Identified housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-27	Linton Springs, Sicklinghall Road, Linton	0	0	0	0	7
Issues raised						
None						

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	С	apacity	
HG1-28	Spofforth Hill, Wetherby LS22	9	2	6	1		325	

Issues raised

Agricultural land, Community and local character, Conservation and heritage, General approach/methodology, Greenbelt, Greenfield/brownfield, Highways and transport, Local services, Schools

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-31	FORMER GEORGE & DRAGON, HIGH STREET, WETHERBY, LS22 6LT	0	0	0	0	2
Issues raised						

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-32	Benfield Ford, Deighton Road, Wetherby	2	0	2	0	56
Issues raised						

Highways and transport, Local services, Schools

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-33	HALLFIELD LANE WETHERBY	0	0	0	0	9
Issues raised						

None

Identified housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-34	Forensic Science Lab, Sandbeck Lane, Wetherby	2	0	2	0	57

Issues raised

Highways and transport, Local services, Schools

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Ca	apacity
HG1-35	Thorp Arch Grange, Walton Road, Thorp Arch	0	0	0	0		14

Issues raised

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity			
HG1-36	Moor End (7-14) - Boston Spa LS23 6ER	0	0	0	0	9			
Issues raised									

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-37	Churchfields, Boston Spa	0	0	0	0	153
Issues raised	3					

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	C	apacity
HG1-38	REAR OF 134-140 HIGH STREET, BOSTON SPA, WETHERBY, LS23 6BW	0	0	0	0		6

Issues raised

None

Identified housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-39	Church Lane (27) - St Vincents School, Boston Spa	0	0	0	0	13

Issues raised

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-40	201 HIGH STREET BOSTON SPA	0	0	0	0	10

Issues raised

None

No proposed changes

•

HG1-41 Harewood Village Farm 1 0 1 0 8	Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
	HG1-41	Harewood Village Farm	1	0	1	0	8

Issues raised

Conservation and heritage

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-42	First Avenue, Bardsey	0	0	0	0	5
Issues raised	1					

None

No proposed changes

Identified housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-43	Keswick Lane, Bardsey	0	0	0	0	9
Issues raise	od l					
None						
Issues requi	iring further assessment					
Detail	The site has been highlighted as having significant flooding concerns.					
Response	Whilst the site is a UDP housing allocation it has never obtained planning consent. The sustainability benefits that outweigh the flood risk and therefore fails the exception test. of Bardsey and is well related to the existing settlement. However, the site contains sign residential use due to flooding concerns'.	The reason for n	ot allocating	the site is	as follows 'T	he site is situate
Action	Site to be deleted as an identified housing site					
Detail	The site has been highlighted as having significant flooding concerns.					
Response	Whilst the site is a UDP housing allocation it has never obtained planning consent. The sustainability benefits that outweigh the flood risk and therefore fails the exception test. of Bardsey and is well related to the existing settlement. However, the site contains sign residential use due to flooding concerns'.	The reason for n	ot allocating	the site is	as follows 'T	he site is situate
Action	Site to be deleted as an identified housing site					
Detail	No representations on this site were received					
Response	No specific response required					
Action	No change to the plan					
Detail	No representations on this site were received					
Response	No specific response required					
Action	No change to the plan					

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-44	Woodacre Green and Bankfield (land to south), Bardsey	0	0	0	0	14
Issues raised	3					

None

No proposed changes

٠

Identified housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-45	High Street, Clifford	0	0	0	0	5

Issues raised

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-46	Land To Rear Of 20-30 Syke Lane, Scarcroft, Leeds	0	0	0	0	9

Issues raised

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-47	Syke Lane/Moses Syke, Scarcroft	0	0	0	0	11
Issues raised						

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-48	Wetherby Road (land to east at Castle Mona Lodge), Scarcroft	0	0	0	0	11
Issues raised						

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	C	Capacity
HG1-49	THE BIGGIN GREAT NORTH ROAD BRAMHAM	0	0	0	0		7

Issues raised

None

Identified housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-50	Bowcliffe Road Timber Yard, Bramham	0	0	0	0	14
Issues raised						

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-51	Bowcliffe Road - Bramham House, Bramham	0	0	0	0	30

Issues raised

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-52	Aberford Road - Bramham Lodge	0	0	0	0	11
Issues raised						

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-53	Spen Common Lane, Bramham	0	0	0	0	9
Issues raised						

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-54	Black Horse Farm, South Approach, Aberford	0	0	0	0	5
Issues raised	1					

None

Identified housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-55	Station Road (37-51), Scholes	0	0	0	0	1

Issues raised

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-56	Elmhurst, Elmwood Lane, Barwick In Elmet	0	0	0	0	1

Issues raised

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-57	White House Farm, Bunkers Hill, Aberford, LS25	0	0	0	0	5
Issues raised						

None

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG1-288	East Leeds Extension	0	0	0	0	675
Issues raised						
None						

Housing allocation

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG2-19	Land at Sandbeck Lane Wetherby	15	3	11	1	165

Issues raised

Affordable housing, Agricultural land, Community and local character, Conservation and heritage, Ecology/Landscape/Trees, Factual correction required, General approach/methodology, Greenbelt, Greenfield/brownfield, Highways and transport, Housing target, Local services, Noise/Air quality, Other, Ownership/Delivery, Schools, Site status, Sustainability, Sustainability appraisal

Issues requi	ring further assessment				
Detail	Approximatley three quarters of the site has planning permission for residential use.				
Response	The Site Allocations identified housing sites have been updated to 5.4.16. The site obtained planning after the 5.4.16, hence why it is not included within the list of identified sites.				
1	The planning permission status of the site will be reflected within the next planning permission refresh.				
Action	No change to the plan				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG2-20	Mercure Hotel, Wetherby Road, Wetherby	15	5	9	1	86

Issues raised

Community and local character, Conservation and heritage, General approach/methodology, Greenbelt, Greenfield/brownfield, Highways and transport, Housing mix, Housing target, Local services, Noise/Air quality, Other, Ownership/Delivery, Policy omission/Site requirements, Schools, Site boundary, Sustainability

Issues requ	iring further assessment
Detail	The site at Micklethwaite Farm benefits from outline planning consent granted in August 2016 for up to 13 dwellings, with a Reserved Matters application pending consideration The allocation should reflect the extant outline permission boundary. Both the Micklewaite Farm and the adjacent Mercure Hotel Site are in separate ownerships and development on either Site is likely to come forward independently. There is no rationale to co-join the two site's together.
Response	The Site Allocations identified housing sites have been updated to 5.4.16. The site obtained planning after the 5.4.16. The planning permission status of the site will be reflected within the next planning permission refresh. A smaller part of the site may come forward in advance of the wider site via a planning application prior to the adoption of the Site Allocation Plan.
Action	No change to plan

Housing allocation

Ref /	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG2-22	Church Street, Boston Spa	1	1	0	0	36

Issues raised

Conservation and heritage

Issues requ	uiring further assessment
Detail	Site would have been brought forward before now if it represented a deliverable housing site. Understand that it has not been developed to due landownership concerns.
Response	A representation has been made on behalf of the landowner which states that the site is available, deliverable and suitable. Given the information contained within the landowner representation the site is considered to form a deliverable housing site.
Action	No change to the plan
Detail	WYAAS have indicated that there may be below ground archaeologically significant remains dating from the late Iron Age-Romano-British period on the site.
Response	Archaeological implications could be dealt with post-determination by condition. The Heritage Background paper has been updated to to highlight these potential archeological issues.
Action	No change to the plan - Heritage Background paper to be updated

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG2-24	Keswick Lane (land to north of), Bardsey - site of The Blessed Sacrament Church	3	3	0	0	10

Issues raised

Community and local character, Conservation and heritage, General approach/methodology, Greenbelt, Greenfield/brownfield, Other, Ownership/Delivery, Phasing, Sustainability, Sustainability appraisal

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG2-25	Farfield House, Bramham	3	3	0	0	14

Issues raised

Community and local character, Conservation and heritage, Greenbelt, Greenfield/brownfield, Highways and transport, Other, Ownership/Delivery, Phasing

No proposed changes

Housing allocation

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG2-26	Wetherby Road - Scarcroft Lodge, Scarcroft	7	3	2	2	100

Issues raised

Conservation and heritage, Ecology/Landscape/Trees, General approach/methodology, Greenbelt, Greenfield/brownfield, Highways and transport, Local services, Other, Policy omission/Site requirements, Schools, Sustainability

Issues requ	iring further assessment
Detail	The landowner requested that the site be considered for removal from the Green Belt designation, as it does not fulfil any of the tests laid out in the NPPF.
Response	The site has been considered for removal from the Green Belt and the Green Belt assessment has been updated to make this clear. The detailed Green Belt Assessment concluded that the site should not be removed from the Green Belt as it would create an isolated development which is not well related to the urban area. Nevertheless, the development of the site is deemed appropriate providing that it has no greater impact on the Green Belt than the existing development, as specified within the NPPF. Consequently, it is considered that the sites removal from the Green Belt is not justified or necessary.
Action	No change to the plan
Detail	Landowner requests reference to the use of Vacant Building Credit to be acknowledged and supported through the Plan, in line with up-to-date national planning guidance.
Response	The potential use of Vacant Building Credit on the site will be considered and determined at planning application stage. A site specific requirement is not required within the Site Allocations Plan given that Vacant Building Credit is a generic issue, potentially impacting upon a large number of sites.
Action	No change to the plan
Detail	The landowner has requested that the capacity of the site is increased to 130 units (as previously proposed within the Publication Draft 2015), to enable greater flexibility.
Response	A capacity of 100 units is considered to be appropriate given the conservation and Green Belt constraints of the site. The stated capacities within the Site Allocations document are indicative. As such it may be possible for a higher number of dwellings to be achieved on the site at planning application stage.
Action	No change to the plan

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG2-28	Land to the East of Belle Vue Avenue, Scholes	9	2	7	0	15

Issues raised

Affordable housing, Conservation and heritage, Ecology/Landscape/Trees, Greenbelt, Greenfield/brownfield, Highways and transport, Housing mix, Housing target, Local services, Other, Policy omission/Site requirements

No proposed changes

Housing allocation

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG2-225	Land at the Rowans, Wetherby	6	2	4	0	18

Issues raised

Community and local character, Conservation and heritage, Flooding and drainage, General approach/methodology, Greenbelt, Greenfield/brownfield, Highways and transport, Housing target, Local services, Noise/Air quality, Other, Ownership/Delivery, Phasing, Schools

Issues requ	iring further assessment
Detail	The EA have stated that the site is located wholly within Flood Zones 3 and 2. The site will need to pass the Sequential and Exception test before it can be allocated.
Response	The flood risk of the site has been re-assessed The site has significant flood risk concerns which deem the site unsuitable for allocation for residential use.
Action	Delete the site as a housing allocation
Detail	Following analysis of representations and further assessment significant flooding risk concerns regarding the site have been highlighted
Response	The site is deemed unsuitable for allocation for residential use due to flooding concerns. The reason for not allocating the site for residential use is as follows 'Small area of vacant land adjacent to an existing area of development which includes a cluster of residential properties. The site is not within the UDP Green Belt, however it is open countryside which is currently safeguarded by rural land policy (RL1) within the UDP. Given that the area adjacent to the site contains significant urbanising features it is not considered that a small residential development will be unduly detrimental to the rural character of the wider area. The site is not suitable for residential use due to flooding concerns.'
Action	Delete the site as a housing allocation
Detail	The site should not be washed over with Green Belt as this leads to policy conflict and confusion over interpretation
Response	The definitive boundaries of the proposed new Green Belt area to the north of the River Wharfe have been reassessed to ensure that the form logical boundaries. Following the re- assessment it is considered that the site should be removed from the proposed area of
Action	Amend the proposed Green Belt boundary to exclude the site

.

Housing allocation

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG2-226	Land to the east of Wetherby	113	13	93	7	1100

Issues raised

Affordable housing, Agricultural land, Community and local character, Conservation and heritage, Consultation process, Duty to Cooperate, Ecology/Landscape/Trees, Employment/economy, Flooding and drainage, General approach/methodology, Greenbelt, Greenfield/brownfield, Greenspace/Green infrastructure, Highways and transport, Housing mix, Housing target, Local services, Noise/Air quality, Other, Ownership/Delivery, Phasing, Policy omission/Site requirements, Schools, Site boundary, Sustainability, Sustainability appraisal

Issues requ	iiring further assessment
Detail	A local resident has stated that Great Crested Newts are present in Sand Beck and in a pond on the site.
Response	The Council's Nature Conservation Officer and Natural England have been consulted on the proposed allocation and have raised no specific concerns regarding newts on the site. Nevertheless the site requirements for the allocation have been updated to include the need for an ecological assessment and mitigation measures (where required), given that the site is proposed to be extended to include potentially areas of potentially higher ecological sensitivity.
Action	Add ecological site requirement
Detail	The plan fails to consider the impact to the Grade 2 listed buildings less than one kilometre to the north-east at Ingmanthorpe Hall.
Response	An assessment of the potential impact on Ingmanthorpe Hall has been undertaken by Conservation Officers. The assessment concluded that Ingmanthorpe Hall is a substantial distance away from the site and would not necessarily be directly affected by the allocation due to the existing tree belt and the flat landscape setting. However, the setting of the hall runs all the way to the B1224, which bounds the site to the north. There would need to be a buffer within the site to the B1224 boundary to preserve this setting. Consequently a site requirement has been added to the allocation outlining the potential heritage issues.
Action	Add heritage site requirement
Detail	WYAAS comment that the site is an area of potential archaeological sensitivity, evidenced by cropmarks in vicinity (Iron Age/ Roman activity).
Response	Noted, a reference to the need for an archaeological evaluation assessment to be undertaken prior to the development of the site has been added within a heritage site requirement.
Action	Add heritage site requirement
Detail	The landowners believe that the requirement for a two form entry primary school on the site is excessive given that a development of this size would generate circa 250 primary school aged children which equates almost exactly to one-form entry primary school requirement. The existing Wetherby primary schools are also thought to have some spare capacity. As such they consider that a one form entry school should be sufficient.
Response	The site is proposed to be slightly extended (with capacity increase) which will increase the school place demand generated by the development. A 1FE primary school would not be sufficient for the site and the site has poor accessibility to existing schools. Furthermore, 2FE is the preferred model size for primary schools. The schools background paper acknowledges that circumstances may change as a result of the statutory approval process. However, it is essential that the SAP includes school requirements.
Action	No change to the plan
Detail	Highways England state suggests that some physical mitigation at Junction 46 of the A1M will be required to handle the increased traffic generated by the 1080 houses proposed because of the proximity to A1M junction 46.
Response	Comments noted. Site requirement to be added to regarding appropriate highways mitigation to improve local and strategic highway networks, including mitigating measures at A1(M) junction.
Action	Add highways site requirement
Detail	The Environment Agency have stated that the site needs to pass the flood risk Sequential and Exception Tests before it can be allocated.
Response	The site has passed the sequential test (full details within the Flood Risk Background Paper). Where only a small part of the site is within a higher flood zone (up to 25% for sites 2ha+) they are not subjected to an Exceptions Test. Approximatley 12.2% of the site lies within Flood Zones 2 & 3. Consequently it falls below the threshold and an Exceptions Test is not required.
Action	No change to the plan. Please note a general update has been made to the flood risk site requirement for the site.

Housing allocation

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG2-227	Land to the north of HMP Wealstun Prison	37	4	30	3	142

Issues raised

Community and local character, Conservation and heritage, Consultation process, Ecology/Landscape/Trees, Factual correction required, Flooding and drainage, General approach/methodology, Greenbelt, Greenbelt, Greenfield/brownfield, Greenspace/Green infrastructure, Ground conditions, Highways and transport, Housing mix, Housing target, Local services, Noise/Air quality, Other, Policy omission/Site requirements, Schools, Site boundary, Sustainability, Sustainability appraisal

u ti	There is already a deficiency in the provision of greenspace in the Wetherby ward (and this counts provision at the Leeds United Training Ground which is not available for public use). This allocation would result in the loss of further amenity greenspace and UDP protected playing pitches. The emerging Neighbourhood Plan (whilst supporting a small part of
	this site for housing) seeks to protect existing greenspaces and aspires to restablish one football pitch, the footpath on part of the site and create new allotments.
la fu tl	Noted. In order to meet housing needs it is necessary to balance a range of factors, including the desirability of maintaining existing greenspace, with the need to provide additional land for residential development to meet housing needs. Whilst the pitches were designated in the UDP, they were associated with and used by HMP Wealstun, have been unused for over 5 years and are now surplus to requirements, no longer forming part of the prison estate. In accordance with the requirements of Core Strategy Policy G4, development on this site will be required to provide 80sqm of on-site greenspace per dwelling (this equates to 1.14ha based on the indicative capacity of 142 dwellings). This will ensure that a significant part of the site continues to have a greenspace function, which could potentially include use for football or allotments as intended by the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.
Action N	No change to the plan
	Highways England consider that this site is small and some distance from the Strategic Road network its individual impact on the A1(M) and M1 will be relatively small, but the combined impact with that arising from HG2-226 and MX2-39 it will need further assessment.
	The site is small and is unlikely to have a significant impact on the strategic highway network. Mitigation measures maybe required as a result of an assessment of a detailed scheme. However, these mitigation measures can be considered at planning application stage.
Action N	No change to plan
	The scoring of this site in relation to SA03 (Educaton), SA04 (Health), SA06 (Leisure), SA09 (Community cohesion), SA15 (Transport network), SA16 (Local needs met locally) and SA20 (Local distinctiveness / scale) of the Sustainability Appraisal has been questioned.
a fr c a in tl	SA3 - The scoring has been reassessed and it is agreed that the single positive score does not reflect the accessibility of the site to existing schools. The site just meets the accessibility standards for primary schools but falls outside the standards for secondary schools. Therefore the score should be revised to neutral (partly within accessibility zones for primary and secondary schools). SA4 - The scoring has been reassessed and it is agreed that the current score does not reflect the accessibility of the site to existing primary health facilities. It falls outside the standards therefore the score should be revised to a single negative. SA6 - The score reflects the accessibility comments provided by highways officers. The loss of the greenspace is reflected in the double negative score for SA10. SA9 - The score is based on the scale of development relative to the surrounding developed areas at Walton and Thorp Arch. SA15 - The score reflects the accessibility score provided by highways officers. A lower score of double negative is only given to sites where there is no public transport or local services within walking distance. SA20 - The score is based on the scale of development relative to the surrounding developed areas at Walton and Thorp Arch. It considered that local distinctiveness overall will be maintained.
Action A	Amend Sustainability Appraisal
	Concerns have been raised about potential contamination on this site. This relates to both the use of some parts of the sit by the MOD post war, and concerns that asbestos may have been dumped in the northern part of the site.
v te	It is acknowledged in the Sustainability Appraisal of this site that there is a potential for contamination. This could be remediated as part of development of the site, in accordance with Policy LAND1 of the adopted Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document. This requires that developers included information regarding the status of the site in terms of contamination in a planning application. The Council will assist applicants in the development process to identify an appropriate remediation solution, where necessary, prior to the development being brought into use.
Action N	No change to the plan

Housing all	The consistency between the allocation of this site and the Core Strategy has been queried. It is suggested the site should have been sieved out, as Wealstun does not form part of the Settlement Hierarchy in Spatial Policy 1 of the Core Strategy, and that it is not justified by Spatial Policy 10 as this policy applies to sites in sustainable locations that are able to provide a full range of local facilities and services.
Response	The sieving out process only occurred at the Issues and Options stage of the Site Allocation Plan. This site was received for consideration after this stage of the plan and was subjected to a full site assessment. Whilst the site is not situated within the settlement hierarchy it is not UDP Green Belt or Rural Land and is surrounded by existing development. The site is considered to form a sustainable option for residential development when considered against reasonable alternatives.
Action	No change to the plan

New site suggestion - allocated

Ref		Address	Capacity
5364	Land at S	andbeck Farm, Wetherby	0
ssessmer	nt summary	Small site which lies directly to the north of the proposed East of Wetherby extension (HG2-226). The s developable. However, the northern section of the site appears to make a small logical extension to the 226 would help to create stronger and logical new Green Belt boundaries, as well as enable a more cor	HG2-226 allocation. The inclusion of the site as part of HG
Ref		Address	Capacity
5365	Land oppo	osite The Rowans, Wetherby	0
ssessmer	nt summary	Small site which lies directly to the south of the proposed East of Wetherby extension (HG2-226). The s to the HG2-226 allocation. The site could help to provide access and stronger links to the Town Centre of HG2-226 would also enable more comprehensive development of the wider site.	

New site suggestion - not allocated

Ref	Ref Address		Capacity	
5361	Land at K	eswick Lane, Bardsey	21	
			undaries are poorly defined and as a consequence the site will have an unaccepta scence, in that the development would significantly reduce the Green Belt gap	able

between Bardsey and East Keswick.

concerns.

٠

Ref	Address		Capacity
5362	Land at St Johns Farm, Main Street, Aberford		37
Assessment	t summary	formed by a collection of agricultural buildings and a small open field. The site co	refore the location does not align with the spatial development strategy. The site is ould possibly support small scale redevelopment for change of use of some the suitable location for a housing allocation due to Green Belt and general sustainability

.

R	Ref	Address	Capacity
53	5363 Land at Becca Farm, Main Street, Aberford		32
Asse	ssment	t summary Green Belt site which lies outside the settlement heirachy and therefore the local adjacent to Aberford conservation area as well as adjacent to a scheduled ancient of the settlement heirachy and therefore the local adjacent to a scheduled ancient adjacent to adjacent to a scheduled ancient adjacent to a scheduled ancient adjacent to a scheduled ancient adjacent to adja	tion does not align with the spatial development strategy. The site lies both within and

adjacent to Aberford conservation area as well as adjacent to a scheduled ancient monument. The development of the site would have an unacceptable impact on these heritage assests. The site is also considered to have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt.

•

Ref	Address	Capacity	
5366	Land at Holywell Lane, Shadwell, Leeds	10	

Assessment summary Green Belt site which lies outside the settlement heirachy and therefore the location does not align with the spatial development strategy.

Ref	Address		Capacity	
5367	5367 Land at Nanny Goat Lane, Garforth, Leeds		10	
		ry Green Belt site which does not relate well to the existing urban area and would create an isolated development. The site is significantly detached from the urban area		
		of Garforth and a railway line which creates a strong defensible boundary to the characterised by large dwellings set within substantial plots. Housing developme		

New site suggestion - not allocated

Ref		Address	Capacity
5368	Land at B	ecca Farm/Highfield Road, Aberford, Leeds	60
Assessment summary		Green Belt site which lies outside the settlement heirachy and therefore the location does not align with th adjacent to Aberford conservation area as well as adjacent to a scheduled ancient monument. The develo these heritage assests. The site is also considered to have an unacceptable impact on the Green Belt.	
Ref		Address	Capacity
5369	Land west	t of Roundhay Park Lane, Shadwell, Leeds	367
Assessme	nt summary	Large Green Belt site which lies adjacent to the main urban area. Whilst the site would constitute a partial	ι τοποσιοσιού οι τοε πορραγικά τρειδικές γομισιεχτερό σενοι
		strong defensible boundaries to the existing Green Belt and would not be well contained. The site forms at is clearly visible from the adjacent Ring Road due to land level changes. Development of the site would ha also forms part of a UDP green corridor. Development of the site would be detrimental the function of this	n attractive countryside setting to the main urban area whic ave a negative impact on this landscape character. The site
Ref		strong defensible boundaries to the existing Green Belt and would not be well contained. The site forms at is clearly visible from the adjacent Ring Road due to land level changes. Development of the site would have	n attractive countryside setting to the main urban area whic ave a negative impact on this landscape character. The site
Ref 5370	Land at S	strong defensible boundaries to the existing Green Belt and would not be well contained. The site forms an is clearly visible from the adjacent Ring Road due to land level changes. Development of the site would ha also forms part of a UDP green corridor. Development of the site would be detrimental the function of this	n attractive countryside setting to the main urban area whit ave a negative impact on this landscape character. The site green corridor.

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
70	Linton Spring (office building), Sicklinghall Road, Wetherby	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
78	Blackmoor Lane (120), Bardsey LS17 9DZ	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
361	Spofforth Hill (land at), Wetherby LS22 6SF	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
789	Oaks Lane, Boston Spa	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

No proposed changes

4		
٩	,	

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
830	Thorner Lane - Oaklands Manor, Scarcroft	0	0	0	0

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1001	Tarn Lane - Brandon Hall LS17	0	0	0	0
No proposed	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1005	Wetherby Road, Scarcroft	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1027	Wetherby Road (land to west), south of Bardsey	0	0	0	0
	d ahan maa				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1028	Wetherby Road (land to west), north of Scarcroft	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1031	Sandhills (land to east), Thorner	0	0	0	0
No propos	ad changes				

No proposed changes

•

•

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1040	Carr Lane, Thorner, LS14				
No propose	d changes				

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1048	Main Street (north of), Aberford LS25	1	0	1	0
No propose	d changes				

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1055A	Thorpe Arch Estate, Wetherby LS23 7BJ	48	2	44	2
Issues requ	uiring further assessment				
Detail	Landowner objects due to inadequate justification for site 1055A not being allocated for Housing Background Paper states "Unless new evidence has come to light to alter the i evidence has been set out in the plan to identify why the site cannot be developed phys sites is "local preference for alternative strategic option". No evidence is presented to de land at Thorp Arch Estate for residential development in the Housing Background Pape	initial assessment ically. The only ne emonstrate this pl	on these si w evidence reference fo	ites, they have that has c	ave either b ome to ligh
Response	Whilst it is considered that the Council's approach to the Outer North East allocations is Housing Background Paper which clarify the reasons for Thorp Arch being discounted a		merit in furtl	her explaini	ng this app
Action	No change to the Plan but alterations to the Housing Background Paper are proposed.				
Detail	The Housing Background Paper fails to adequately set out how the SA has informed the submitted SA fails comprehensively in providing any clear consideration that the propose the relevant environmental, economic and social objectives.				
Response	Whilst it is considered that the Council's approach to the Outer North East allocations is Housing Background Paper which draw clearer links to the Sustainability Appraisal and			her explaini	ng the app
Action	No change to the Plan but amendments to the Housing Background Paper are proposed	d.			
Detail	The justification for not allocating Thorp Arch for housing is not consistent with what is 'local preference' has come to light justifying an alternative approach to that set out in the cannot be developed physically. The reasons for not allocating land at TATE for resider	he Issues and Op	tions Draft.	No evidence	e has beer
Response	No specific response required				
Action	No change to the plan				
Detail	Objectors question the release of Green Belt land at Parlington, when non-Green Belt, be through the Housing Background Paper, or through the Sustainability Appraisal	brownfield land is	available at	t Thorp Arc	h. The Cou
Response	The Site Allocations Plan sets out through the Housing Background paper that the deliv North East. Whilst it is considered that the Council's approach to the Outer North East amendments to the Housing Background Paper which draw clearer links to the Sustaina	allocations is sou	nd, there is	merit in fur	ther explair
Action	No change to the Plan but amendments to the Housing Background Paper are propose				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1055B	Thorpe Arch Estate, Wetherby LS23 7BJ	5	1	3	1
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1056	Main Street (off) - Cricket Field, Shadwell	1	0	0	0

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1057	Scholes Lane, Scholes	2	0	2	0
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1070	Linton Lane - Cragg Hall Farm, Wetherby LS22	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

1	C)	

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1088	Whinmoor Lane, land to rear of Wainscott Cottage, Shadwell, LS17 8LS	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1089	York Road - Homecroft, Scholes LS15 4NF	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1094A	Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane (between)	1	0	1	0
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1106	First Avenue (land west of), Bardsey	1	1	0	0
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1107	Green Lane (land east of), Boston Spa LS23	0	0	0	0

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1108	Willow Lane (land west of), Clifford LS23	0	0	0	0
	· ·				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1109	Cinder Lane (land west of), Clifford, LS23	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1121	Trip Lane (land at), Linton	0	0	0	0

•

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1130	Parlington Lane (land off)	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1131	Field Lane (south of), Aberford	1	0	0	1
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
1132	Lotherton Lane (land south of)	1	0	0	1	
No proposed	No proposed changes					

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1134	Aberford Road, Barwick LS15	1	0	1	0
No propose	d changes				

Not allocated as housing

1139York Road, Morwick Hall (land adj to), Whinmoor, LS15000	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1155	Bramham Road and North of Lyndon Road (land to west of), Bramham LS23	1	0	1	0
-					

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1156	Bramham Road (land to east of), Clifford	1	0	1	0
	ed changes		0	ļ	

•

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1157	Old Mill Lane (land to south of), Clifford LS23	1	0	1	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1158	Boston Road (land to west of), Clifford LS23	1	0	1	0
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1161	Parlington Drive (west of), Aberford LS25	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1162	Parlington Drive (east of), Aberford, LS25	0	0	0	0
No proposo	d changes				

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1163	Main Street - Beckside, Aberford LS25	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1164	Richmondfield Lane (land at) - Long Lane LS15	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
1165	Barwick Road (land north of), Garforth	0	0	0	0		
No proposed changes							

1182 Woodlands Farm (land at), Syke Lane, Scarcroft LS14 0 0 0 0	Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
	1182	Woodlands Farm (land at), Syke Lane, Scarcroft LS14	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
1226	Nanny Goat Lane (land north of) and adjacent to M1, Garforth LS25					
No proposed changes						

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
1239	Dowkell Lane (land south of), Thorp Arch LS22	1	1	0	0	
No proposed changes						

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
1240	Church Causeway (land north of), Thorp Arch	1	1	0	0	
No proposed changes						

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1241	Walton Road (land at), Thorp Arch LS22	1	1	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1251	Leeds Road, Collingham LS22	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
1252	Northgate Lane, Linton LS22	1	0	1	0			
No proposed changes								

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1262	Roundhay Park Lane, Sandy Lodge (site of) LS17 8AS	1	0	1	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
1271	Rakehill Road (land off), Scholes, LS15	0	0	0	0		
No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
1286	Colliers Lane (land off), Shadwell, LS17	0	0	0	0	
No proposed changes						

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1287	Blind Lane (land at), Shadwell, LS17	0	0	0	0
	d ek ev eve				

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1288	Manor Farm (land at), Shadwell, LS17	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

1280 Dowkell Lane (land north of) Thorne Arch Boston Sna 1 1 0	Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
	1289	Dowkell Lane (land north of), Thorpe Arch, Boston Spa	1	1	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1290	Thorpe Arch - The Vicarage (land to rear of), Boston Spa	1	1	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1291	Lilac Farm (land at), Lilac Farm, Collingham LS22	1	0	1	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1292	Jewitt Lane (paddock at), Collingham, LS22	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1293	Harewood Road (land at), Collingham LS22	0	0	0	0
No proposed	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1294	Leeds Road (land at), Collingham LS22	1	0	1	0
No propose	d changes				

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1300	Linton Lane - land opposite the Ridge, Linton LS22	0	0	0	0
		1			

No proposed changes

1301 Linton Lane - Wetherby Golf Course house and car park. Wetherby LS22 0 0 0 0 0	Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
	1301	Linton Lane - Wetherby Golf Course house and car park, Wetherby LS22	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

	•	
•	,	

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1304	Larumrise (land to the west of), off Willow Lane, Clifford LS23	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1309	Linton Lane (land to the rear of) LS22	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1315	Holywell Lane / Bridle Path Road (land to east of), Shadwell LS17	1	0	1	0
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1316	Bridle Path Road (land to north of), Shadwell, LS17	1	0	1	0
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1329	Blackmoor Lane (land to north of), Bardsey, Leeds	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
1367	Rakehill Road (land north of), Barwick in Elmet	0	0	0	0
	debenace				

No proposed changes

•)					
	Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
	1368	Rakehill Road (land south of), Barwick in Elmet	0	0	0	0
-						

No proposed changes

-	

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
2059	Oakhill Cottage Farm, Shadwell LS17	0	0	0	0
	d shangaa				

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
2067	Thorp Arch Grange, Wetherby LS23	1	1	0	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
2068	Thorp Arch Estate Waste Tip, Wetherby LS23	1	1	0	0
No propose	d changes				

no pre

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3019	Land off Whinmoor Lane Shadwell	0	0	0	0
No proposed	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3020	Land at Elmete Lane Shadwell	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3114	Barwick Road, Garforth	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3126	Syke Lane, Scarcroft	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3127	Wetherby Road, Scarcroft	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3128	Land west of Deepdale Lane, Boston Spa	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3129	Moor End, Boston Spa	1	0	1	0
No proposed	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3130	Primrose Lane (west), Boston Spa	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3130	Primrose Lane (west), Boston Spa	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
3131	Primrose Lane (east), Boston Spa	0	0	0	0		

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3131 Pr	rimrose Lane (east), Boston Spa	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3133	Woodacre Lane (north), Bardsey	1	0	1	0
No propose	d changes				

_

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
3134	Woodacre Lane, Bardsey							

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3135	Land south of Wetherby Race Course (adj to Race Course)	1	0	1	0
No propose	ed changes				

_

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3136	Land south of Wetherby Race Course, Walton Road	1	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3309	Scarcroft Cottage, Wetherby Road, Scarcroft, Leeds, LS14 3HJ	0	0	0	0
No proposo	d changes				

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3310	Land Boston Road, Wetherby	1	0	1	0
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3317	railway sidings at scholes	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3319	Main Street, Aberford	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3322	Winnow Lane	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3323	Land at Brandon Golf Course, Shadwell	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

_

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3325	Land at Thorner Lane Leeds	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3332	High Trees School, Boston Spa	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3333	Land off Ling Lane, Scarcroft	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3334	Land South of A58 Collingham	1	0	1	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps Support	t Object	Neutral
3363	Mill Lane, Bardsey	0 0	0	0
No propose	d changes			

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3371	Sweep Farm, Wetherby	1	0	1	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3375	Boundary between Green Belt and Urban Developement	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3391	Headley Hall, Bramham, Leeds	1	0	1	0
No proposed	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3429	Land off Black Moor Lane, Bardsey	0	0	0	0
No propose	ad changes				

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3438	Aberford Road, Aberford	0	0	0	0
No proposed	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3448	Land off Trip Lane Linton	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3452	Land off Potterton Lane	2	1	0	0
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3453	Land off Potterton Lane	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3461	Land off Tithe Barn Lane, Bardsey	0	0	0	0
No propose	ed changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
3462	Land at Clifford Moor Road, Clifford	0	0	0	0
No proposed	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4018	Shadwell Lane	1	0	1	0
No proposed	d changes				

Not allocated as housing

4066 Wood Farm, Scarcroft 1 0 1 0	Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
	4066	Wood Farm, Scarcroft	1	0	1	0

Issues requiring further assessment

No change to the plan

Detail The site should be assessed independently to the wider Wood Farm site (5168).

Response Site 4066 has been assessed independently to site 5168. The site is not considered to be suitable for a residential allocation for the following reason. Site lies outside the settlement hierarchy and therefore the location does not align with the spatial development strategy. The site is formed by a collection of agricultural buildings, some of which are in equine uses. The site is washed over by Green Belt and is significantly detached from the main settlement of Scarcroft, consequently any development is likely to constitute sprawl, as well as failing to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. The site is also situated within the Scarcroft conservation area, where the cluster of agricultural building have a positive impact on the character of the area. The site is could potentially support small scale redevelopment for change of use of some the existing buildings. However, it is not considered to be a suitable location for a housing allocation'. The full site assessment will be included with the Executive Board papers.

Action

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4079	Site of Prison Social Club, Walton Road, Wetherby				
No proposo	d abangaa				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4096	Nidd Vale Motors, Wetherby	0	0	0	0
No proposed	l changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4151	Ferndale House Shadwell	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4152	Aberford Road, Bramham	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral				
4154	Wike Ridge Lane, Alwoodly	1	0	1	0				
No propose	No proposed changes								

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4155	Land at Harewood Road, Collingham	1	0	0	1

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4162	Land to the rear of Woodland Gardens, Scarcroft	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4163	Woodland Gardens, Scarcroft	0	0	0	0
No propose	ed changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4165	Hampson House, Bardsey	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4166	Land South of Shadwell Lane	1	0	1	0
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4170	Whinmoor Lane, Shadwell	1	0	1	0
No proposed	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
4176	High Street, Boston Spa	0	0	0	0	
No proposed changes						

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4201	Land at Rose Croft, East Keswick,	0	0	0	0
	• •				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4218	Thorp Arch & Boston Spa Cricket Ground	1	1	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
4221	Barwick	0	0	0	0		
No proposed changes							

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
4229	Land behind Wyncroft Court, Barwick in Elmet	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
4234	Field & Well Opposite 4 Oaks Farm, Boston Spa	0	0	0	0	
No proposed changes						

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
5001	Thorner Lane, Scarcroft	0	0	0	0			
	No week and show we							

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
5022	Land South Of Main Street, Shadwell LS17 8ES	0	0	0	0	

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
5134	34 Land at Wetherby Road/Walton Road Walton 0 0		0	0	0
No propose	d obongoo				

No proposed changes

|--|

5142 Land north of A58 Wetherby 0 0 0 0	Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
	5142	Land north of A58 Wetherby	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
5154	Land north of Bramham Road Thorner		0	1	0
No proposed	I changes				

•

Ref	Address		Support	Object	Neutral
5158	Meadowside Keswick lane Bardsey	1	0	1	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
5162	5162 Land at Whinmoor Lane Redhall		0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
5163 Land at Wike Ridge Lane Slaid Hill		0	0	0	0
No proposed changes					

•

Ref	Address		Support	Object	Neutral
5168 Wood Farm south of Ling Lane Scarcroft		1	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
5198	Nursery at Clifford Moor Road Clifford LS23 0 0		0		

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
5240	Land adjacent to Mars Hall, Wetherby Road, Scarcroft, Leeds.	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

4			

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
5252	Land off A58 Wetherby Road, Scarcroft	1	0	1	0	
No proposed	No proposed changes					

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
5256	Land north of Hall Park Road, Walton	1	0	1	0

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
5257	Land to the North of Wighill Lane, Walton	0	0	0	0	
No proposed changes						

No proposed changes

(D	

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
5273	Harewood Avenue, Harewood	0	0	0	0	
No proposed changes						

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
5274	Harrogate Road, Harewood	1	0	1	0		
No propose	No proposed changes						

Not allocated as housing

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
5275	Harrogate Road/Malt Kiln Lane	1	0	1	0	
No proposed obenses						

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
5277	Kings Meadow Close, Wetherby	0	0	0	0

No proposed changes

	•	
•	,	

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
5297	Land NE of M1 J 47 between Aberford Rd, M1, Great North Rd		0	0	0
No proposed changes					

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
5312	SE of A1(M), N of R Wharfe, S of Walton Road, Wetherby	1	0	1	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
5319	Becca Hall, Aberford	6	2	3	1

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
5341	Land at Main Street Shadwell	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				

Safeguarded land (PAS)

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG3-7	The Ridge, Linton	5	1	4	0	100
No propose	d changes					

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG3-8	Leeds Road Collingham	5	1	3	1	100

No proposed changes

•	
,	

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG3-9	West Park, Boston Spa	5	0	4	1	110

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG3-10	Grove Road, Boston Spa	3	0	3	0	103

Issues requi	iring further assessment		
Detail	The site has planning permission	for 104 units which should be reflected in the plan.	
Response	The Site Allocations identified ho	using sites have a baseline of 31.03.16. The site obtained planning after the baseline date, hence why it is	not included within the list of identified
	sites. The planning permission st	atus of the site will be reflected within the next planning permission refresh.	
Action	No change to the plan		

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Ca
HG3-11	Chapel Lane (land to the east of), Clifford LS23	3	0	3	0	
No propose	d changes					
•						

•	
Dof	

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
HG3-12	Wood Lane (land off), and east of the former railway, Scholes, LS15	3	1	2	0	60
No proposed	d changes					

Safeguarded land (PAS)

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capa
HG3-13	Scholes (east of)	11	5	5	1	850
No propose	l changes					
•						

Mixed use allocation

Ref		Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Housing	Office (sqm)	General (ha)
MX2-39	Parlington Estate, Aberford		3302	30	3263	9	1850		5
Issues requ	iiring further assessment						1		
Detail	traffic generated by the 3000 ho	A full modelling exercise cannot be completed untruses proposed in the informal consultation; physica gation will be required to make the allocation "soun"	al mitigation will still be				•		
Response	Officers to update once informa	tion is available. See proposed change to amend be	oundary for a smaller s	ettlement (and add n	ew policy M	X2-39)		
Action	to be reviewed/verbal update at	DPP							
Detail	Disused mine on the site. Has a	ny investigation/survey been undertaken to acertair	n routes and shafts.						
Response		n the former coal mining area where there is a legac plicy GP5 all applications for development are requi							
Action	See Proposed change to page 2	24 (para 2.54) of Volume 1 (Introduction and overvie	ew): additional wording	on 'land st	tability'.				
Detail	Landscape Quality - the Parling landscape character and its pre-	ton Estate is located in 'one of the highest value lan servation.	ndscapes within Leeds	'. A specifi	ic site requi	rement is re	quested to b	be added to ref	flect the
Response	this is a generic site requiremen	e Areas (SLA's) (Policy N37, under the Saved Policy t that applies to all sites that are within or adjacent nust show particular regard to conservation of the la	to a SLA and that a lar	ndscape ap	praisal will	be required			
Action		s. See proposed change to add new Policy MX2-39, and design code which will address Policy N37.	. The proposed new tex	t requires	the site to b	e developed	l in accorda	nce with an ag	reed
Detail		o this proposal (is) absolutely disgusting. You knew tely overused) services, so to send a letter out 6 day						round using G	arforth's
Response	have previously commented on	the YEP and Wetherby News advertising the consu- previous consultations of the Plan were notified by ement. Unfortunately the council does not have the	email/letter. This is in	ine with the	e guidance	set out in th	e NPPF and	I the Councils	adopted

Mixed use	allocation
Detail	Delivery: Paragraph 018 of the National Planning Policy Guidance states "The plan should also be realistic about what can be achieved and when (including in relation to infrastructure). This means paying careful attention to providing an adequate supply of land, identifying what infrastructure is required and how it can be funded and brought on stream at the appropriate time. The Local Plan should make clear, for at least the first five years, what infrastructure is required, who is going to fund and provide it, and how it relates to the anticipated rate and phasing of development." The guidance continues stating that where the deliverability of critical infrastructure is uncertain then the plan should address the consequences of this, including possible contingency arrangements and alternative strategies. It is clear that to accord with NPPG guidance, key infrastructure requirements on which delivery of the Plan depends should be contained in the Plan itself. In this case there is no statement in the SAP regarding deliverability of the required infrastructure for Parlington Estate, nor inclusion of alternative strategies to cover the eventuality that either development comes forward at a later date within the Plan period than is envisaged at this stage or beyond. On this basis alone, there is sufficient uncertainty over deliverability of key infrastructure, upon which the Parlington Estate allocation is reliant, to question the likely contribution to meeting the needs of the HMCA within the Plan period and for additional allocations to be made.
Response	The Publication Draft plan is clear that the site has the potential to be a new settlement that will go beyond the plan period (i.e. 2028). The anticipated delivery within the plan period is scaled back to an estimated 1,850 units. This would equate to an annual delivery rate of 265, assuming all infrastructure is in place by 2021. The site submitter is confident that this is achievable through a mix of private sale, rent and affordable properties. Associated with a new sustainable settlement the Site Requirements in proposed Policy MX2-39 are again very clear that associated infrastructure is provided upfront and integral to the development - the details of this will come through the required comprehensive development brief for the site.
Action	No change to capacity within the plan period. (See proposed change to add new Policy MX2-39, which seeks to add clarity on the extent of the site to be developed within the plan period.)
Detail	PAS: can the remaining capacity of the site up to 5000 (c. 3150) be designated as PAS?
Response	LCC are proposing to amend the site boundary of MX2-39 to a smaller sustainable settlement (c 1850) within the plan period (to be referenced upto examination as MX2-39A with an area of land for a larger settlement (c.5000)to be identified on the plan, to only be released as part of a future review of the plan. In that regard the remaining land remains in the Green Belt and cannot be allocated as PAS. Across the district LCC has identified sufficient PAS to meet the Core Strategy target and therefore no additional PAS land is needed.
Action	No change
Detail	Consider that the HMCAs are not fit for purpose. Call on officers to urgently review the HMCA boundaries. If MX2-39 (5320) is relocated from Outer North East to Outer South East – which makes far more sense in terms of topography, infrastructure and existing conurbation – it can be removed from the site allocation process as OSE will have already filled its quota via HG2-124 1232B.
Response	The HMCA boundaries are set out in the adopted Core Strategy and any amendment of this at this stage has significant impacts to the implementation of the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations Plan.
Action	No change
Detail	No sustainability approach has been undertaken of the location of MX2-39 and its impact on surrounding areas (including impact resulting from settlements effectively prevented from having new development until the next plan period)
Response	An SA of the site has been undertaken and was published as part of the Revised Publication Outer NE draft Site Allocations Plan.
Action	No change

 development of this area has the potential to harm the significance of a number of designated and non-designated heritage assets both within the area of the propose settiment itself and in the surrounding area. The Heritage Impact Assessment recognises that the development of Site MX2-39, as illustrated, is likely to result in considerable harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset of high sensitivity" (and therefore, prevambly, areas where develop be inconsistent with the Government Policy for the conservation of the historic environment). Withen considering the impact of proposals upon the significance of a designated heritage asset of the NPPF makes it clear that the Government considers Grade II' Luit and Scheduled Monuments to be in the category of designated heritage assets of the highest significance. An allocation which would be likely to result in harm to the so any designated heritage assets, the requirements NPFP. It is clear, that the development of the vast majority of this site is considered by the local planning authority, itself, to result in harm to the historic environment (and, 1 inconsistent with the requirements of both the NPFP and the duites under the 1960 Ac). Therefore, there must be serious questions about the deliverability of this scale of development in this location. The mitigation mascurs identifies in the leritage insert as out within the leritage Background Paper, which est out areas of lefaity sensitivity, rather the sensitivity relative to all site. Historic England Aave misinterpreted the highest solution and policy guidance, as as to unit he NPFF, or LPIA have thoroughly as heritage implications of the site and through the infighest possitivity relative to all sites, when this is not the case, THPA Acida Acid	t. The
The Heritage Impact Assessment recognises that the development of Site MX2-39, as illustrated, is likely to result in considerable harm to the significance of the man assets around this area. Indeed, the Assessment identities some two-thirds of this area as being of "high sensitivity" (and, therefore, presumably, areas where develop be inconsistent with the Government Policy for the conservation of the historic environment). When considering the impact of proposals upon the significance of a designated heritage assets to E- The NPPF makes it clear that the Government considers Grade II" List and Scheduled Monuments to be in the category of designated heritage assets of the highest significance. An allocation which would be likely to result in harm to the so any designated (and undesignated) heritage assets, the greater the weight should be. The NPPF makes it clear that the development of the inconsideration, would be wholly contray to the requirements NPPF. It is clear, that the development of the vast majority of this site is considered by the local planning authority, itself, to result in harm to the historic environment (and, 1 inconsistent with the requirements of both the NPPF and the duites under the 1900 Act). Therefore, there must be serious questions about the deliverability of this scale of development in this location. The miligation measures identified in the Heritage impact Assessment seem unlikely to reduce the harm that the development of the 1990 Act. It is felt that Historic England have ministrepreted the informations or sout within the Heritage Background Paper, which sets out areas of relative sensitivity, relative to other areas of the site. Historic England have the highest possible level of the sensitivity, relative to other areas of the site have the highest possible level of the sensitivity relative to other areas of the site. Historic England have the highest possible level of the sensitivity relative to a listes, when thist so toth caces. The LPA have thorough yas heritage exelopment	seu new
 be inconsistent with the Government Policy for the conservation of the historic environment). When considering the impact of proposals upon the significance of a designated heritage asset Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that "great weight" should be given conservation of those assets. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. The NPPF makes it clear that the Government considers Grade II List and Scheduled Monuments to be in the category of designated heritage assets of the highest significance. An allocation which would be likely to result in harm to the so any designated (and undesignated) heritage assets, especially to those which the Government considers to be of the highest significance and to which it requires weight be given to their conservation, would be wholly out to the requirements NPPF. It is clear, that the development of the vast majority of this site is considered by the local planning authority, itself, to result in harm to the historic environment (and, 1 inconsistent with the requirements of both the NPPF and the development in this location. Therefore, there must be serious questions about the deliverability of this scale of development in this location. The mitigation measures identified in the Heritage linpact Assessment seem unlikely to reduce the harm that the development of this area would be likely to cause to environment to a level which would be compatible with the requirements and high quilty to colume to the view site site is and the work the highest (Peed of assinity) relative to all sites. When this is not the case. The LPA have thorought as heritage implications of the site have the highest (Peed of sensitivity, relative to all sites. When this is not the case. The LPA have thorought as heritage implications of the site and through the heritage assets. Amendment to the site boundary Detail (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 for the following reason: "Only	
 When considering the impact of proposals upon the significance of a designated heritage asset Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that "great weight" should be "the NPPF states" icear that the Government considers Grade II" List and Scheduled Monuments to be in the category of designated heritage assets of the hipset significance. An allocation which would be likely to result in harm to the so any designated (and undesignated) heritage assets of the hipset significance and to which it requires weight be given to their consentation, would be wholly contrary to the requirements NPPF. It is clear, that the development of the vast majority of this site is considered by the local planning authority, itself, to result in harm to the historic environment (and, this clear, that the development of the vast majority of this scale of development in this location. Therefore, there must be serious questions about the deliverability of this scale of development in the NPPF, or the dulates of the 1990 Act. It is felf that Historic England have misinterpreted the information set out within the Heritage Background Paper, which sets out areas of relative sensitivity, rather the sensitivity, relative to all site, where this is not the consolidate of the site have the highest possible level of the sensitivity relative to all site. When this is not the case. The LPA have thoroughly as heritage implications of the site have the highest possible level of the site have the index posses. Amendment to the site boundary Amendment to the site boundary of the issues of relative says where or not it is the right consultation. The consultation on the allocation of Parlington Estate is considered as part of the sonal weight sensitivity. We have shown that certain areas of the site have the highest possible level of the assibility relative to all sites, whether or not have interg places development largely away from the areas of relative as whether or not t	opment would
Therefore, there must be serious questions about the deliverability of this scale of development in this location. The mitigation measures identified in the Heritage Impact Assessment seem unlikely to reduce the harm that the development of this area would be likely to cause to environment to a level which would be compatible with the requirements of national policy guidance, as set out in the NPPF, or the duties of the 1990 Act. Response It is felt that Historic England have misinterpreted the information set out within the Heritage Background Paper, which sets out areas of relative sensitivity, rather the sensitivity. We have shown that certain areas of the site have the highest level of sensitivity to other areas of the site. Historic England appare to have interp information to mean that parts of the site and through the implementation of the relevant site requirements and high quality design, it is felt that development can take place or without substantial harm to heritage assets. In consideration of the issues of scale the site boundary is proposed to be re-drawn, which reduces the size of the settlen places development largely away from the areas of relative high sensitivity. Action Amendment to the sile boundary Detail The consultation on the allocation of Parlington Estate reaces, such as whether or not it is the right location". This statement actively discourages representations relating 1 "Only comments relating to the Outer North East HMCA will be considered as part of this consultation". This statement actively discourages representations relating 1 "Only comments relating to the duter on the wider infrastructure beyond the ONE area. The allocation of the site a Parlington fails to complex in the following reason: The LPA's duty to co-operate Background Paper ONE addendum dated September 2016 refers to a meeting to di	sted Buildings le significance of les the greatest
The mitigation measures identified in the Heritage Impact Assessment seem unlikely to reduce the harm that the development of this area would be likely to cause to environment to a level which would be compatible with the requirements of national policy guidance, as set out in the NPPF, or the duties of the 1990 Act. Response It is felt that Historic England have misinterpreted the information set out within the Heritage Background Paper, which sets out areas of relative sensitivity, rather the sensitivity. We have shown that certain areas of the site have the 'highest' level of sensitivity, relative to all sites, when this is not the case. The LPA have thoroughly as heritage implications of the site and through the implementation of the relevant site requirements and high quality design, it is felt that development an take place or without substantial harm to heritage assets. In consideration of the issues of scale the site boundary is proposed to be re-drawn, which reduces the size of the settlee places development largely away from the areas of relative high sensitivity. Action Amendment to the site boundary Detail The consultation on the allocation of Parlington Estate is considered inconsistent with LCC's Statement of Community Involvement and Regulations 18, 19 and 20 of Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 for the following reason: "Only comments relating to the Outer North East HMCA will be considered as part of this consultation". This statement actively discourages representations relating is sues which the allocation of Parlington Estate creates, such as whether or not it is the right location to delete land from the Green Belt or whether there could be an elsewhere in the Plan area and the impact on the wider infrastructure beyond the ONE area. The allocation of the site at Par	
 sensitivity. We have shown that certain areas of the site have the 'highest level of sensitivity, relative to other areas of the site. Historic England appear to have intery information to mean that parts of the sites have the highest possible level of the sensitivity, relative to all sites, when this is not the case. The LPA have thoroughly as heritage implications of the site and through the implementation of the relevant site requirements and high quality design, it is felt that development can take place or without substantial harm to heritage assets. In consideration of the issues of scale the site boundary is proposed to be re-drawn, which reduces the size of the settler places development largely away from the areas of relative high sensitivity. Action Amendment to the site boundary Detail The consultation on the allocation of Parlington Estate is considered inconsistent with LCC's Statement of Community Involvement and Regulations 18, 19 and 20 of Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 for the following reason: "Only comments relating to the Outer North East HMCA will be considered as part of this consultation". This statement actively discourages representations relating 1 issues which the allocation of Parlington Estate creates, such as whether or not it is the right location to delete land from the Green Bet or whether there could be an elsewhere in the Plan area and the impact on the wider infrastructure beyond the ONE area. The allocation of the site at Parlington fails to comply with Section 33 (all Localism Act 2011 as Amended in relation to the duty to co-operate for Korground Paper CONE addendum dated September 2016 refers to a meeting to discharge the duty to co-operate in relation to proposi arranged for 6 September 2016. This date was after the Council had resolved to allocate the site at Parlington. The LPA's duty to co-operate Background Paper ONE addendum dated September 2016 refers to and locate	o the historic
Detail The consultation on the allocation of Parlington Estate is considered inconsistent with LCC's Statement of Community Involvement and Regulations 18, 19 and 20 of Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 for the following reason: "Only comments relating to the Outer North East HMCA will be considered as part of this consultation". This statement actively discourages representations relating to issues which the allocation of Parlington Estate creates, such as whether or not it is the right location to delete land from the Green Belt or whether there could be an elsewhere in the Plan area and the impact on the wider infrastructure beyond the ONE area. The allocation of the site at Parlington fails to comply with Section 33 (a) Localism Act 2011 as Amended in relation to the duty to co-operate for the following reasons: The LPA's duty to co-operate Background Paper ONE addendum dated September 2016 refers to a meeting to discharge the duty to co-operate in relation to propose arranged for 6 September 2016. This date was after the Council had resolved to allocate the site at Parlington. There can therefore have been no co-operation in relat decision to allocate the site at Parlington. The Background Paper refers to including Selby District Council and North Yorkshire County Council in this process. It refers to the relevance of Harrogate but does that Harrogate Borough Council was included in any co-operation. Traffic impact was considered to need mitigation and it is clear that further co-operation with Highways England is required in order to address this. No such co-operation with the Local Enterprise Partnership despite the statutory requirement to do so contained in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Amendment Regulations 2012. Response As a consequence of the withdrawal of t	erpreted the issessed the on the site
Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 for the following reason: "Only comments relating to the Outer North East HMCA will be considered as part of this consultation". This statement actively discourages representations relating to issues which the allocation of Parlington Estate creates, such as whether or not it is the right location to delete land from the Green Belt or whether there could be an elsewhere in the Plan area and the impact on the wider infrastructure beyond the ONE area. The allocation of the site at Parlington fails to comply with Section 33 (a) Localism Act 2011 as Amended in relation to the duty to co-operate for the following reasons: The LPA's duty to co-operate Background Paper ONE addendum dated September 2016 refers to a meeting to discharge the duty to co-operate in relation to propose arranged for 6 September 2016. This date was after the Council had resolved to allocate the site at Parlington. There can therefore have been no co-operation in rela decision to allocate the site at Parlington. The Background Paper refers to including Selby District Council and North Yorkshire County Council in this process. It refers to the relevance of Harrogate but does in that Harrogate Borough Council was included in any co-operation. Traffic impact was considered to need mitigation and it is clear that further co-operation with Highways England is required in order to address this. No such co-operation with the Local Enterprise Partnership despite the statutory requirement to do so contained in the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Amendment Regulations 2012. Response As a consequence of the withdrawal of the Headley Hall new settlement proposal, immediately before the SAP Publication draft consultation (in October 2015), the C committed to a further round of consultation on revised Publication draft proposals for the ONE HMCA. At the 19th July 2016 Development Plan Panel meeting, mer considered and agreed a revised Publication Draft Plan for further pub	
 "Only comments relating to the Outer North East HMCA will be considered as part of this consultation". This statement actively discourages representations relating to issues which the allocation of Parlington Estate creates, such as whether or not it is the right location to delete land from the Green Belt or whether there could be an elsewhere in the Plan area and the impact on the wider infrastructure beyond the ONE area. The allocation of the site at Parlington fails to comply with Section 33 (a) Localism Act 2011 as Amended in relation to the duty to co-operate for the following reasons: The LPA's duty to co-operate Background Paper ONE addendum dated September 2016 refers to a meeting to discharge the duty to co-operate in relation to propose arranged for 6 September 2016. This date was after the Council had resolved to allocate the site at Parlington. There can therefore have been no co-operation in relation to allocate the site at Parlington. The Background Paper refers to including Selby District Council and North Yorkshire County Council in this process. It refers to the relevance of Harrogate but does that Harrogate Borough Council was included in any co-operation. Traffic impact was considered to need mitigation and it is clear that further co-operation with Highways England is required in order to address this. No such co-operation with the Local Enterprise Partnership despite the statutory requirement to do so contained in the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Amendment Regulations 2012. Response As a consequence of the withdrawal of the Headley Hall new settlement proposal, immediately before the SAP Publication draft consultation (in October 2015), the C committed to a further round of consultation on revised Publication draft proposals for the ONE HMCA. At the 19th July 2016 Development Plan Panel meeting, mer considered and agreed a revised Publication taking place 26th September - 7th November 2016. In regard to DtC, this is a co	of the Town and
The LPA's duty to co-operate Background Paper ONE addendum dated September 2016 refers to a meeting to discharge the duty to co-operate in relation to propose arranged for 6 September 2016. This date was after the Council had resolved to allocate the site at Parlington. There can therefore have been no co-operation in rela decision to allocate the site at Parlington.The Background Paper refers to including Selby District Council and North Yorkshire County Council in this process. It refers to the relevance of Harrogate but does no that Harrogate Borough Council was included in any co-operation. Traffic impact was considered to need mitigation and it is clear that further co-operation with Highways England is required in order to address this. No such co-operation therefore informed the decision to allocate Parlington. The LPA's duty to co-operate Background Paper does not refer to co-operation with the Local Enterprise Partnership despite the statutory requirement to do so contained in the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Amendment Regulations 2012.ResponseAs a consequence of the withdrawal of the Headley Hall new settlement proposal, immediately before the SAP Publication draft consultation (in October 2015), the C committed to a further round of consultation Draft Plan for further public consultation for the ONE HMCA. This material was subsequently agreed at Executive Board September 2016, with public consultation taking place 26th September - 7th November 2016. In regard to DtC, this is a continual process involving regular meetings correspondence. A meeting was arranged with the relevant adjoing LPAs (Selby, Harrogate and NYCC as well as highways England) on the 6th september, prior to the	in alternative
The Background Paper refers to including Selby District Council and North Yorkshire County Council in this process. It refers to the relevance of Harrogate but does in that Harrogate Borough Council was included in any co-operation. Traffic impact was considered to need mitigation and it is clear that further co-operation with Highways England is required in order to address this. No such co-operation therefore informed the decision to allocate Parlington. The LPA's duty to co-operate Background Paper does not refer to co-operation with the Local Enterprise Partnership despite the statutory requirement to do so contained in the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Amendment Regulations 2012. Response As a consequence of the withdrawal of the Headley Hall new settlement proposal, immediately before the SAP Publication draft consultation (in October 2015), the C committed to a further round of consultation on revised Publication draft proposals for the ONE HMCA. At the 19th July 2016 Development Plan Panel meeting, mer considered and agreed a revised Publication Draft Plan for further public consultation for the ONE HMCA. This material was subsequently agreed at Executive Board September 2016, with public consultation taking place 26th September - 7th November 2016. In regard to DtC, this is a continual process involving regular meetings correspondence. A meeting was arranged with the relevant adjoing LPAs (Selby, Harrogate and NYCC as well as highways England) on the 6th september, prior to the function of the	
The LPA's duty to co-operate Background Paper does not refer to co-operation with the Local Enterprise Partnership despite the statutory requirement to do so contained in the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Amendment Regulations 2012. Response As a consequence of the withdrawal of the Headley Hall new settlement proposal, immediately before the SAP Publication draft consultation (in October 2015), the C committed to a further round of consultation on revised Publication draft proposals for the ONE HMCA. At the 19th July 2016 Development Plan Panel meeting, mer considered and agreed a revised Publication Draft Plan for further public consultation for the ONE HMCA. This material was subsequently agreed at Executive Board September 2016, with public consultation taking place 26th September - 7th November 2016. In regard to DtC, this is a continual process involving regular meetings correspondence. A meeting was arranged with the relevant adjoing LPAs (Selby, Harrogate and NYCC as well as highways England) on the 6th september, prior to the construction of the september of the sequence of the september of the sequence of the sequence of the sequence of the relevant adjoing LPAs (Selby, Harrogate and NYCC as well as highways England) on the 6th september, prior to the sequence of the sequence of the sequence of the sequence of the relevant adjoing LPAs (Selby, Harrogate and NYCC as well as highways England) on the 6th september, prior to the sequence of the sequence of t	not confirm
committed to a further round of consultation on revised Publication draft proposals for the ONE HMCA. At the 19th July 2016 Development Plan Panel meeting, mer considered and agreed a revised Publication Draft Plan for further public consultation for the ONE HMCA. This material was subsequently agreed at Executive Board September 2016, with public consultation taking place 26th September - 7th November 2016. In regard to DtC, this is a continual process involving regular meetings correspondence. A meeting was arranged with the relevant adjoing LPAs (Selby, Harrogate and NYCC as well as highways England) on the 6th september, prior to b	
cancelled and a series of correspondence was issues between the parties. All DtC parties, as statutory consultees, are invited to formally comment through the statut	embers therefore ird on 21st s a nd o the decision to subsequently
Action No change.	

Detail	There has been no sustainability appraisal on the location of the Parlington Estate (MX2-39) and the impact upon surrounding areas. Some settlements have more proposed sites
	than others, with Bardsey, Barwick and Bardsey having the least and Collingham and Boston Spa the most. This analysis fits with the sustainability appraisal and comparison with other homes, which provides a clear indication and support for the reduction in the level of homes in Barwick, Bardsey and Bramham and reapportionment to Collingham and Boston Spa.
Response	The SA of the Parlington site has been undertaken in the same way as other sites for consistency. It is not considered appropriate to take a different approach to assessment.
Action	No change
Detail	M&G (site owner/promoter/developer) recommend some policy amendments to the Site Requirements for added clarity set out within section 4 of the AECOM report (November 2016). [Proposed changes to policy HG2 and the site requirements for the site]
Response	The suggestions made are points of clarity that seek to improve the plan. The Council has considered all representations and has suggested amending the site boundary and subsequent amendments to the site policy and site requirements for MX2-39. The Council has had further discussion with M&G around the proposed approach to reduce the site boundary and new policy wording. M&G are broadly in agreement with the revisions.
Action	Add new Policy MX2-39 Parlington to provide clarity on the extent of Parlington (MX2-39A - boundary change) and amend Site Requirements. Also amend Policy HG2 to add clarification that the site specific requirements identified for each site listed after para 3.6.9 are part of the policy.
Detail	Alternatives to Parlington: The area to the north of Boston Spa and the River Wharfe to the east of Walton and west of the Wetherby racecourse was selected by the private sector development industry as a site for a new country town of 5,000 dwellings promoted through the unitary development plan process in the mid 1990's. The Inspector reporting on the UDP inquiry found against this proposal (loss of some best and most versatile agricultural land and the lack of a sufficiently sustainable public transport service). The Inspector concluded that this was a project before its time and that it might be a strategic option in the future. This is raised simply to demonstrate that there are alternative sites including a location outside the Green Belt.
Response	The site referenced (north of Boston Spa), although previously considered through the UDP has not be resubmitted for consideration either in SHLAA or the SAP process and the Inspectors findings on that site are dated to the previous plan period. Other alternatives have been considered and discounted as set out in the revised Publication Draft Plan (section 6: ONE)
Action	No change
Detail	The Green Belt assessment Appendix 1 clearly shows that the Green Belt characteristics of MX2-39 (Parlington Estate) and Sturton Grange North (SITE REF) differ and that release of Parlington Estate from the Green Belt would be more damaging to the purposes and integrity of the Leeds Green Belt, more so than Sturton Grange North. The Council has failed to provide robust evidence in support of its decision to remove Parlington Estate from the Green Belt and find it an appropriate site for a new settlement.
Response	The aim has been to make the minimum change necessary to the Green Belt boundaries to deliver the Core Strategy targets. This inevitably varies to reflect the needs and characteristics of the area concerned. The Green Belt Review is just one factor in the overall assessment process. The overall assessment has considered the relationship of a site to the settlement hierarchy, whether brownfield or greenfield, site attributes – whether it can be physically developed, considering comments from infrastructure providers and the sustainability assessment of sites. Stourton Grange North is in a different HMCA. The Council has through the preparation towards the Revised Publication Plan for ONE recognised that a new settlement approach could play a role in the mix of solutions required to meet housing need in Leeds and is in line with the direction of travel of the Government in their aspirations for Garden Villages. Proposals for Headley Hall were withdrawn by the landowner immediately prior to Publication consultation, which has necessitated a revised approach to the Outer North East. A new settlement proposal at Parlington coupled with an extension to the major settlement of Wetherby, so as to help distribute development throughout the area, is the preferred approach moving forward.
Action	No change

Mixed use	
Detail	The development of Parlington Estate (MX2-39) has the potential to harm the significance of a number of designated and non-designated heritage assets both within the area of the proposed new settlement itself and in the surrounding area. The mitigation measures identified in the Heritage Impact Assessment seem unlikely to reduce the harm that the development of this area would be likely to cause to the historic environment to a level which would be compatible with the requirements of national policy guidance (NPPF or 1990 Act). Therefore consider that the site would result in a significant adverse effect () against SA objective 21 (historic environment).
Response	It is felt that Historic England have misinterpreted the information set out within the Heritage Background Paper, which sets out areas of relative sensitivity, rather than absolute sensitivity. We have shown that certain areas of the site have the 'highest' level of sensitivity, relative to other areas of the site. Historic England appear to have interpreted the information to mean that parts of the sites have the highest possible level of the sensitivity relative to all sites, when this is not the case. The LPA have thoroughly assessed the heritage implications of the site and through the implementation of the relevant site requirements and high quality design, it is felt that development can take place on the site without significant harm to heritage assets. In any event the site boundary has now been significantly re-drawn, which places development largely away from the areas of relatively higher sensitivity.
Action	No change on the issue raised.
Detail	Delivery: It is noted that of the 1850 allocated units at the Parlington Estate, 100 units were displaced from identified site HG2-220 Moor End, Boston Spa and added to the capacity of Parlington Estate MX2-39 at the Leeds Plans Panel meeting on the 19th July 2016. The Minutes note that Members proposed that "given improved build out rates at Parlington [it] would not be required". Question how discarding housing numbers from other sites into MX2-39 demonstrates positive plan making or full consideration of build out or deliverability. Settlement hierarchy and level of growth: The Outer North East area is not identified as an area of the District where major growth can be accommodated – indeed it is stated that such areas provide opportunity for only "modest" growth. A new settlement of 5,000 units and 11ha of employment land and substantial new infrastructure is not modest growth. Major growth can be accommodated, however, at urban extensions to the Major Settlements.
Response	Delivery is considered above. The scale of Parlington, delivering an anticipated 37% of the ONE target (c5000) is consistent with the approach of a new sustainable settlement. The ONE is characterised by a number of smaller and rural settlements, some of which do not have primary schools or doctors. By planning for a new sustainable settlement that can accommodate a sustainable community with upfront infrastructure is in the round considered the most sustainable option than incremental and smaller scale developments. The Core Strategy Policy SP10 states that stand alone settlements must "within the context of their Housing Market Characteristic Area, [be] more appropriate in meeting the spatial objectives of the plan than the alternatives". On its own it is considered that Parlington does not achieve this objective because it focusses a significant level of housing development in a part of the HMCA, which has little affinity with Wetherby – the major settlement. The Core Strategy Inspector noted that growth in the HMCA and placing less reliance on one major site.
Action	No change
Detail	Sites with unimplemented planning permission and sites with existing or recently expired planning permission have not been included within the SA. The SA scoring for Parlington (MX2-39) has negative effects on 11 of the 26 criterion, most of these significant negative. Comparison made with rejected site at Sturton Grange North (1232A). The two sites have the same SA implications for 17 of the 26 sustainability criterion. The SA fails in providing any clear considerationthat the proposed allocation of Parlington when judged against reasonable alternatives, of which Sturton Grange North is one, ill help to achieve the relevant environmental, economic and social objectives of the Plan.
Response	The SA Report explains the approach to assessing sites and reasoning for not including extant UDP allocations and permissions. The SA informs the decision making process in selecting sites for allocation. Other factors are also taken into account in this selection process. Just because one site performs better overall in SA terms does not automatically mean it will be allocated in preferance to other sites. It should be noted that the two sites referred to fall within different HMCAs.
Action	No change

Datall	
Detail	Heritage England have raised concerns on the impacts on the heritage assets of the site. This landscape, which, itself, is a non-designated heritage asset, provides a setting and context for a large number of designated and other nondesignated heritage assets associated with the Parlington Estate. The Council has a statutory duty under the provisions of S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 to pay "special attention" to "the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance" of its Conservation Areas. They refer to the evaluation in the Heritage Impact Assessment that development in this location is likely to result in serious harm to the Conservation Area. The mitigation measures identified (Heritage Impact Assessment) seem unlikely to reduce the harm that the development of this area would be likely to cause to the historic environment to a level which would be compatible with the requirements of national policy guidance, as set out in the NPPF, or the duties of the 1990 Act. Either:- (a) Delete MX2-39 completely, or (b) Reduce the extent of the Allocation to a scale where is can be clearly demonstrated that the development would be compatible with the requirements.
Response	It is felt that Historic England have misinterpreted the information set out within the Heritage Background Paper, which sets out areas of relative sensitivity, rather than absolute sensitivity. We have shown that certain areas of the site have the 'highest' level of sensitivity, relative to other areas of the site. Historic England appear to have interpreted the information to mean that parts of the sites have the highest possible level of the sensitivity relative to all sites, when this is not the case. The LPA have thoroughly assessed the heritage implications of the site and through the implementation of the relevant site requirements and high quality design, it is felt that development can take place on the site without substantial harm to heritage assets. In consideration of the issues of scale the site boundary is proposed to be re-drawn, which reduces the size of the settlement and places development largely away from the areas of relative high sensitivity.
Action	Amendment to the site boundary
Detail	Capacity: The MX2-39 Parlington proposal is an unsuitable development plan as it does not accurately provide for the transport infrastructure that would be required to support it, nor does it take into account the impact on local communities and the infrastructure requirements of the wider Leeds city region. (SEE detailed rep)
Response	Taking into consideration all the representations received, discussions with statutory bodies, Sustainability Appraisal and the significant concerns in regard to the upper level of scale of development, officers consider that the Revised Publication Draft proposals for Parlington needs to be amended prior to submission of the Plan. The release from the Green Belt of the site as set out in the Publication Draft Plan, which provides land for up to 5,000 new homes cannot be justified. However, a smaller green belt release, to provide for a smaller sustainable new settlement (circa 1,850) can be justified. Given the acknowledged difficulties surrounding the master planning and delivery of new settlements it is prudent to consider primarily the needs of the housing market area for the current plan period and only release Green Belt to support this.
Action	Amend site boundary to reduce the site for a smaller settlement (c 1850) but retain indentification of a larger settlement to be subject to future review (to remain in the GB until that time) (see proposed change to add new policy MX2-39)
Detail	Agricultural Land Classification: The Council is required to undertake a sequential assessment and include reference within any site selection methodology to endure the best and most versatile land is protected, and lesser quality land is released in preference to land such as that at Parlington Estate.
Response	Para 112 of the NPPF states that "Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality". The assessment of agrigultural land is included in the Sustainability Assessment (SA22A). This site includes a combination of small pockets of grade 2 and larger areas of grade 3 (further sub categorised as 3a and 3b) and agricultural land.
Action	No direct change. See proposed change to site boundary and new Policy MX2-39 - any subsequent phases (beyond the plan period) will be subject to a review of the plan.
Detail	A new settlement should be developed in conjunction to development in the smaller settlements, not as an alternative to them - it should be provided in addition to the Council meeting their housing needs.
Response	See answer to above, the Parlington Site will be developed in conjunction with the other listed HG2 sites in ONE. It is considered that the new settlement provides a sustainable solution for the ONE area and that the promotor/developer is confident it can be delivered within the plan period.
Action	No Change
Detail	SUSTRANS - NCN route 66. It is not for Sustrans to approve or object to the housing allocation, but there is the need for improvements should the allocation be approved. It uses a track (Parlington Lane) which is in very poor repair and dark and wet tunnel on what was an old Fly Line, but it would give a very good cycle route towards Manston Lane and CS2. NCN 66 is described and included in the statements from the company wishing to develop the site but SUSTRANS would like to be included as stakeholders should any application come forward.
Response	Agreed and noted.
Action	Propose inclusion of cycle routes into the site requirement wording (see proposed change to add new Policy MX2-39)

Mixed use allocation A green infrastructure and biodiversity plan will be required for the site. The Elmet Magnesian Limistone has rare Magnesian Grassland and Ancient Woodland habitats that rely on Detail green infrastructure to sustain ecosystems. Response The generic site requirement set out on Page 24 of Parts 1&2 (Introduction and) of the Site Allocation Plan set out the need for Landscape and ecology assessments. No change (see proposed change to add new Policy MX2-39, which seeks to add clarity on the extent of the site to be developed within the plan period and sets out site Action requirements on ecology) Detail Proposals for a New Settlement in the Outer North East are not considered to be consistent with the adopted Core Strategy spatial development strategy comprising Policies SP1. SP6. SP7 and SP10. Policy SP10 makes clear that where sites are "In sustainable locations and are able to provide a full range of local facilities and services and within the context of their housing Response Market Characteristic Area, are more appropriate in meeting the spatial objectives of the plan than the alternatives within the Settlement Hierarchy." Through the Housing Background Paper the Council has set out that a new settlement at Parlington adheres to this policy. Further details will be provided within the Housing Background paper to expand on this point and to make the links between the Core Strategy and the Sustainability Appraisal absolutely clear. No Change to the plan but alterations to the Housing Background Paper Action Detail It is considered that the material set out in the SA Addendum issued as part of this consultation does not provide an objective appraisal of the reasonable alternatives or whether the New Settlement scheme presented (particularly within the Officer's Report to Development Plan Panel of 19th July) is the most appropriate strategy. As a consequence it does not justify the policy approach set out in the Revised Draft Publication SAP for the ONE HMA. Also it therefore fails the soundness tests as set out in Paragraph 182 of the Framework, as it does not demonstrate that SAP represents the most appropriate strategy. It is considered that the SA is not the appropriate document to justify why MX2-39 was the most appropriate strategy. The Housing Background Paper which supports the SAP sets Response this out in more detail. Action No change

Not allocated for mixed use

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
3391	Headley Hall, Bramham, Leeds	1	0	1	0		
No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
CFSM033	NEB Site, Scarcorft Lodge, Scarcroft, Leeds				
No proposed	l changes				
•					

Identified employment

Ref		Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
EG1-8	Land at Rudgate Walton Wetherby		3	2	1	0	0.37 ha
Issues requ	iring further assessment						
Detail	Planning permission for a single storey would not be effective with its continued	extension to a factory 13/05708/FU was co inclusion.	ompleted on 15/05/2014	4 and theref	ore the pro	posed allocation	on should be d
Response		ns Plan started in 2012 it is recognised that here sites as they make a contribution to					lete before the
Action	No Change						

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
EG1-9	Units 512 & 515 Thorp Arch Trading Estate Wetherby Ls23 7bj	3	2	1	0	1.9 ha

No proposed changes

•	,	

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
EG1-10	Holmecroft York Road Ls13 4					2.29 ha

No proposed changes

	b	
•		

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
EG1-63	Avenue D Thorp Arch T E	4	2	2	0	4.32 ha

Issues requiring further assessment

Detail	Applicant states that the site is undeliverable for employment uses due to the adverse ground conditions on site. Only residential development would provide the values to be able to remediate the site.
Response	Local planning authorities should work with developers to find acceptable ways forward if there are concerns about land contamination. Responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the develop and/or landowner. It is considered that development for general employment will be appropriate subject to conditions and/or planning obligations which can be sought following consideration of a detailed assessment of contamination and establishing any necessary remediation measures and standards. It is considered that employment use does not pose an unacceptable risk.

Action No change to the Plan.

٠

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
EG1-64	Wighill Lane & Rudgate, Thorp Arch Ind Estate	3	2	1	0	3.49 ha
No propose	d changes					

Identified employment

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		Capacity
EG1-65	Avenue D & E Thorp Arch Estate	4	2	2	0		8.06 ha
Issues requi	ring further assessment]	

 Detail
 Applicant states that the site is undeliverable for employment uses due to the adverse ground conditions on site. Only residential development would provide the values to be able to remediate the site.

 Response
 Local planning authorities should work with developers to find acceptable ways forward if there are concerns about land contamination. Responsibility for securing a safe

development rests with the develop and/or landowner. It is considered that development for general employment will be appropriate subject to conditions and/or planning obligations which can be sought following consideration of a detailed assessment of contamination and establishing any necessary remediation measures and standards. It is considered that employment use does not pose an unacceptable risk.

Action No change to the plan.

RefAddressTotal repsSupportObjectNeutralEG1-68Unit 204 Avenue C Thorp Arch Estate, Wetherby21101.12 haNo proposed changes

•

Identified employment

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
EO1-3	Park Hill Farm Park Hill Studio Walton Road Wetherby	0	0	0	0	579 sqm

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	Capacity
EO1-40	BLDGS B PARK HILL FARM WALTON ROAD WETHERBY	0	0	0	1	1050 sqm
No proposed	d changes					

New site suggestion - not allocated

Ref		Address	
EMP00358	Land at H	arewood Yard, Harewood, Leeds	
Assessment	t summary	Green Belt site located within the Harewood Estate and within the Harewood Hou and therefore the location does not align with the spatial development strategy. buildings and former agricultural buildings. The site also contains significant area land is availlable within the site for development and these are not considered to Green Belt. If the whole site was considered for development then it would have buildings), as well as the Green Belt and areas of ecological importance.	ne site is presently a small business park formed by conversions from historic of woodland which have ecological importance. Consequently very little residu epresent a strategic allocation opportunity which would justify its release from th

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G99	The Ings Wetherby				
No proposed	l changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G132	Harland Way (Within Leeds boundary only)				

No proposed changes

•							
Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G140	Lotherton Hall Estate						
No proposed changes							

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G419	Quarry Hill Lane Rec, Wetherby				
No proposed	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G420	St Joseph's School Playing Field				
No propose	d changes				

No proposed changes

()		

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G421	St Joseph's Primary School				
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G422	Quarry Hill Bridge, Wetherby						
No proposed	No proposed changes						

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G423	Quarry Hill, Wetherby						
No proposed	No proposed changes						

Ref	Address	Total reps Support	Object	Neutral
G425	Lazenby Drive Greenspace			

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G466 F	Raby Park				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G467	Butterwick Gardens				
No proposed	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G469	King Georges Field Recreation Ground				
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G512	Woodlea (Primrose Lane) Allotments				
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G513	Hallfield Lane Recreation Ground				
No propose	d changes				

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G514	Hallfield Lane Cemetery						
No proposed	No proposed changes						

G534 Law Close Greenspace	Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
	G534	Law Close Greenspace				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G536	Nidd Approach							
No proposed changes								

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G537	St James Church of England School							
No proposed changes								

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G538	Wetherby High School						
No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G540	Deighton Gates Junior and Infant School							
No proposed changes								

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G542	North Grove Road						
No proposed changes							

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G543	Deighton Road							
No proposed changes								

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G544	West Park				

No proposed changes

Ref Address Total reps Support Object Neutral G545 Deepdale Community Centre Image: Support Image: Suppor

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address To	otal reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G554	Keswick Lane Allotments							
No proposed	No proposed changes							

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G571	Boston Spa Riverside /Ebor Way						
No proposed changes							

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G572	Northways Field and Woodland Area				
No proposed	d changes				

- - -

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G573	Stables Lane Playing Field				
No proposed	d changes				

٠

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G574	Clifford Village Hall				
No proposed	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G609	Crossley Park Wood				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G610	Wetherby Wilderness				
No propose	• •				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G611	Sandringham Road Recreation Ground				
No proposed	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G612	Jubilee Gardens				
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G618	Crossley Street Primary School				
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G622	Deepdale Lane Playground				
No propose	d changes				

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G672	Bramham Recreation Ground						
No proposed	No proposed changes						

Ret	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G673	Aberford Road Greenspace				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G674	Boston Spa Allotment Gardens						

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address Tota	al reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G675	Terrace Lawn Tennis Club				
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G992	Harewood Cricket Club							
No propose	No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral				
G993	Gateways School	1	1	0	0				
No propose	No proposed changes								

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1208	St Peters Churchyard						
No propose	No proposed changes						

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral				
G1219	Moat End (rear of)								
No proposed	No proposed changes								

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1398	St John's Residential School for the Deaf				

No proposed changes

● Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1407	Aberford Albion FC	Total Teps	Support	Object	Neutrai
	· ·				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address Total	reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1408	Aberford Allotments - Field Lane				
No proposed	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1409	St Ricarius Church				
No proposed	l changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1410	St Ricarius Churchyard				
No proposed	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1455	The Yorkshire Conductive Education Centre				
No proposed	l changes				

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1456	Walton Road Sports Pitches	1	0	1	0
No propose	d changes				

_

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1457	Thorp Arch HM Prison Sports Ground	1	0	1	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1458	Bramham Park Cricket Pitch				
No proposo					

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1459	Wetherby Cricket Ground				
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1460	Thorp Arch Cycleway				
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1461	St Edwards Church Clifford				
	d changes				

No proposed changes

۲

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1463	Thorp Arch Grange				
No propose	d changes				

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1464	Leeds United Training Ground	1	0	1	0
No proposed	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1465	St Peters Church Walton				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
G1466	Thorp Arch and Boston Spa Cricket Ground	2	2	0	0	
No proposed changes						

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral				
G1467	Woodland Drive								
No propose	No proposed changes								

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1468	Rudgate Park	1	0	1	0
No proposed	d changes				

. .

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1470	Clifford Allotments				
No proposed	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1471	St Lukes Church Clifford						
No proposed changes							

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1472	All Saints Church, Bramham						
No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1473 Rig	gton Hill				

No proposed changes

	Address	i otal reps	Support	Object	Neutra
G1474	Harewood Avenue Cemetery				
51474					

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1475	East Keswick Sports Association				
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1476	East Keswick War Memorial and Woodland						
No propose	No proposed changes						

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1477	St Mary Magdelene's Church East Keswick				
No proposed changes					

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1478	East Keswick Main Street				
No proposed changes					

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1480	Bardsey Grange Close (North)						
No proposed changes							

•

G1481 Bardsey Sports Ground	Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
	G1481	Bardsey Sports Ground				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address T	otal reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1482	Bardsey Bowling Green and Tennis Courts.				
No propose	d changes				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1483	East Keswick Tennis Courts				
No proposed	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1484	Holywell Lane Park				
No proposed	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1485	Thorner Tennis Club				
No proposed changes					

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
G1488	Thorner Church of England Primary School					
No proposed changes						

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1521	Collingham Bowling Green and Tennis Courts				
No propose	d changes				

G1523 Collingham And Linton Sports Association	1	1	0	0

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1525	Collingham and Linton Bridge	1	1	0	0
No propose	d changes				

No proposed changes

•
•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1547	Bardsey Catholic Church of the Blessed Sacred						
No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1548	Bardsey Dog Exercising Area						
No propose	No proposed changes						

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1549	Sand Bridge Sports Ground							
No propose	No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1550	Garforth Golf Course				
No propose	d changes				

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1551	Aberford Pond - Field Lane							
No proposed	No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1553	Lyndon Road				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps Support	Object	Neutral
G1554	Thorp Arch All Saints Church			
	d ek			

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral				
G1555	Rudgate Park 2								
No proposed	d changes		No proposed changes						

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1556	Grange Avenue 2				
No proposed	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1557	Grange Avenue						
No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1558	Rudgate Park 3						
No proposed	No proposed changes						

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1559	Rudgate Park 4	1	0	1	0			
No proposed changes								

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1561	Thorp Arch Tennis Courts				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
G1573	Aberford Bowling Green					
No proposed changes						

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1574	Aberford Playing Fields and Tennis Courts							
No proposed changes								

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1576	Thorner FC and Thorner Mexborough CC						
No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
G1587	Shadwell Primary School					
No proposed changes						

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1588	Bardsey Junior & Infant School						
No proposed changes							

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1591	Lady Elizabeth Hasting Church of England Aided Primary School	1	1	0	0
No propose	d obongoo				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1608	Barwick in Elmet Church of England Junior and Infant School				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
G1609	Mill Lane Collingham	1	1	0	0	
No proposo	No proposed changes					

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1610	Scholes Elmet Primary School							
No proposed	No proposed changes							

Ref	Address To	otal reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1612	Aberford Church of England Primary School				
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1622	St Mary's Church of England Primary School				
No proposo	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1627	Linton Tennis Courts							
No proposed changes								

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
G1628	Lady Elizabeth Hastings Church of England Primary School					
No propose	No proposed changes					

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1629	Boston Spa Comprehensive School				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1630	Collingham Community Hall				
No propose	d changes				

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1631	Boston Spa Primrose Lane Primary School							
No propose	No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1632	St Edward's RC Primary School							
No proposed	No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1633	Bishopdale Drive							

Ref	Address Total r	eps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1634	West Oaks SILC				
No proposed changes					

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1635	Bramham Primary School						
No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps Support	Object	Neutral
G1636	Bramham Cricket Pitch			

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1645	Shadwell Lane	1	1	0	0
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
G1669	Wetherby Golf Club					
No proposed changes						

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
G1670	Thorner Road Allotments					
No proposed	No proposed changes					

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1686	Collingham St Oswald's Church	1	1	0	0		
No propose	No proposed changes						

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1687	Church Lane Collingham				
No propose	d changes				

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1688	Collingham Allotments							
No proposed	No proposed changes							

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1689	Aberford Road Allotments				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
G1717	Alwoodley Golf Club					

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1738	Thorner Bowling Club							
No propose	No proposed changes							

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1747	Bowcliffe Beck				
No proposed	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1748	Bowcliffe Wood				
No proposed	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1749	Bramham Lodge							
No proposed changes								

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1758	Scarcroft Disused Railway							
No proposed	No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1759	Hetchell Woods				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
G1760	Hell Pot Woods / Dam Wood					

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address Tota	al reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1761	Moor Allerton Golf Club				
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1763	Shadwell Cricket Ground				
No proposed	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1764	All Hallows Church, Badsey						
No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1766	Scarcroft Cricket Pitch				
No propose	d changes				

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral		
G1768	Scarcroft Golf Course						
No proposed changes							

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1769	Scarcroft Plantation				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps Support	Object	Neutral
G1795	Berwick in Elmet Allotments			
	d changes			

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1796	Welfare Avenue OS				
No proposed	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1797	Barwick Sports Ground				
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1798	Leeds Road POS				
No propose	d changes				

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1799	Belle Vue Allotments - Scholes				
No propose	d changes				

Greenspace

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral			
G1800	Scholes Playing Field							
No proposed	No proposed changes							

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1801	St Philips Church				

No proposed changes

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1866	Beckside Play Area				
No proposed changes					

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1868	Harewood House Estate				
No proposed	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1880	Woodhouse Farm/Oakhill Woods				
No propose	d changes				

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
G1881	High Trees Nursery School					
No proposed changes						

No proposed changes

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
G1906	Whinmoor Grange Cemetery				
No propose	d changes				

New greenspace site suggestions

Ref		Address	
G1925	Wetherby	/ Race Course	
Assessme	ent detail	The actual race course and associated structures are a strategic leisure facility ar used on race days and for other activities such as car boot sales and there is info These other areas are ancilliary to the main race course use and their primary fur opportunites for recreational activities will continue.	
Assessmen	t summary	No changes to the plan.	

Retail centres

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral	
TLC016	Collingham Local Centre	1	1	0	0	
No proposed changes						

•

Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
TLC026	Boston Spa Local Centre	0	0	0	0

•					
Ref	Address	Total reps	Support	Object	Neutral
TLC059	Wetherby Town Centre	0	0	0	0
No propose	d changes				