

## New site suggestions

---

Submission ref [PDE00835\\_7](#)

Submitter

Position

### Issues

Sound

### Respondent comments

To reflect the range of uses in this area of the site, the area should be allocated under either Policy AVL2 or AVL4 for general employment development. Such an allocation would provide comfort to both freehold owner and leasehold tenants that future wholesale or piecemeal redevelopment is supported by the council. The allocation would therefore tie in with adjacent parcels of land which are identified under policy AVL2 or AVL4.

Legal

### Respondent legal comments

### Officer comments

The land is already in existing employment use with many premises already occupied employment space. The land is not available for imminent employment re-development within the plan period. A designation of the land under either AVL2 or AVL4 would not be appropriate. The purpose of both policies is to identify land available for new employment supply.

### Modification

•

## New site suggestions

---

Submission ref [PDE00835\\_8](#)

Submitter

Position

### Issues

Sound

### Respondent comments

To reflect the range of uses in this area of the site, the area should be allocated under either Policy AVL2 or AVL4 for general employment development. The site has the potential to make a significant contribution to the development objectives in the area and potential for further growth. Therefore it should be allocated for general employment uses. Such an allocation would provide comfort that future wholesale or piecemeal redevelopment is supported in principle by the council. The allocation would therefore tie in with adjacent parcels of land which are identified under policy AVL2 or AVL4. We are neither aware of any viable reasons for discounting the site, nor any justification from the council as to why the site has been omitted. Therefore it should be considered for allocation.

Legal

### Respondent legal comments

### Officer comments

### Modification

•

## New site suggestions

---

Submission ref [PDE02250\\_1](#)

Submitter Saxton Hill Community Group (non-constituted)

Position Unspecified

### Issues

Greenspace/Green infrastructure - Not supportive

Sound Unspecified

### Respondent comments

The Saxton Hill Community Group consulted with Saxton residents and Saxton Gardens residents on Facebook. As at 16 November 2015, 3.06pm, eighteen local residents from both communities agreed that "the green land on the Avenue to either side of the road on the approach to Saxton should remain as green space, possibly designated as a park or garden". One person did not know. No one disagreed, or raised an objection. This green space is at the heart of the Saxton community - arguably Saxton Gardens wouldn't be able to be called this without the gardens. It has been designed to be very beautiful, a lot of money has been spent on it, and it is important to residents who don't have their own gardens. It does not represent an extensive tract of land.

Legal Unspecified

### Respondent legal comments

n/a

### Officer comments

The attached plan shows a group of fragmented landscaped spaces separated by highway carriageway. Whilst beneficial in terms of the setting of the buildings and clearly of value to local residents based on the submission, the spaces do little to fulfil the functions of green space. The individual sites are themselves below the 0.2ha threshold used to identify and assess green space protected in the AAP. No change.

### Modification

-

## New site suggestions

---

Submission ref [PDE02250\\_3](#)

Submitter Saxton Hill Community Group (non-constituted)

Position Unspecified

### Issues

Greenspace/Green infrastructure - Not supportive

Sound Unspecified

### Respondent comments

Request that the green space opposite the Tetley is designated as a green space.

Legal Unspecified

### Respondent legal comments

n/a

### Officer comments

Relates to the area of grass adjacent to Salem Place / Hunslet Rd. Private land forming part of site AV94 South Bank Planning Statement Area. The city park is already indicatively identified within this approximate area. Protection of an area of private surplus land as green space at this time could prejudice masterplanning of the site and optimum layout for the city park within redevelopment of the wider site and south bank area. Green space requirements already exists and will have to be fulfilled as part of redevelopment of the site.

### Modification

-

## New site suggestions

---

Submission ref [PDE02250\\_7](#)

Submitter Saxton Hill Community Group (non-constituted)

Position Unspecified

### Issues

Local services - Not supportive

Sound Unspecified

### Respondent comments

The corner site [Mill Street / Flax Place] could be suitable to be secured for for:

- A community facility

Such as a prefabricated community centre, perhaps a beautiful eco-building and/or a community cafe. The vision would be that services would be accessible and open to everyone in the community, regardless of diverse opinions or personal characteristics, as a charity, or community group.

There are developments planned for nearby which may help fund community infrastructure such as this though levies etc. Alternatively, community facilities may be integrated into those buildings, particularly through 'active frontage'. This type of approach may at some stage release other sites for alternative uses, however, consultation should still happen about this.

Legal Unspecified

### Respondent legal comments

n/a

### Officer comments

Previous consultation has not identified a need for a community facility, the purpose of which appears vague. The council's own research of community buildings suggest that there is already sufficient accommodation. The issue is related to management of the accommodation and sharing between different community groups. There is no detail provided as to the delivery mechanism or the involvement of support of other key agencies which would be required to evidence need, delivery and viability. No change.

### Modification

•

## New site suggestions

---

Submission ref [PDE03302\\_1](#)

Submitter Kim Hawkins

Position Unspecified

### Issues

Greenbelt - Not supportive

Sound Unspecified

### Respondent comments

Instead of building on valuable greenbelt I would like to urge you to reconsider the many options that exist to regenerate existing brownfield sites. There are many such sites that would really benefit from investment and regeneration in Leeds, including the Cross Green Industrial Estate.

Legal Unspecified

### Respondent legal comments

n/a

### Officer comments

Cross Green Industrial Estate is an well established, largely developed, industrial area. A number of smaller predominantly infill sites have been identified and allocated for employment purposes in the draft plan to help meet the employment land requirement set out in the Core Strategy. The area is not considered appropriate for new housing development given its existing character and considerable constraints e.g. bad neighbour uses.

### Modification

-

## New site suggestions

---

Submission ref [PDE03303\\_1](#)

Submitter James Hingston

Position Unspecified

### Issues

Greenbelt - Not supportive

Sound Unspecified

### Respondent comments

Instead of building on valuable greenbelt I would like to urge you to reconsider the many options that exist to regenerate existing brownfield sites. There are many such sites that would really benefit from investment and regeneration in Leeds, including the Cross Green Industrial Estate.

Legal Unspecified

### Respondent legal comments

n/a

### Officer comments

Cross Green Industrial Estate is an well established, largely developed, industrial area. A number of smaller predominantly infill sites have been identified and allocaed for employment purposes in the draft plan to help meet the employment land requirement set out in the Core Strategy. The area is not considered appropriate for new housing development given its existing character and considerable constraints e.g. bad neighbour uses.

### Modification

-