

LEEDS SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN

ISSUES AND OPTIONS FOR THE PLAN

DRAFT April 2013

VOLUME 2: SITE PROPOSALS FOR EACH HOUSING MARKET CHARACTERISTIC AREA 5. NORTH

VOLUME 2: SITE PROPOSALS FOR EACH HOUSING MARKET CHARACTERISTIC AREA 5. NORTH:

| CONTENTS: | PAGE: |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| 5.1.0 INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| 5.2.0 RETAIL ISSUES AND OPTIONS: | 3 - 5 |
| 5.3.0 HOUSING ISSUES AND OPTIONS: | 6 - 22 |
| 5.4.0 EMPLOYMENT ISSUES AND OPTIONS: | 23 - 26 |
| 5.5.0 GREENSPACE ISSUES AND OPTIONS: | 27 - 33 |

PLANS:

RETAIL: NORTH

| | |
|-----------|---|
| PLAN 5.2A | Alwoodley |
| PLAN 5.2B | Butcher Hill |
| PLAN 5.2C | Chapel Allerton |
| PLAN 5.2D | Harehills Corner |
| PLAN 5.2E | Hawthornthwaite |
| PLAN 5.2F | Headingley |
| PLAN 5.2G | Hollins Park |
| PLAN 5.2H | Holt Park |
| PLAN 5.2I | Horsforth New Road Side |
| PLAN 5.2J | Horsforth Town Centre |
| PLAN 5.2K | Kirkstall Road |
| PLAN 5.2L | Kirkstall Town Centre |
| PLAN 5.2M | Meanwood |
| PLAN 5.2N | Montreal Harrogate Road |
| PLAN 5.2O | Moor Allerton |
| PLAN 5.2P | Moortown |
| PLAN 5.2Q | Oakwood |
| PLAN 5.2R | Slaid Hill |
| PLAN 5.2S | Station Road, Horsforth |
| PLAN 5.2T | Street Lane |
| PLAN 5.2U | Weetwood Far, Headingley |
| PLAN 5.2V | Plan showing all centres and 'call for sites' submissions |

HOUSING: NORTH

PLAN 5.3 Housing

EMPLOYMENT: NORTH

PLAN 5.4 Employment

GREENSPACE: NORTH

PLAN 5.5A UDP Greenspace allocations and open space audit sites

PLAN 5.5B Types of Greenspace

5.1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 5.1.1 Volume 1 of the Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options sets out the approach and an overview for each topic which will be included in the final Site Allocations Plan. The plan will cover Retail, Housing, Employment and Greenspace allocations. Please see Volume 1 in conjunction with the area proposals for a full understanding of the context and work involved in producing the Issues and Options for the plan.
- 5.1.2 Plans for initial proposals for retail, housing, employment and greenspace are at the end of this document. View the plans on line at www.leeds.gov.uk/ldf. Please note that if you view this document on line, you can access the full site assessments for housing and employment sites. If you do not have access to a computer, you can use computers at libraries. The Council can make further details available on request, but printing costs may be incurred. It is not practical to put all site details in an appendix due to the volume of sites and information involved.
- 5.1.3 The North Leeds area is characterised by a number of distinctive communities which form part of the Main Urban Area of Leeds. These include Chapel Allerton, Alwoodley, Cookridge, Horsforth and Headingley. The Meanwood Valley and Roundhay Park, also form part of the wider network of Green Infrastructure.

5.2.0 NORTH RETAIL ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

- 5.2.1 The main retail centres are at Harehills, Moor Allerton, Meanwood and Horsforth. It is proposed to include eight new centres. There are 21 centres within the North area:
- Alwoodley – new proposed centre (See Plan 5.2A)
 - Butcher Hill – new proposed centre (See Plan 5.2B)
 - Chapel Allerton (See Plan 5.2C)
 - Harehills Corner (See Plan 5.2D)
 - Hawksworth – new proposed centre (See Plan 5.2E)
 - Headingley (See Plan 5.2F)
 - Hollins Park – new proposed centre (See Plan 5.2G)
 - Holt Park (See Plan 5.2H)
 - Horsforth New Road Side (See Plan 5.2I)
 - Horsforth Town Centre (See Plan 5.2J)
 - Kirkstall Road – new proposed centre (See Plan 5.2K)
 - Kirkstall Town Centre (See Plan 5.2L)
 - Meanwood (See Plan 5.2M)
 - Montreal Harrogate Road – new proposed centre (See Plan 5.2N)
 - Moor Allerton (See Plan 5.2O)
 - Moortown (See Plan 5.2P)
 - Oakwood (See Plan 5.2Q)
 - Slaid Hill – new proposed centre (See Plan 5.2R)
 - Station Road, Horsforth (See Plan 5.2S)
 - Street Lane (See Plan 5.2T)
 - Weetwood, Far Headingley – new proposed centre (See Plan 5.2U)

5.2.2 For each centre a review of the centre boundary and survey of current uses has been undertaken. This has involved redefining the boundaries of town centres to accommodate retail development within centres. The council is not allocating sites for retail in these centres but making boundary changes may provide scope to accommodate additional retailing. The survey of uses has been used to determine the primary shopping area and frontages (primary and secondary). Of those centres previously identified in the Leeds UDP, the proposed boundaries of both Kirkstall and Harehills Lane contain potential opportunity sites at the edge of centre.

5.2.3 Volume 1 page 16 defines these as:

Primary Shopping Areas (PSA)

This is the area where retail development and activity is concentrated.

Frontages

Primary Frontages include the main shopping core of the centre where class A1 premises, such as shops, post offices, travel agencies, hairdressers and dry cleaners, are normally protected.

Secondary Frontages include premises on the edge of centres where a wider mix of uses are permitted including financial and professional services, restaurants and cafés and pubs.

See page 16 Volume 1 for full details as to why these designations are required.

5.2.4 **Call for sites**

The following sites were submitted for retail use as part of the Council's 2012 'call for sites':

| Site Name | REF | Ward | Nearest Centre | Distance to 300 mtr Edge | Sequential Location | Comment |
|--|---------|----------|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Land adjacent to Clayton Wood Road, Weetwood, LS16 6NS | CFSR009 | Weetwood | Butcher Hill Local Centre | 251 | Outside Centre & 300m Buffer | Sequentially inappropriate. |
| Clayton Wood Bank, West Park, Leeds, LS16 6QZ | CFSR004 | Weetwood | Butcher Hill Local Centre | 233 | Outside Centre & 300m Buffer | Sequentially inappropriate. |

See plan 5.2V showing the location of the 'call for sites' submissions in the table above.

QUESTIONS ON RETAIL ISSUES AND OPTIONS

The council would like your views on the proposed boundaries and frontage designations.

R1. Do you have any comments on the proposed centre and Primary Shopping Area (PSA) boundary? Please state the centre/s to which your comments relate.

Use plans to support your comments where possible

R2. Do you have any comments on the proposed frontage designations? Please state the centre/s to which your comments relate.

Use plans to support your comments where possible.

R3. Do you have any comments on the 'call for sites', sites coming forward for retail uses within the plan period.

R4. Do you have any other sites to suggest for retail development ?(please provide details and plans)

5.3.0 NORTH HOUSING ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

5.3.1 See Volume 1, pages 18 - 22 for a full explanation of the approach to considering which sites should be allocated for housing. See plan 5.3 Housing showing the sites referred to in this section.

5.3.2 **Total housing target for North** (set out in the Core Strategy) = 6,000 units (9% of District wide total)

Total number of dwellings/capacity we are seeking:

The target of 6,000 residential units does not mean that land for 6,000 new units has to be allocated for housing. From the overall total, existing allocations (previous UDP housing allocations not developed) and planning permissions with units still remaining to be built as at 31.3.12 will be deducted. These sites are listed in table 5.3.1 below and will count towards the overall target. They are shown in lime green on plan 5.3 Housing.

Table 5.3.1.
Table illustrating existing permissions and allocations as at 31.3.12. These sites are shown in lime green on the plan.

| SHL AA Ref | HLA Ref | Address | Capacity | Complete | Under con | Not started |
|--|---------|--|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|
| Allocations - not yet developed | | | | | | |
| | 26002 | | | | | |
| 685 | 30 | Eastmoor Tile Lane LS16 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| | 26016 | | | | | |
| 687 | 60 | Dunstarn Lane Adel LS 16 | 30 | 2 | 0 | 28 |
| | 26016 | | | | | |
| 688 | 70 | Silk Mill Drive LS 16 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| | 27000 | | | | | |
| 720 | 70 | Westbrook Lane Horsforth | 31 | 16 | 0 | 15 |
| | 27000 | | | | | |
| 721 | 71 | Westbrook Lane Horsforth | 75 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| | 27009 | | | | | |
| 731 | 90 | Victoria Avenue Horsforth | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Sites 0.4ha+ with planning permission | | | | | | |
| | 27014 | | | | | |
| 34 | 90 | Riverside Mills, Low Hall Road, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 4EF* | 90* | 0 | 0 | 90* |
| | 24053 | | | | | |
| 1092 | 40 | Former Boston Diner, St Anns Lane, Burley, Leeds | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| | 26001 | | | | | |
| 689 | 61 | Former Cookridge Hospital, Silk Mill Way LS16 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| | 26026 | | | | | |
| 689 | 90 | Cookridge Hospital LS16 | 169 | 0 | 19 | 150 |
| | 26035 | | | | | |
| 3 | 70 | 3 Monkbridge Road LS6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| | 26037 | | | | | |
| 376 | 50 | Ring Road West Park, Silk Mill Way And Iverson Drive | 485 | 0 | 0 | 485 |
| | 26037 | | | | | |
| 3010 | 90 | Farrar Lane, Adel, Leeds, LS16 7NQ | 52 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| | 24048 | | | | | |
| 626 | 10 | Kirkstall Forge Abbey Road LS5* | 970* | 0 | 0 | 970* |
| | 26038 | | | | | |
| 6 | 30 | Former Victoria Nursing Home, 224 Kirkstall Lane, Kirkstall, Leeds | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| | 26038 | | | | | |
| 0 | 50 | Spensfield House Otley Road Headingley | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| | 27013 | | | | | |
| 65 | 80 | Woodside Mill Low Lane Horsforth | 59 | 0 | 0 | 59 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--|-----|----|---|-----|
| 124 | 30019 90 | Beech Lodge Park Avenue LS8 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 4 |
| 762 | 30023 80 | Chandos Avenue LS8 | 55 | 54 | 1 | 0 |
| 764 | 30024 20 | The Mansion Woodlea Drive LS6 | 49 | 24 | 0 | 25 |
| 3151 | 30026 20 | Queenshill Court LS17 | 62 | 56 | 6 | 0 |
| 253 | 30026 60 | Land Off Cranmer Gardens, Alwoody, Leeds, LS17 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 845 | 34017 82 | Mansion House Mansion Gate Drive LS9 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| 106 | 34026 10 | Civil Service Sports Association Ground, Newton Road, Chapeltown, Leeds, LS7 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 1339 | 27014 80 | Former Clariant Works, Calverley Lane, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 | 400 | 0 | 0 | 400 |
| Sites 0.2ha to 0.4ha with planning permission | | | | | | |
| 3217 | 24039 00 | 232 Burley Road LS4 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 7 |
| 3184 | 24053 90 | The Former Dutton Arms, Queenswood Drive, Headingley, Leeds | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 0 | 26032 50 | 116 Cardigan Road LS6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 3201 | 26038 40 | The Former Lounge Cinema North Lane Headingley | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 3207 | 30025 20 | Rear 268-274 Shadwell Lane LS17 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 3215 | 30025 50 | The Grove North Lane LS8 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| 3301 | 30026 70 | 128 Wetherby Road, Roundhay, LS8 2JZ | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 3341 | 30026 90 | Rear Of The Hollies, Park Avenue, Roundhay, Leeds, LS8 2JJ | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Sites below 0.2ha with planning permission | | | | | | |
| 0 | 24048 60 | 83 Cardigan Lane LS4 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 0 | 24049 50 | Eden Mount LS4 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 0 | 26027 80 | 25-7 Bennett Road LS6 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 0 | 26032 70 | 45 St Michael's Lane LS6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 0 | 26033 10 | 1 North Grange Mount LS6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 689 | 26037 40 | Cookridge Hospital - Conversion | 77 | 0 | 0 | 77 |
| 0 | 26037 60 | 51 - 61 Otley Road And 3 - 9 North Lane, LS6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 3177 | 26038 20 | Granby Street, Headingley, Leeds, LS6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 0 | 26039 20 | 8 Holly Bank, Otley Road, Headingley, Leeds, LS6 4DJ | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 0 | 27013 70 | Long Row Horsforth | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 0 | 27014 10 | Throstle Nest Villa, New Road Side | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 3178 | 27014 30 | 85 Broadgate Lane, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 3185 | 27014 40 | Former Stanhope Drive Youth Centre, Stanhope Drive, Horsforth, Leeds | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 0 | 27014 70 | Low Fold Garage, New Road Side, Horsforth, Leeds | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 0 | 30023 70 | Sutherland Avenue LS8 | 27 | 19 | 8 | 0 |
| 0 | 30026 00 | 468 Harrogate Road LS17 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 0 | 30026 40 | 467 Street Lane, Roundhay, Leeds | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 3181 | 34026 40 | 2 St Martin's Road, Leeds, LS7 3LX | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---|-------------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| 0 | 34026 60 | 321 Chapeltown Road, Chapeltown, Leeds, LS7 3LL | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 0 | 34026 90 | 3 Park Crescent, Roundhay, Leeds | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| North Leeds TOTAL | | | 3150 | 185 | 54 | 2911 |
| * Riverside Mills, Low Hall Road, Horsforth - site split between Aireborough (60 units) and North Leeds (90 units) | | | | | | |
| * Kirkstall Forge, Abbey Road - site split between Outer West (415 units) and North Leeds (970 units) | | | | | | |

The number of dwellings still to be built (still under construction or not started) is 54+ 2911 (last 2 totals in table) = 2965 dwellings still to be built from existing permissions and allocations.

So, the residual target is 6000 – 2965 = **3035 units remaining to find from pool of SHLAA sites as at 31.3.12.**

5.3.3 As Volume 1 para 8.3 explains figures will constantly change as planning permissions are granted through the course of production of this plan. In addition, the target set in the Core Strategy could change as the Core Strategy plan is not yet adopted. The target for each area is therefore based on information at a point in time. If the final target is less, we will be able to further select from the pool of sites the ones we consider most suitable for development. If the final target is more we will have to reconsider some sites, or consider further suggestions for sites.

5.3.4 Sites ‘sieved out’ of the assessment process (removed from further consideration)

See page 19 Volume 1 for an explanation of sites which have been sieved out as a first stage in the overall assessment process.

Table 5.3.2 Sieved out sites prior to site assessments in North

| SHLAA ref | Address | Reason sieved out |
|------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| 1339 | Clariant Production UK Limited, Calverley Lane, Horsforth, LS18 4RP | Not within settlement hierarchy |
| 3016 | Low Hall Farm, Low Hall Road, Horsforth, LS18 | Not within settlement hierarchy |

These sites are shown in purple on Plan 5.3 Housing.

5.3.5 Remaining sites in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to assess

The sites remaining in SHLAA after taking account of sites in table 5.3.1 and table 5.3.2 are the ones left to assess to see which may have potential as housing allocations. A site assessment methodology has been developed. The site proforma including the Green Belt Review Assessment is attached at Volume 1 Appendix.

All sites have been assessed using this proforma and the Green Belt Review assessment undertaken where relevant. In addition a sustainability appraisal has been undertaken of all sites surveyed. See the Issues and Options Sustainability Appraisal Report.

From undertaking this process, sites have been categorised according to the following colour coding:

Green – sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing.
Amber – sites which have potential but there may be issues which need to be resolved, or the site may not be in such a favoured location as those highlighted in green.
Red – sites which are not considered suitable for allocation for housing.

Table 5.3.3 shows the colour coding and reasons for the sites being within the relevant categories. The colour coding and sites listed are shown on Plan 5.3 Housing.

TABLE 5.3.3: SITES ASSESSED FOR POTENTIAL HOUSING ALLOCATIONS IN NORTH

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA Ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 1 | 16 | 29 Sandhill Lane, Moortown, Leeds LS17 6AJ | Moortown | 0.426 | 10 | Brownfield site within urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development. |
| 2 | 37 | Land at Vesper Road, Kirkstall | Kirkstall | 0.482 | 15 | Brownfield site within urban area, suitable for residential development in principle. |
| 3 | 81 | Land Rear High Moor Court, High Moor Avenue, Moor Allerton | Moortown | 0.903 | 32 | Within the urban area. The eastern half of the site is designated as greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See greenspace section, page 30, question G8. Otherwise, residential use is acceptable in principle. |
| 4 | 82 | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 Moor Allerton Gardens, Moor Allerton | Moortown | 0.470 | 16 | Given proximity of the site to the town centre the site could be appropriate for retail and other town centre uses as well as residential. Residential use is acceptable on upper floors in principle. |
| 5 | 94 | 7-9 Sandhill Lane, Moortown, Leeds, LS17 6AG | Moortown | 0.408 | 2 | Has planning permission granted 5th November 2012 for undeveloped section (two units). Work has begun on site. |
| 6 | 97 | Meanwood Road Working Men's Club, Meanwood Road, Leeds | Moortown | 0.471 | 9 | Town centre location - potential for mixed use or residential on upper floors acceptable in principle. |
| 7 | 118 | 21 And 23 The View, Alwoodley, Leeds LS17 7NA | Alwoodley | 0.436 | 6 | Brownfield site within the main urban area. The site has two properties on site currently. Residential use acceptable in principle. |
| 8 | 120 | 55 Harrogate Road, Chapel Allerton, Leeds, LS7 3RU | Chapel Allerton | 0.563 | 40 | Appropriate for retail and/or offices as within Chapel Allerton town centre. Current application for Morrisons foodstore on site. Residential would be suitable on upper floors in principle but primary use should be retail. |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA Ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|---|
| 9 | 174 | University Of Leeds Tetley Hall, 40-42 Moor Road, 11 | Weetwood | 2.557 | 114 | The site has permission for redevelopment of the former halls of residence, granted 2nd August, 2012 for a total 114 units comprising 4 storey residential care home, 3 blocks of 54 flats, 2 blocks of 14 townhouses, conversion of stables to detached house, with landscaping and public open space. |
| 10 | 177 | 54 And 56 Broomfield, Adel, Leeds, LS16 7AD | Adel and Wharfedale | 0.443 | 5 | Permission has been granted for demolition of number 54 Broomfield and replacement with two dwellings. Suitable in principle for residential development. |
| 11 | 235 | Land At Clarence Road, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 4LB | Horsforth | 0.707 | 5 | Site within the urban area. Suitable in principle for residential development. |
| 12 | 1014 | Land at Fraser Avenue, Horsforth | Horsforth | 1.238 | 45 | The site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 30, question G9. Highway concerns re achieving a suitable access. |
| 13 | 1015 | Land South of Lee Lane West, Horsforth | Horsforth | 30.13 | 791 | Green Belt site. The site has an important function in providing access to the countryside and views across the site to open countryside beyond. It is highly visible, with landscape value and a designated Local Nature Area within the site. The site performs poorly in highways and accessibility terms. |
| 14 | 1016 | Land at Broadway and Calverley Lane, Horsforth | Horsforth | 0.567 | 13 | Green Belt site, adjoining the main urban area with strong links to Horsforth. A main road borders the site to the west, residential development to the east and the education site to the south, so the site is well contained. Highway concerns regarding local congestion, mitigation measures required. |
| 15 | 1019 | Land off Gledhow Valley Road, Chapel Allerton, LS7 4ND | Chapel Allerton | 1.976 | 30 | Part of site is unused allotments and designated as allotments (N1A) on the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 30, question G10. Significant tree cover on a large part of the site as part of wider Gledhow Valley Woods. |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA Ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|---|
| 16 | 1026 | Cardigan Fields, Kirkstall Road | Kirkstall | 0.91 | 33 | Half of the site is covered by a recent planning approval for an Aldi supermarket. Adjacent to waste transfer station. |
| 17 | 1033 | Government Buildings, Otley Road, LS16 5PU | Adel and Wharfedale | 4.699 | 142 | The site is in an established residential area. Residential development acceptable in principle. The southern boundary is treed offering a substantial buffer to the open amenity space to the south. |
| 18 | 1062 | The former waste water treatment work, Horsforth | Horsforth | 3.089 | 53 | Green Belt site. The site is contained by a main road to the north, the river to the south, residential to the west and the Kirkstall Forge site to the east, so relates well to the urban area and development would be well contained and not set a precedent for further Green Belt sprawl. The site is being considered as a possible future school site. We are consulting Education on all sites and any comments received will be considered before making final decisions on sites. |
| 19 | 1079 | Long Causeway, Adel, LS16 8DU | Adel and Wharfedale | 3.260 | 86 | Green Belt site. In conjunction with sites 1243 and 1246 development could be seen to effectively 'round off' the settlement form. Highway concerns regarding accessibility and access. |
| 20 | 1120 | Land at Headingley Lane, Headingley | Headingley | 2.347 | 36 | Previous approvals for residential. Site includes NGT (New Generation Transport) route off A660 making access difficult and significantly reducing the developable area. |
| 21 | 1138 | Land adjacent to Beechwood, Elmete Lane, Roundhay, LS8 | Roundhay | 2.948 | 59 | Green Belt site. By itself the site does not relate well to the existing settlement pattern. The site includes a number of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) and a listed building to the east. Significant highway concerns relating to access, accessibility and suitability of local network. |
| 22 | 1151 | Cookridge Lane, Cookridge, LS16 | Adel and Wharfedale | 1.628 | 50 | Green Belt site adjoining the main urban area bordered by residential development to the east and a cricket pitch to the south, so relates relatively well to the existing settlement. However, there is no existing defensible boundary to the west, which could set a precedent for further sprawl. |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA Ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding. |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 23 | 1170 | Highbury Cricket Ground, Meanwood, North East Hollins Drive | Moortown | 0.99 | 31 | Green Belt site. The site is well contained and relates well to the existing settlement form. The site is designated as a protected playing pitch (policy N6) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See greenspace section, page 30, question G11. There is a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on the site. Highway concerns as no existing access to site and narrow local roads. |
| 24 | 1172 | Former Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, LS17 | Moortown | 4.670 | 88 | Designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See greenspace section, page 30, question G12. Could be suitable for residential development in principle, subject to greenspace analysis. |
| 25 | 1178A | Land south of Dunstarn Lane, Adel, LS16 | Adel and Wharfedale | 2.353 | 62 | Green Belt site. The site has been split into 2. Site A is south of the main residential area of Adel, sloping towards the ring road. Development of the site could be considered to 'round off' the existing built up area. Access would need to be through adjacent site 687 which is a housing allocation on the existing UDP, without planning permission. |
| 26 | 1178B | Land south of Dunstarn Lane, Adel, LS16 | Adel and Wharfedale | 10.658 | 280 | Green Belt site. The site has been split into 2. Site B slopes more steeply to the ring road and provides a buffer between the road and development and is more removed from the existing residential area. |
| 27 | 1190 | Land adjoining Wetherby Road/Elmete Lane, Roundhay LS8 | Roundhay | 6.870 | 181 | Green Belt site. The site borders the main urban area to the south and is well contained, with trees to the north, and roads along the remaining three sides. |
| 28 | 1199 (Part of site in Aireborough area) | Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge. LS16 | Adel and Wharfedale / Otley and Yeadon | 9.835 | 173 | Protected Area of Search (PAS) site on existing UDP, so not within the Green Belt. Capacity limited to 200 due to access constraints (split over two HMCAs). |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA Ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|---|
| 29 | 1202 | Land off Victoria Avenue, Horsforth LS18 | Horsforth | 8.745 | 185 | Green Belt site. The site is well related to the existing urban area being contained by the college to the west, existing residential to the east and the river to the south, so reducing the potential for further sprawl. Highway concerns re access - development could be accessed through the existing UDP housing allocation in the north east corner. Capacity has been reduced so this site and the housing allocation total 200, the maximum amount of units acceptable due to Highway concerns. |
| 30 | 1238 | Land to the rear of Oakford terrace, Low Lane, Horsforth, LS18 | Horsforth | 0.507 | 15 | Green Belt site. The site does not relate well to the existing settlement form but projects out to the east of Low Lane into Green Belt and is steeply sloping. Development of the site would not constitute rounding off of the settlement. The site is also designated as proposed greenspace by policy N5 of the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 30, question G13. Highway concerns as no road frontage to provide access. |
| 31 | 1242 | Paddock, Church Lane, Meanwood, LS6 | Moortown | 0.736 | 25 | Site is within the urban area, and surrounded by residential uses, so residential development is acceptable in principle. Parts of the site are sloping. |
| 32 | 1243 | Former Rectory Paddock, Back Church Lane, Adel , LS16 | Adel and Wharfedale | 0.574 | 18 | Green Belt site. In conjunction with sites 1079 and 1246 development could be seen to effectively 'round off' the settlement form. Highway concerns regarding accessibility and can only be accessed via site 1079. |
| 33 | 1246 | Former Rectory Paddock North of Memorial Rec Ground, Back Church Lane, Adel , LS16 | Adel and Wharfedale | 2.51 | 66 | Green Belt site. In conjunction with sites 1079 and 1243 development could be seen to effectively 'round off' the settlement form. Highway concerns regarding accessibility and can only be accessed via site 1079 which may limit housing numbers. |
| 34 | 1299A | Bodington Hall, Otley Road, Lawnswood,LS16 | Weetwood | 9.341 | 160 | The site has outline planning permission (20th September, 2012 - estimated 160 units) for residential development. |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA Ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding. |
|-----------------------|--|---|-----------|-----------------|---------------|---|
| 35 | 1299B | Bodington Hall, Otley Road, Lawnswood, LS16 | Weetwood | 17.365 | 521 | The site is currently designated as Protected Playing Pitch (N6) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See greenspace section, page 31, question G14. The site is also a proposed park and ride site on the existing UDP. |
| 36 | 1310 | Land at Outwood Lane, Horsforth, LS18 | Horsforth | 3.388 | 121 | Part of the site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP, linking to greenspace to the north west, north east and south of the site. See also greenspace section, page 31, question G15. A planning application for residential development was previously refused due to loss of greenspace, conservation reasons, and access issues. Highway concerns regarding access as the site has no road frontage and accessibility. |
| 37 | 2046 | North Ives Farm, Brownberrie Gardens, Horsforth, LS18 | Horsforth | 14.561 | 383 | Green Belt site. The site performs a role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, but is relatively well contained with residential development to three sides, except the north. The site is also designated as proposed open space (N5) on the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 31, question G16. The site also lies within the airport public safety zone where development is not permitted and there are Highways concerns regarding access and local network constraints. |
| 38 | 2049 | West Park Centre, LS16 | Weetwood | 2.297 | 69 | Former West Park Centre, within the urban area. Residential development acceptable in principle as this is a brownfield site within a residential area. Existing buildings on site formerly in community use. |
| 39 | 2051A (Part of site is in Outer North West area) | King Lane, Alwoodley, LS17 | Alwoodley | 53.99 | 1418 | Green Belt site. Development of the site would lead to a significant incursion into the Green Belt creating unrestricted sprawl. Highways concerns re. poor accessibility, access and local network capacity. |
| 40 | 2051B (Part of site is in Outer North West area) | King Lane, Alwoodley, LS17 | Alwoodley | 2.15 | 56 | Green Belt site. The site is unrelated to the existing settlement pattern and as such would represent a significant incursion into Green Belt. Highways concerns re. poor accessibility, access and local network capacity. |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA Ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 41 | 2052 | Tile Lane, Adel, LS16 | Adel and Wharfedale | 17.171 | 451 | Green Belt site. Development would be contained by residential development to the west and north (once the existing centre is redeveloped), and by woodland on the eastern boundary. However, no existing defensible boundary exists to the south. Highway concerns regarding poor accessibility and the narrow width of the estate road linking to the site. |
| 42 | 2053A | Alwoodley Lane, Alwoodley, LS17 | Alwoodley | 5.880 | 154 | Green Belt site. The site has been split into 2 sites. Site A is unrelated to the existing settlement, is nearer to Eccup Reservoir and would create an incursion into Green Belt that could set a precedent for further sprawl. |
| 43 | 2053B | Alwoodley Lane, Alwoodley, LS17 | Alwoodley | 13.430 | 353 | Green Belt site. The site has been split into 2 sites. Development of site B would constitute 'rounding off' of the existing settlement and is well related to the existing urban area. Concerns about local ecology impact. |
| 44 | 2055 | Carr Manor, Meanwood | Moortown | 4.68 | 15 | Site includes designated allotments (N1A) on existing UDP, and listed building. See also greenspace section, page 31, question G17. Conversion of listed building to residential is a possibility, but would need to maintain character of Carr Manor. Capacity revised down from 37 to 15 to reflect this. Conversion only would allow retention of allotments. |
| 45 | 2058 | Allerton Grange High School, Talbot Avenue, Moor Allerton, LS17 | Roundhay | 1.952 | 70 | Site adjoins school and is designated as N6 - Protected Playing Pitch on the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 31, question G18. We are consulting Education on all sites and any comments received will be considered before making final decisions on sites. |
| 46 | 2063 | Cobble Hall, Roundhay, LS8 | Roundhay | 19.017 | 500 | Green Belt site. Contingent on site 3315 coming forward to better relate to the urban area, and for access. Well contained site, with golf course and highway acting as a strong defensible boundary to the north. Wind turbine in centre of site. Highway concerns regarding poor accessibility and impact on the Ring Road. |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA Ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding. |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|-----------------|---------------|---|
| 47 | 2160 (Part of site in Aireborough area) | Ling Bob, Scotland Lane, Horsforth | Horsforth / Otley and Yeadon | 45.330 | 1189 | Green Belt site. The site performs a role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and despite its large size, is relatively well contained with residential development to three sides, except the north. The site is situated to the north of site 2046 which falls within the airport public safety zone where development is not permitted. This makes this site more remote from the centre of Horsforth. Highway concerns regarding access, accessibility and local network constraints. |
| 48 | 3008 | Former Elmete Caravan Park, Elmete Lane, Roundhay, Leeds, | Roundhay | 2.870 | 47 | Green Belt site. Isolated site. Development would represent an island of development within Green Belt, unrelated to the existing urban area. The site provides a buffer between Roundhay Park and the residential area and has planning permission for a cemetery. Highway concerns regarding accessibility and substandard local network. |
| 49 | 3010 | Holt Park Leisure Centre, Holt Road, Adel | Adel and Wharfedale | 2.83 | 85 | The site is part of the Holt Park design brief and has been identified as having potential for residential development. |
| 50 | 3014 | Area within Kirkstall Hill, Beecroft Street, Commercial Road (Kirkstall District Centre) | Kirkstall | 3.625 | 109 | Pending Tesco application on site. A mix of residential and commercial retail would be appropriate given town centre location. Amber as preferred retail use, residential could be in place on upper floors. |
| 51 | 3034 (The majority of this site falls within Aireborough area) | Rawdon Billings, LS19 6AB | Horsforth / Otley and Yeadon / Guiseley and Rawdon | 2.66 | 70 | Green Belt site. Only a small part of the site is within this area. The site covers the area commonly known as Rawdon Billings and envelopes Billing Hill, a protected nature area. The site is large and development would have a serious impact on the openness of the Green Belt and result in a large area of urban sprawl. The area and capacity of has been split - 2.66ha, capacity of 70 in North Leeds housing market characteristic area, majority (56.25ha) in Aireborough. Highway concerns regarding access, accessibility and suitability of local network. |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA Ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding. |
|-----------------------|--|---|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|---|
| 52 | 3044 | Cookridge Hall Golf Course/Driving Range, Cookridge Lane, Cookridge, LS16 7LQ | Adel and Wharfedale | 10.448 | 274 | Green Belt site. The site is not well related to the existing settlement form and development would represent a significant incursion into Green Belt which could set a precedent for further unrestricted sprawl. |
| 53 | 3315 | Land adjacent to Elmete Lane, Roundhay | Roundhay | 33.769 | 886 | Green Belt site, on the edge of the urban area. Existing defensible boundaries would prevent further sprawl. Development is contingent on site 1190 being brought forward. Highway concerns regarding suitable access may reduce capacity of site. |
| 54 | 3327 | Land at Bayton/Layton Road Junction, Rawdon, Leeds, LS18 5ET | Horsforth | 2.224 | 58 | Green Belt site. The site is set to the west of Bayton Lane, relatively remote from the centre of Horsforth. The site itself is relatively contained on all sides by the road and existing residential development, but development would further reduce the Green Belt gap between residential areas Highway concerns regarding access. |
| 55 | 3328 | Land at Layton Road, Rawdon, LS19 6QT | Horsforth | 5.087 | 133 | Green Belt site. Development would result in the coalescence of Rawdon and Horsforth, contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belts in preventing the merging of settlements. |
| 56 | 3330 | Land at West End Lane, Horsforth, Leeds | Horsforth | 1.503 | 47 | Green Belt Site. The site is set to the west of West End Lane which is the current boundary to Horsforth. Development here would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, encroach into the Green Belt and reduce the gap between settlements (Horsforth and Rawdon) contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belts in preventing the merging of settlements. Highway concerns regarding suitable access and accessibility. |
| 57 | 3360 (Part of site in Outer North West area) | Cookridge Hall, Cookridge Lane, LS16 7NL | Adel and Wharfedale | 39.747 | 1043 | Green Belt site. The site is not well related to the existing settlement form and development would represent a significant incursion into Green Belt which could set a precedent for further unrestricted sprawl. Highway concerns regarding access and accessibility. |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA Ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 58 | 3376 | Weetwood Avenue, Leeds, LS16 5NQ | Weetwood | 3.971 | 89 | Green Belt site. The site is relatively well related to the urban area, bounded by residential development to the west and south and trees to the north and east, but performs an important function as open space. The bulk of the site is designated as protected playing pitch (N6) on the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 31, question G19. It is also in an Urban Green Corridor and a Conservation Area. |
| 59 | 3381 | Brownberrie Farm, Brownberrie Lane, Horsforth, LS18 | Horsforth | 1.255 | 35 | Part of the site is within Green Belt (30%). Part of the site is also a Local Nature Area (LNA) on the existing UDP. The remaining area is occupied by existing dwellings. This area alone would be too small to be allocated. Highway concerns regarding access - would need to be combined with site 3384. |
| 60 | 3384 | Land at Brownberrie Lane, Horsforth, LS18 5 | Horsforth | 0.842 | 12 | Site within urban area. Residential use acceptable in principle. Scope for road frontage development (capacity reduced to reflect this). |
| 61 | 3402 | Ring Road West Park, Clayton Wood Road, Leeds LS16 6NS | Weetwood | 0.98 | 30 | Existing employment site, surrounded by other employment uses and Clayton Wood. Therefore considered inappropriate for residential. |
| 62 | 3457 | Land adjacent to Water Treatment Works, Headingley, LS6 3 | Weetwood | 0.913 | 32 | Site within existing urban area where residential use is acceptable in principle. Highway concerns regarding access. |
| 63 | 4000 | Ralph Thoresby (Site F) Holt Park, Leeds | Adel and Wharfedale | 0.373 | 15 | Site is designated as greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See greenspace section, page 31, question G20. No existing facilities or features on the site. Could have some potential for residential development. Adjacent a school and residential area. |
| 64 | 4013 | Land at Elmete Lane, Roundhay | Roundhay | 1.458 | 52 | Green Belt site. Residential property and associated land to west, and field to east. Would only allocate alongside site 3315. If 3315 was released for development, site 4013 would round off development. Significant Highway concerns regarding access, accessibility and local network constraints. |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA Ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 65 | 4021 | Horsforth Mills, Low Lane, Horsforth | Horsforth | 0.696 | 22 | Site currently on the market with vacant possession. Site is in flood zone 3 (high risk). We are consulting the Environment Agency on all sites and their comments will be taken into consideration before making a final decision on allocations. |
| 66 | 4055 | Former Police Station, Broadway, Horsforth | Horsforth | 0.406 | 13 | Site would be suitable for residential development in principle. However could also come forward for employment/retail use as a result of proximity to centres. |
| 67 | 4056 | Church Lane, Horsforth | Horsforth | 0.744 | 23 | Site would be suitable for residential development in principle. May also be appropriate for offices given proximity to Town Street and New Road Side. |
| 68 | 4057 | St Joseph's, Outwood Lane, Horsforth | Horsforth | 0.833 | 26 | Residential use acceptable in principle. Previous applications on site. |
| 69 | 4058 | Cockcroft House, Cardigan Road, Headingley | Headingley | 0.524 | 17 | Part of site has modern residential institution which could be redeveloped. The older property should be maintained, but could potentially be converted to residential subject to detail. Suitable for residential use in principle. |
| 70 | 4092 | St Annes Mills | Kirkstall | 0.878 | 28 | Current employment site that has been highlighted as necessary to retain. |
| 71 | 4094 | South of Fearnville Place | Gipton and Harehill / Killingbeck and Seacroft | 7.532 | 198 | Designated greenspace (N1) and allotments (N1A) on the existing UDP. Even if some of this wider green space were necessary for housing this site is poorly situated and would encroach greatly into its corridor function. Site boundary includes stretch of Wyke beck itself. See also greenspace section, page 32, question G20. |
| 72 | CFSM024 (SHLAA 1033) | Government Buildings, Lawnswood, Otley Road, Leeds, LS16 2PU | Adel and Wharfedale | 4.697 | 150-200 | Uses requested - Housing, Retail, Other (Car Showroom / Hotel). Same site as SHLAA Ref 1033, principle for housing acceptable. |

5.3.6 Para 5.3.2 identifies that in this area we need to allocate sites to accommodate 3035 residential units. From table 5.3.3 above, the total capacity from green sites alone is 911. The total capacity from amber sites is 2690. The total from both green and amber is 3601 which is over and above the 3035 we are seeking, so not all green and amber sites will eventually need to be allocated. At this stage, we are seeking views as to whether we have got the colour coding right and which are the most suitable sites. Alternative sites can also be suggested.

QUESTIONS ON SITES PUT FORWARD TO CONSIDER FOR HOUSING

H1. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'green' represent the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing development?

Yes/No

Reason

H2. Which sites do you disagree with and why? (Give SHLAA ref no. and reason)

H3. Do you think a site that is not colour coded green should have been? If so, please give SHLAA ref no. and reason

H4. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for allocating for future housing development?

Yes/No

Reason

H5. Which sites do you disagree with and why? (Give SHLAA ref no. and reason)

H6. Do you think a site that is not colour coded amber should have been? If so, please give SHLAA ref no. and reason

H7. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'red' are not suitable for allocation for future housing development?

Yes/No

Reason

H8. Which sites do you disagree with and why? (Give SHLAA ref no. and reason)

H9. Do you think a site that is not colour coded red should have been? If so, please give SHLAA ref no. and reason

H10. Do you think there are other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future housing allocations? If so, please supply details – address and site plan.

**H11. The Site Allocations Plan will need to also identify phasing of housing allocations (see Volume 1 page 20). The phases are:
Delivery/development in the short term, 0-5 years**

Delivery/development in the medium term, 5-10 years

Delivery/development in the long term, 10 + years

Do you think any particular sites should be developed in the short, medium or long term? If so, please state SHLAA ref no of site and phase (short, medium or long term) and why.

H12. Do you think that any sites being considered in this area could be suitable for gypsy and traveller site use? Please state reason, and list SHLAA site ref no.s of any specific sites.

H13. Do you think there are other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that could be considered for future gypsy and traveller site use? If so, please supply details – address and site plan.

H14. Do you think that any sites being considered in this area could be suitable for use solely or in part for elderly housing accommodation? Please state reason, and list SHLAA site ref no's of specific sites.

H15. Do you think there are other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that could be considered for elderly housing accommodation? If so, please supply details – address and site plan.

5.4.0 NORTH EMPLOYMENT ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

See Plan 5.4 Employment

5.4.1 The employment sites in North have been assessed to determine their total contribution towards an overall district requirement of **1,000,000 sq m** office based development and **493 hectares** of industrial and warehousing. Sites which either have planning permission for employment uses (as at 31.3.12) and/or are allocated for employment as part of the existing development plan and are to be retained for employment are shown as lime green on plan 5.4. These sites will count towards the employment requirement.

In North these sites are:

Table 5.4.1: Office based development

'Lime Green' sites for office development.

| Site Ref | Address | Site area (ha) | Total floorspace (sq m) | Reason for retention |
|-------------------|--|----------------|-------------------------|--|
| Lime Green | | | | |
| 2601361 | Ex-Gilchrist Bros Ltd Ring Road West Park LS16 | 1.43 | 4950 | Retain recommended due to its location adjacent to existing employment uses. Employment land is the dominant land use in the area. |
| 2701350 | S/O Troy Mills Troy Road LS18 | 0.57 | 1140 | Retain for offices in mixed use scheme 07/02260/FU approved 6/3/2008 and part-developed. Consent for remaining office building. |
| 3002680 | 355 Roundhay Road, Leeds | 0.26 | 580 | Current site with planning permission for employment purposes. |
| TOTAL | | 2.26 | 6670 | |

Table 5.4.2: Industrial & Warehousing

'Lime Green' sites for industrial and warehousing development.







| Site Ref | Address | Site area (ha) | Reason for retention |
|-------------------|--|----------------|--|
| Lime Green | | | |
| 2404192 | Premises Of J W Hinchliffe Scrap Yard Weaver Str | 0.28 | Current site with planning permission for employment purposes |
| 2404190 | Lcc Depot Off Viaduct Road Leeds LS4 | 0.29 | Current site with planning permission for employment purposes |
| 2404193 | Former Gas Holder Station Burley Place Leeds LS4 | 0.46 | A small site with remediation completed. Best suited to small-scale low-sensitivity commercial uses such as B1c/B2/B8. |
| 2405330 | Unit 2 St Anns Mills off Commercial Road Kirkstall | 0.22 | Current site with planning permission for employment purposes |
| TOTAL | | 1.25 | |

5.4.2 Sites assessed for employment are those sites from the Employment Land Review which are categorised as 'LDF to determine' sites and new sites submitted through the 'Call for Sites'. There were no 'call for sites' for employment, or mixed use including employment submitted in North. There will of course be numerous existing employment sites both in use or last in use for employment which do not require planning permission or allocation. From undertaking assessments, sites have been categorised according to the following colour coding:

- Green** 'To assess' sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for employment.
- Amber** 'To assess' sites which have potential but there may be issues which need to be resolved, or the site may not be in such a favoured location as those highlighted in green.
- Red** 'Remove' sites from the Employment Land Review and 'To assess' sites which are not considered suitable for allocation for employment.

Table 5.4.3 below shows the colour coding and reasons for the sites being within the relevant categories. The sites are shown on Plan 5.4 Employment.

Table 5.4.3 SITES ASSESSED FOR POTENTIAL EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS IN NORTH

| Colour code | Site Ref | Address | Site area (ha) | Total floorspace (sq m) | Assessment type | Conclusion | Reason for colour coding |
|---|----------|--|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|------------|--|
| Offices | | | | | | | |
| Green | | | | | | | |
|  | 2404570 | Office Element Kirkstall Forge Scheme Abbey Road LS5 | 3.57 | 14270 | ELR | Retain | Reflects the outline planning permission for mixed use granted 20/7/2007. |
|  | 2602760 | Bodington Business Park Otley Road LS16 | 6.50 | 24375 | Site assessment | Retain | Retain. Boundary to be amended. Northern part of site residential but retain remaining as employment. |
| Amber | | | | | | | |
| None | | | | | | | |
| Red | | | | | | | |
|  | 3401980 | Mansion & Former Kitchen Garden Gledhow Park Dri | 0.72 | 2700 | ELR | Remove | Planning permission granted for conversion of offices to flats and erection of a further block of flats; 07/02971/FU refers. |
| Industry | | | | | | | |
| Green | | | | | | | |
| None | | | | | | | |
| Amber | | | | | | | |
| None | | | | | | | |
| Red | | | | | | | |
|  | 2404191 | Premises Of A Taylor & Son Weaver Street LS4 | 0.49 | | ELR | Remove | Site is not available. |
|  | 2601811 | Moor Grange West Park LS 16 | 0.68 | | ELR | Remove | Land-locked site within a Local Nature Reserve (LNR 026). Any development would result in loss of established trees. Highway issues. |
|  | 2601360 | Ex-Woodside Quarries Clayton Wood Road LS16 | 8.86 | | ELR | Remove | Constraints too costly to deal with. Outline consent for a housing-led mixed use 'urban village' granted March 2010. Not suitable for B2-B8. |

QUESTIONS ON SITES PUT FORWARD TO CONSIDER FOR EMPLOYMENT

E1. Do you think a site that is not colour coded 'green' should have been? If so, please state which site (site ref) this is and why

E2. Do you think a site that is not colour coded 'amber' should have been? If so, please state which site (site ref) this is and why

E3. Do you agree that the sites that have been identified as 'red' are not suitable for allocation for future employment or office development?

Yes/No

Reason

E4. Do you think there are other more suitable sites not shown on the plan that could be considered as future employment or office allocations? If so, please supply details – address and site plan.

5.5.0 NORTH GREENSPACE ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

5.5.1 The two plans at the end of this document show 1) greenspace sites currently designated through the UDP Review 2006 and sites identified through the open space audit in the North Area (Plan 5.5A) and 2) the categories or types of greenspace (Plan 5.5B). There are two elements to consider, firstly the changes being proposed to the allocated greenspace as a result of the 2011 Open Space, Sport & Recreation Assessment (*hereafter referred to as the 'Open Space Audit'*) and secondly the implications of the subsequent assessments undertaken in relation to surpluses and deficiencies, quality and accessibility to greenspace. Sites that are proposed for deletion following the Open Space Audit are listed at the end of this document and are the sites which are not overlain by hatching on Plan 5.5A. The detailed assessment of greenspace that supports this section can be found in the Greenspace Background Paper. Sites proposed to be deleted will be considered in the context of the surpluses and deficiencies identified in each particular area

5.5.2 Core Strategy policy G3 sets quantity, quality and accessibility standards for these different types of open space:

| Type | Quantity per 1000 people | Quality (Sites were scored from 1 to 10, 10 being excellent quality, 1 very poor. A score of 7 is considered good) | Accessibility |
|--|---|--|--|
| Parks and gardens | 1 hectare | Good (7) | 720 metres |
| Outdoor sports provision | 1.2 hectares (does not include education provision) | Good (7) | Tennis court 720 metres, bowling greens and grass playing pitches 3.2km, athletics tracks, synthetic pitches 6.4km |
| Amenity greenspace | 0.45 hectares | Good (7) | 480 metres |
| Children and young people's equipped play facilities | 2 facilities (per 1000 children/young people 0-16 years old)(excluding education provision) | Good (7) | 720 metres |
| Allotments | 0.24 hectares | Good (7) | 960 metres |
| Natural greenspace | 0.7 hectares main urban area and major settlements, 2 hectares other areas | Good (7) | 720 metres and 2km from site of 20 hectares |
| City Centre open space (all types including civic space) | 0.41 hectares | Good (7) | 720 metres |

5.5.3 There are no standards in the Core Strategy for cemeteries, green corridors and golf courses, therefore there is no analysis of surpluses and deficiencies for these typologies. They are, however, shown on Plan 5.5B for completeness.

5.5.4 Quantity

5.5.5 The table below sets out the amount of surplus land or the deficiency in provision for each greenspace type. It does not include sites that are in educational use since these can only be used by the children attending that school and therefore cannot be considered to be publicly accessible.

Table 5.5.1 Surpluses and deficiencies in different types of greenspace in North

| | Parks and Gardens | Outdoor Sports (excluding education) | Amenity | Children & Young People | Allotments | Natural |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Standard | 1ha/1000 people | 1.2ha/1000 people | 0.45ha/1000 people | 2 facilities/1000 children | 0.24ha/1000 people | 0.7ha/1000 people |
| Horsforth | Deficiency (-0.08ha) | Surplus (0.5ha) | Deficiency (-0.25ha) | Deficiency of 2.8 facilities | Deficiency (-0.07ha) | Surplus (3.03ha) |
| Adel & Wharfedale | Surplus (2.57ha) | Surplus (0.54ha) | Deficiency (-0.05ha) | Surplus of 1 facility | Deficiency (-0.22ha) | |
| Kirkstall | Surplus (1.76ha) | Surplus (0.34ha) | Surplus (0.06ha) | Surplus of 0.16 facilities | Surplus (0.44ha) | Surplus (0.15ha) |
| Headingley | Deficiency (-0.9ha) | Deficiency (-1.08ha) | Deficiency (-0.36ha) | Surplus of 1.45 facilities | Deficiency (-0.02ha) | Deficiency (-0.12ha) |
| Weetwood | Surplus (0.05ha) | Deficiency (-0.29ha) | Deficiency (-0.14ha) | Deficiency of 1.07 facilities | Deficiency (-0.14ha) | Surplus (2.9ha) |
| Moortown | Surplus (0.45ha) | Deficiency (-0.74ha) | Surplus (0.78ha) | Surplus of 0.11 facilities | Deficiency (-0.18ha) | Surplus (1.2ha) |
| Alwoodley | Deficiency (-0.55 ha) | Deficiency (-0.36ha) | Surplus (0.15) | Deficiency of 6 facilities | Deficiency (-0.23 ha) | Surplus (1.91 ha) |
| Roundhay | Surplus (5.67ha) | Deficiency (-0.06ha) | Deficiency (-0.26ha) | Deficiency of 1.8 facilities | Deficiency (0.09ha) | Surplus (1.78ha) |
| Chapel Allerton | Deficiency (-0.15ha) | Deficiency (-0.32ha) | Surplus (0.32ha) | Deficiency of 1.5 facilities | Surplus (0.01ha) | Surplus (0.19ha) |
| Average | Surplus (0.975ha) | Deficiency (-0.31ha) | Requirement met (0.45ha total) | Deficiency of 1.137 facilities | Deficiency (-0.056ha) | Surplus (1.71ha) |

5.5.6 Overall the North area is well provided for in terms of certain types of greenspace, though deficient in others. The most notable deficiency is in allotments, with some wards having very significant deficiencies. It should also be noted that most of the 9 wards generally have a reasonable level of provision, whilst lacking in some typologies this tends to be compensated with other typologies. However this is not the case in Headingley ward where there are deficiencies in all typologies except children's and young people's equipped play facilities. Kirkstall Ward has the best provision with surplus in all typologies.

5.5.7 The quantity of Parks and Gardens is very unevenly distributed across the area with some wards being very deficient (Headingley) and other wards having a large surplus (Adel and Wharfedale, Roundhay). The best provision is in natural greenspace with only Headingley ward having a deficiency. Horsforth, Adel and Wharfedale and Weetwood have very significant provision of natural greenspace. It should be noted that outdoor sport excludes a significant number of sport facilities within education facilities as they have been universally regarded as for the use of the school only and private. In some cases communities will have access to school pitches and facilities therefore these deficiencies may not exist.

5.5.8 There is a need to provide certain specific types of greenspace across all 9 wards. This could be achieved by laying out some of the surplus areas of alternative

greenspace types e.g. lay out some of the surplus natural greenspace to allotments which are deficient. Alternatively new areas which aren't currently greenspace could be laid out to improve quantity of provision. This could be delivered by a developer as a requirement on new residential development or by the Council following the payment of commuted sums. If the typology of an area of greenspace is to be changed, it will need to be carefully assessed to ensure it is suitable and appropriate for the new type and not a well used and valued area of the original typology.

5.5.9 A number of greenspace sites have been suggested for housing. The following questions (page 35 and 36) seek views as to whether the sites should be retained for their current or alternative greenspace use, or might be better used for housing in preference to land elsewhere within the area.

5.5.10 Quality

5.5.11 Across the North area, the majority of sites (194 out of 238) are below the required quality standard of 7, which indicates an issue of substandard greenspace provision across all typologies in the area. The lack of good quality natural greenspace and allotment sites is particularly noticeable.

5.5.12 Accessibility

5.5.13 Most of the built up area is accessible to at least some types of greenspace. Accessibility to amenity space and tennis courts is generally good, though there are areas to the west around Horsforth which are beyond the G3 standard of 480m. Accessibility to natural greenspace and children and young people's play facilities are very good with the majority of the area falling within the 720m radius of each. There is good accessibility to all other typologies.

QUESTIONS ABOUT GREENSPACE PROVISION IN NORTH

General

- G1. Do you have any comments on the proposed boundary amendments, additions and deletions to the greenspace provision in the area as shown on greenspace plan A?**
- G2. Do you think the Council should consider changing the type of greenspace where that type of greenspace is in surplus (ie more than meets the standard) to another type of greenspace that falls short of the standards?**
- G3. Do you think the Council should consider allowing development of any of the greenspace sites where that type of greenspace is in surplus (ie more than meets the standard)? If so, which sites?**
- G4. The quality of many existing greenspace sites in the area falls below the required standard. Do you agree that resources (including commuted sums obtained from planning permissions and legal agreements) should be channelled to improving quality of existing sites?**

- G5. Alternatively, if a site is of poor quality and/or disused, do you think it is better to consider allowing development of that site to generate resources to invest in greenspace elsewhere?**
- G6. Do you agree that, where opportunities arise, new greenspace provision should be provided in areas that fall below accessibility distance standards, to ensure residents have adequate access to different types of greenspace?**
- G7. Have you any other comments/suggestions about greenspace provision in the area?**

Specific to North:

- G8. The existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at High Moor Avenue and the open space to the west identified as amenity greenspace in the Open Space Audit, has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 81, see page 10). Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing??**
- G9. The existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) designation at land at Fraser Avenue, Horsforth has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 1014, see page 11). It was not identified as in a greenspace use in the Open Space Audit and has clearly not been delivered through Policy N5, therefore it is proposed to delete the allocation. Do you think this land should be retained as an opportunity for possible future greenspace or could it be released for housing?**
- G10. Part of the existing UDP N1A (allotments) designation at land off Gledhow Valley Road, Chapel Allerton has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 1019, see page 11). It was not identified as in a greenspace use in the Open Space Audit therefore it is proposed to amend the boundary of the allocation to exclude this land. Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?**
- G11. The existing UDP N6 (playing pitches) designation at Highbury Cricket Ground, North East Hollins Drive, Meanwood and the open space to the west identified as outdoor sport in the Open Space Audit, has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 1170, see page 13). Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?**
- G12. The existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) designation at the Former Yorkshire Bank Sports Ground, Shadwell Lane and the open space to the east identified as outdoor sport in the Open Space Audit, has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 1172, see page 13). Do you think this site could be developed for housing or should it be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies)?**
- G13. A significant part of the existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) designation at land to rear of Oakford Terrace, Low Lane, Horsforth has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 1238, see page 14). The majority of this site was identified as natural greenspace in the Open Space Audit. Do**

you think this land should be retained as an opportunity for possible future greenspace or could it be released for housing?

- G14. A small part of the existing UDP N6 (playing pitches) designation at Boddington Hall, Otley Road, Lawnswood has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 1299B, see page 15). The whole N6 allocation (including the area beyond the SHLAA site) and the whole SHLAA site was identified as outdoor sport in educational ownership in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this land (the existing N6 allocation and the new areas identified through the Open Space Audit) should be allocated as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?**
- G15. The existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) designation at land at Outwood Lane, Horsforth has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 1310, see page 15). It was not identified as in a greenspace use in the Open Space Audit and has clearly not been delivered through Policy N5, therefore it is proposed to delete the allocation. Do you think this land should be retained as an opportunity for possible future greenspace or could it be released for housing?**
- G16. The existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) designation at land at North Ives Farm, Brownberrie Gardens, Horsforth has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2046, see page 15). It was not identified as in a greenspace use in the Open Space Audit and has clearly not been delivered through Policy N5, therefore it is proposed to delete the allocation (called land north of Brownberrie Walk/ Avenue for greenspace purposes). Do you think this land should be retained as an opportunity for possible future greenspace or could it be released for housing?**
- G17. The existing UDP N1A (allotments) designation at Carr Manor, Meanwood has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2055, see page 16). The site was identified as allotments in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?**
- G18. Part of the existing UDP N6 (playing pitches) designation at Allerton Grange Hill School, Talbot Avenue, Moor Allerton, identified as outdoor sport in educational ownership in the Open Space Audit, has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2058, see page 16). Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?**
- G19. The existing UDP N6 (playing pitches) designation at Weetwood Avenue, Far Headingley (Weetwood Sports Ground) has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 3376, see page 19). The site was identified as outdoor sport in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?**
- G20. The N1 greenspace UDP designation South of Fearnville Place has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 4094, see page 20). Do you**

think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?

Appendix 1

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

| Open Space type | Ref number | Address | Reasons for proposed deletion |
|--------------------------|------------|--|--|
| N1 | 9/3 | Holtdale Approach, Holt Park | Less than the 0.2ha threshold. |
| N1 | 16/16 | Kirkstall Lane, Kirkstall | Privately owned, no public access |
| N1 | 16/19 | St Michael's Lane, Headingley | 2 areas less than the 0.2ha threshold. |
| N1 | 16/34 | The Village Street, Burley | Less than the 0.2ha threshold. |
| N1 | 18/5 | Leafield Towers, Moortown | 2 areas less than the 0.2ha threshold. |
| N5 (proposed open space) | | Land at Outwood Lane, Horsforth | Proposed site still in an agricultural rather than a greenspace use |
| N5 (proposed open space) | 14/6X | Land at Fraser Avenue, Horsforth | Proposed site still in an agricultural rather than a greenspace use. |
| N5 (proposed open space) | 14/21 | Land north of Brownberrie Walk/ Avenue | Proposed site still in an agricultural rather than a greenspace use |
| N6 (playing pitch) | 27/4X | Talbot Road Sports Ground, Roundhay | Developed for housing |
| N6 (playing pitch) | 13/8 | Springbank Primary School, Headingley | Developed – hard standing/car parking. |