storic features, which c	
Greenbelt Assessment Conclusion:			
Isolated site that relates poorly to urban area. Well contained by tree sprawl.	es and canal eliminates	potential for further	
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 Village/Rural Extens	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

<u>Utilities</u> Gas:

HLAA Conclusions				
Availability:	Suitability:	A	chievability:	
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provider co	omments and oth	er planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro			
Accessibility comment				Rank (1-5)
Poor public transport access. A education and health.	verage accessibility to s	secondary education. Poo	or access to primary	3
Access Comments				Rank (1-5)
Existing accesses to the site w	hich would need slight o	changes.		4
Local network comment			·	Rank (1-5)
Congestion in Bradford, cumm	ulative impact into Leed	S.		4
				4
Mitigation measure				Total scor
Access works				11
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites:	Suitability for partial d	evelopment:
Yes				
Highways Agency				
Network Rail :				
<u>Biodiversity</u>				
West Yorkshire Ecology and I	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary A	Amendment	
Natural England:				
<u>Education</u>				
Drainage/Water/Flooding				
Environment Agency Comme	nts:	Environment Age	ncy Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water \	Waste Water Treatment V	Vorks Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management	<u> </u>			

Telecom:				
Fire and Rescue Services:				
Built Heritage				
Leeds City Council:				
West Yorkshire Archaeology	Service:			
English Heritage:	OCI VICC.			
English Heritage.				
Gypsy _Traveller Site	e Assessment			
Could site be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe	ī
managed	(Text)			
Would symples and	Vac	No	Mouleo	-
Would gypsies and travellers live on the	Yes (Text)	No	Maybe	-
site?	(1211)			
Proximity to housed	Yes	No		1
gypsies and travellers	(Text)			1
Experience of previous	Yes	No	Unknown	
encampments	(Text)			
				_
				L
Conclusion of Asses	sment			
Conclusion summary:				-
	1337 Stylo House, Harr	rogate Road, Apperley Bridg	e which is the subject of a current nor	
			expand site 1337 further, providing	
which would effectively prevent for			to the north and woods to the east site.	
Site Capacity (dwellings units)	: 32	Floorspace sq m (No	n residential):	0
Residential Conclusion:	Retail Co	onclusion:	Employment Conclusion:	
Amber	Not asse	essed	Not assessed	

Apperley Bridge

Site Ref: 4097

Electric:

Site Name:

Calverley Cutting / Leeds Liverpool Canal,

Site Details

Northing: 432537 Area sq m: 16307.77 Ward Farnley and Wortley Easting: 425762 Area Ha: 1.630777 HMCA: Outer 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: Transport - Transport tracks & ways

Neighbouring Use 3: Forestry - Unmanaged Forest

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):2610.00Distance to bus stop (metres)101.15Nearest Railway StationBramleyBus Stop ID10333SFRA 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:No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Existing employment site set adjacent to the ring road. Residential dwellings to south and west.

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 %
24/34/95/RE	Renewal of permission for the erection of detached warehouse industrial unit with offices to engineering works	25/01/1995	28/03/1995	Α	79.90
H24/310/83/	Outline application to erect I ight industrial and wareh ouse unit to vacant site. (s ite area 0.32ha)	07/11/1983	20/02/1984	А	20.47
24/221/04/SI	4 internally illuminated signs to workshops	29/04/2004	21/05/2004	А	20.47
12/02166/FU	Retrospective application for electric fence within the perimeter fencing	16/05/2012	24/07/2012	А	99.49
24/48/00/RE	Renewal of permission for the erection of detached warehouse industrial unit with offices to engineering works	22/02/2000	18/04/2000	Α	79.86
24/465/05/FU	Laying out of overflow car parking area to car body workshop	19/09/2005	16/12/2005	Α	18.90
H24/58/89/	Erection of detached industria I unit with offices and bound ary fence to engineering works.	16/02/1989	12/04/1989	Α	72.67
24/509/03/FU	Change of use of warehouse to car body workshop and paint spraying centre	21/10/2003	20/01/2004	Α	17.88
11/04188/DEM	Determination for demolition of industrial buildings	04/10/2011	31/10/2011	NR	79.86
H24/108/84/	Laying out of access and erect ion of detached single store y light industrial and warehou se unit with toiletsand with 2	19/04/1984	22/05/1984	Α	20.23
H24/364/88/	Laying out of enlarged access, to plant hire depot.	12/12/1988	17/01/1989	А	72.29
H24/58/89/1	Amendment to previous applicat ion involving the condi tion regarding the use for the erection of a detached i	15/01/1990	06/02/1990	Α	73.03

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 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:	

East Leeds

Gas:

HLAA Conclusions		
Availability: Suit	ability:	Achievability:
Summary of Infrastructure pr	ovider comments and o	ther planning requirements
Leeds City Council Highways inc I	<u>Metro</u>	
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5
Meets Core Strategy accessibility standar	ds but lacking in local services.	5
Access Comments		Rank (1-5
Ring Road only access mitigation require	d.	4
Local network comment		Rank (1-5
Possible cumulative impact but brownfiel	d site mitigation possible.	4
Mitigation measure		Total sco
Signal junction but may not be justified.		13
Support? Need t	o combine with other sites:	Suitability for partial development:
yes with mitigation.		
<u>Highways Agency</u> Network Rail :		
<u>Biodiversity</u>		
West Yorkshire Ecology and LCC Ecolo	ogy Officer: Boundar	ry Amendment
Supported		
Natural England:		
Education		
Drainage/Water/Flooding		
Environment Agency Comments:	Environment A	gency Constraints:
Yorkshire Water Comments:	Yorkshire Wate	er Waste Water Treatment Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management:		
<u>Utilities</u>		

Site Ref:	CFSM008	Site Name:	Butterbowl Works, Ring F Wortley, Leeds, LS12 5AJ	
Electric:				
Telecom:				
Fire and Re	scue Services:			
Built Herita Leeds City (West Yorks		Service:		
English Her	itage:			
Gypsy ₋ T	raveller Site	e Assessmen	t	
	be effectively	Yes	No	Maybe
managed		(Text)		
Would gyp		Yes	No	Maybe
travellers li site?	ve on the	(Text)		
Proximity t		Yes	No	
gypsies an	d travellers	(Text)		
	of previous	Yes	No	Unknown
encampme	nts	(Text)		
Conclusio	on of Asses	sment		
Conclusion su				
Assessed as S	HLAA 3388 - No s	pecific uses given. T	his submission is larger than the SHLA	AA site boundary.
Site Capacity	(dwellings units):	:	Floorspace sq m (Non reside	ntial):
Residential Co	onclusion:	Retail	Conclusion:	Employment Conclusion:
Red		Not as	ssessed	Green

5UJ

Site Details

Northing: 435386 Area sq m: 33471.94 Ward Calverley and Farsley
Easting: 421677 Area Ha: 3.347194 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Office

Existing Use 2: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Retail - Shops

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

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape:Limited Tree CoverRoad Frontage✓Distance to Rail Station (metres):1209.77Distance to bus stop (metres)128.18Nearest Railway StationNew PudseyBus Stop ID13311SFRA Flood Zone:0.00Within 300m of retail centre boundary:

Environment Agency Flood Zone: 0.00 Agricultural Land Class:

Health and Safety Executive Hazard:

No Strategic Employment Buffer:

O.00

Health and Safety Executive Gas Pipeline:

No Conservation Areas

Yes

Ancient Monument/Battlefield(%):

0.00

Listed Buildings:

No

Public Rights of Way: No

Other comments/observations on site characteristics:

Site of an old mill, several buildings still remain with a mix of uses. Brownfield site, large man made pond in north west section. Well defined trees along western boundary shield residential dwellings to west but site adjoins houses along northern boundary. To the south and east is Farsley town centre.

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:	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 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 %
H25/114/74/	Outline application to erect r esidential development	24/05/1974	16/09/1974	R	12.08

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 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: 100.00 West Leeds Gatew	yay: 0.00

East Leeds

	Suitability: Achiev	ability:
ummary of Infras	tructure provider comments and other	planning requirements
Leeds City Council Hi	ghways inc Metro	
Accessibility comment		Rank (1-5
Meets Core Strategy acce	ssbility standards.	5
Access Comments		Rank (1-5
Adequate frontage to mai	n high street but may require signals.	4
Local network comment		Rank (1-5
Posssible cumulative effe	ct on ring road.	4
Mitigation measure		Total sco
	d bus stop improvements.	13
Support?	Need to combine with other sites: So	uitability for partial development:
Yes		
Highways Agency		
Network Rail :		
West Yorkshire Ecology	and LCC Ecology Officer: Boundary Amer	
Not supported (RED). This on the 1852 O/S map and BAP Priority Habitat. The upond is Lowland Mixed Dealso a UK BAP Priority Haland TPOs in application 12 data on amphibians has be Ecology, but the site is like Priority Species, common Yorkshire BAP Priority Specrested Newts although the	s site has a mill pond which is shown may date to 1829. Ponds are a UK undeveloped area adjacent to the ciduous Woodland (birch woodland) Supported with n excluded and the Drawing RM/CFS protected and en	ndment nitigation if Red hatched areas are boundary is ammended as per SM051 and the western boundary is hanced by an appropriate buffer we trees and shrubs.
Nest Yorkshire Ecology Not supported (RED). This on the 1852 O/S map and BAP Priority Habitat. The use on the 1852 O/S map and BAP Priority Habitat. The use of the 1852 O/S map and TPOs in application 12 data on amphibians has be Ecology, but the site is like Priority Species, common of orkshire BAP Priority Species of the 1852 Orested Newts although the 1852 O/S or map and 1852 O/S or map a	s site has a mill pond which is shown may date to 1829. Ponds are a UK undeveloped area adjacent to the ociduous Woodland (birch woodland) bitat. Note comments re biodiversity 2/02644 (withdrawn) 14/08/2012. Note the ociduous woodland (birch woodland) bitat. Note comments re biodiversity 2/02644 (withdrawn) 14/08/2012. Note the ocident west Yorkshire will be support common toad a UK BAP frog and smooth newt both West ecies. It may also support Great is is unlikely as the nearest reliable	nitigation if Red hatched areas are boundary is ammended as per SM051 and the western boundary is hanced by an appropriate buffer
Nest Yorkshire Ecology Not supported (RED). This on the 1852 O/S map and BAP Priority Habitat. The usual of the 1860 also a UK BAP Priority Haliand TPOs in application 12 data on amphibians has be a cology, but the site is like priority Species, common yorkshire BAP Priority Species are 5km to the nor amphibian habitat.	s site has a mill pond which is shown may date to 1829. Ponds are a UK undeveloped area adjacent to the ociduous Woodland (birch woodland) bitat. Note comments re biodiversity 2/02644 (withdrawn) 14/08/2012. Note the ociduous woodland (birch woodland) bitat. Note comments re biodiversity 2/02644 (withdrawn) 14/08/2012. Note the ocident west Yorkshire will be support common toad a UK BAP frog and smooth newt both West ecies. It may also support Great is is unlikely as the nearest reliable	nitigation if Red hatched areas are boundary is ammended as per SM051 and the western boundary is hanced by an appropriate buffer
Nest Yorkshire Ecology Not supported (RED). This on the 1852 O/S map and BAP Priority Habitat. The upond is Lowland Mixed Dealso a UK BAP Priority Haliand TPOs in application 12 data on amphibians has be Ecology, but the site is like Priority Species, common of orkshire BAP Priority Species are 5km to the nor amphibian habitat. Natural England:	s site has a mill pond which is shown may date to 1829. Ponds are a UK undeveloped area adjacent to the ociduous Woodland (birch woodland) bitat. Note comments re biodiversity 2/02644 (withdrawn) 14/08/2012. Note the ociduous woodland (birch woodland) bitat. Note comments re biodiversity 2/02644 (withdrawn) 14/08/2012. Note the ocident west Yorkshire will be support common toad a UK BAP frog and smooth newt both West ecies. It may also support Great is is unlikely as the nearest reliable	nitigation if Red hatched areas are boundary is ammended as per SM051 and the western boundary is hanced by an appropriate buffer

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 No Yes Maybe managed 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) **Conclusion of Assessment** Conclusion summary: Sunnybank Mills - Suitable for mixed use development - Specific uses proposed residential, employment & office. Capacity is an estimate based on half SHLAA housing capacity to allow for mixed use scheme as no figure supplied by submitter. Site Capacity (dwellings units): Floorspace sq m (Non residential): 0 **Residential Conclusion: Retail Conclusion: Employment Conclusion:**

Site Ref: CFSM051

Site Name:

Town Street, Farsley, Pudsey, Leeds, LS28

Green

Green

Site Details

Northing: 435252 Area sq m: 11275.73 Ward ramley and Stanningley
Easting: 424741 Area Ha: 1.127573 HMCA: Outer West

Site Characteristics

Land Use

Existing Use 1: Industry and business - Manufacturing & Wholesale

Existing Use 2: Office

Existing Use 3:

Neighbouring Use 1 Retail - Shops

Neighbouring Use 2: Residential - Dwellings

Neighbouring Use 3:

Other uses:

Site State: Brownfield

Site Detail

Topography: Flat Boundaries: Existing well defined

Natural Landscape: Limited Tree Cover Road Frontage

☑

Distance to Rail Station (metres): 1148.94 Distance to bus stop (metres) 48.22

Nearest Railway Station Bramley Bus Stop ID 8757

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:

Current employment use though some of the units vacant. Brownfield site that adjoins Bramley town centre. Residential dwellings to west and north.

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:	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:	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 %
H24/361/81/	Change of use of service garag e to warehouse.	30/09/1981	23/11/1981	Α	16.56
H24/345/80/	Outline application to erect I ight industrial devel opment, to vacant site. (site area 0.18ha)	16/06/1980	14/07/1980	Α	16.23
11/03861/FU	Disabled access ramp to sorting office	13/09/2011	07/11/2011	Α	10.30
H24/48/80/	Detached single storey vehicle service garage includingoffic e, toilets, stores, canteen an d paint bay, with car wash a	25/01/1980	14/04/1980	А	16.51
H24/346/80/	Outline application to erect w arehouse development, to vacan t site. (site area 0.18ha)	16/06/1980	22/09/1980	W	16.23
H24/294/90/	Alterations to postal sorting office.	22/08/1990	16/10/1990	Α	10.13
H24/11/79/	Alterations, to form enlarged raised storage and work area, to warehouse.	12/01/1979	08/05/1979	Α	16.61
H24/48/80/1	Detached single storey vehicle service garage includingoffic e, toilets, stores, canteen an d paint bay, with car wash a	21/05/1980	16/06/1980	Α	16.36
H24/120/89/	Detached prefabricated office block to rear of store.	27/04/1989	24/07/1989	Α	16.31
24/398/04/FU	Disabled access ramp to front of sorting office	02/08/2004	23/01/2007	Α	10.26

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:	Suitability:	Achievability:	
Summary of Infrastruc	ture provider co	omments and other planning requi	rements
Leeds City Council Highw	ays inc Metro		Donk (4.4
Accessibility comment Meets Core Strategy accessibil services.	ity standards with good	footway network and walking distance of local	Rank (1-5
Access Comments			Rank (1-
Adequate frontage/s for suitab	le access/es and visibilit	ty splays within site / adopted highway.	5
Local network comment			Rank (1-5
Possible cumulative impact in	local area		4
Mitigation measure			Total sco
Access improvements			14
Support?	Need to combine w	ith other sites: Suitability for partial of	development:
Yes Highways Agency			
Network Rail :			
<u>Biodiversity</u>			
West Yorkshire Ecology and	LCC Ecology Officer:	Boundary Amendment	
Supported			
Natural England:		L L	
<u>Education</u>			
Drainage/Water/Flooding			
Environment Agency Comme	nts:	Environment Agency Constraints:	
Yorkshire Water Comments:		Yorkshire Water Waste Water Treatment	Works Comme
LCC Flood Risk Management	:		
<u>Utilities</u>			

Site Ref:	CFSM044	Site Name:	Waterloo Lan	e and Waterloo	Way, Leeds		
Electric:							
Telecom:							
Fire and Re	scue Services:						
Built Herit	age_						
Leeds City	Council:						
West Yorks	hire Archaeology	Service:					
English He	ritage:						
Cyncy T	roveller Sit	a Assassman	.4				
Gypsy _1	raveller Sit	e Assessmen	ıt				
	be effectively	Yes	No		Maybe		
managed		(Text)					
Would gyp	sies and	Yes	No		Maybe		
travellers I		(Text)			, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
site?							
Dravimity	to housed	Voc		No			
Proximity to	nd travellers	Yes (Text)		No			
3,10000							
	e of previous	Yes	No		Unknown		
encampme	ents	(Text)					
Conclusion	on of Asses	sment					
Conclusion s	ıımmarv:						
Conclusion summary: Assessed under SHLAA 3412 - Specific uses residential and office.							
		,					
Site Capacity	Site Capacity (dwellings units): Floorspace sq m (Non residential):				I):		
Residential C	onclusion:	Retai	il Conclusion:	En	nployment Conclusion:		
Amber		Greei	n	No	t assessed		