

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL - West Leeds Gateway SPD : Reg17
Schedule of Consultation Responses - 15 June to 27 July 2010

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
Rep No: 0038 Ramblers' Association					
Intro	Introduction	S	The Ramblers Association, Leeds Group support the Supplementary Planning Document.	Comment noted.	No change
WL10-12			The Ramblers Association, Leeds Group welcome the Well Connected theme and the associated policies WL10-12.	Comment noted.	No change
WL3-7			The Ramblers Association, Leeds Group welcome the Green and Healthy theme as well as the associated policies WL3-7.	Comment noted.	No change

Rep No: 0046 Environment Agency

WL2		We are pleased to see that the issue of flood risk at the Armley Mills site has been highlighted as recommended in our previous response to the West Leeds Gateway Area Action Plan.	Comment noted	No change.
WL32	An Attractive place to live and work - Mixed Use	Due to the historic use of the site by British Gas it is likely that some remediation work will be required as part of any redevelopment proposals, particularly given the sensitivity of the proposed end use of the site. Any potential developers should be made aware of this, and the implications of any scheme.	The constraints of the site and any likely remediation works would be considered in full when proposals come forward for the redevelopment of the site.	No change
WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds	<p>1) This document sets out a comprehensive scheme for the protection of green spaces and improved green infrastructure which we would fully support.</p> <p>2) We are pleased to see reference in para 3.4.18 to the need to comprehensively assess flood risk and to take account of the Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme.</p>	<p>1) noted.</p> <p>2) noted.</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) No change</p>

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Rep No: 0054

Diocese of Ripon & Leeds (via Sanderson Weatherall)

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds		<p>1) Our Client (the Diocese of Ripon and Leeds) strongly object to the specific designation of what is scrubland to the south of their community hall. This land was used as allotments over 20 years ago and before that the land was glebe land associated with a Victorian vicarage. There is no intention to re-establish the land as allotment. It is recognised that the designation of the land is taken from the adopted Leeds UDP and its subsequent review. However, it should be noted that at the time of adoption of the first UDP (2001), the allotment use had ceased many years before and it was an erroneous designation.</p> <p>The site is privately owned and has no access to the general public. The Council's Countryside and Parks team, specifically the Allotment Officer, has confirmed that the site is not a statutory allotment and that the Council has no powers to create such a use here. The designation is also one of the smallest allotment locations in the West Leeds and North West Leeds area. It has been the focus of various anti-social behaviour and fly tipping and does not constitute a useable amenity or other greenspace.</p> <p>The Land has historically been subject of a planning application for sheltered residential accommodation that was not taken forward and is currently being promoted via application for residential development. Whilst acknowledging that no decision has been made on this and therefore there may be a question of the current status and permitted use of the site, the removal of the specific allotment designation would correct the erroneous designation within the Leeds UDP and subsequent review and be a proper reflection of reality.</p> <p>2) Our client would like to make a comment in respect of the proposed green space designation surrounding St Bartholomew's church. The comment is purely to point out that the land constitutes consecrated ground beneath which are many thousand burials. Our client does not necessarily object to the designation per se, but would like to point out that whilst the</p>	<p>1) An Supplementary Planning Document cannot introduce or remove allocations and therefore the WLGSPD is not in a position to change the UDP allocation of the allotment site. Irrespective of this, the UDP and WLGSPD reflect the last use of the site and the allocation is presently appropriate. Should the representor wish to make case that the site provides no useful role as green space and is surplus then at this stage this should be done through the planning application process which is, as mentioned by the consultee, taking place at this time.</p> <p>2) The WLGSPD has included the land around St Bartholomew's church in recognition of the important role it plays as green space within West Leeds and can therefore can only aid in the protection of the land.</p>	<p>1) No change.</p> <p>2) No change.</p>

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
			<p>churchyard may have certain greenspace functions and might form part of the green space provision for the wider area, it questions whether a formal designation is necessary as many matters of planning control are led by the fact it is considered consecrated ground surrounding a Grade II listed church. These factors provide more protection than simply planning control.</p>		

Rep No: 0058 Natural England					
------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds		<p>1) We are particularly pleased to note the recognition in section 3.4.11 that providing safe walking and cycling routes and green spaces can contribute to improving health and well being.</p> <p>2) It is crucial to maintain good links between green spaces and so we strongly support the West Leeds Country Park initiative.</p> <p>3) Green spaces can be seen as one element of a green infrastructure network. Green infrastructure has a range of functions including enhancement of biodiversity, reducing flood risk and mitigating for the effects of climate change. For example, planting street trees can help reduce urban temperatures and it would be useful to promote the importance of street trees, as well as green spaces, in section 3.4 of the document.</p>	<p>1) comment noted.</p> <p>2) comment noted.</p> <p>3) the potential of street trees is and has been looked at city wide and therefore would not be appropriate for this document.</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) No change</p> <p>3) Pass on the comments to the relevant officer looking at the potential of street trees in a city wide context.</p>
WL9-13	A Well connected City		<p>The River Aire and Leeds-Liverpool canal road corridor has been identified as a strategic green infrastructure corridor of regional importance as part of Natural England's Green Infrastructure Mapping Project for the region. We therefore welcome the proposal to improve pedestrian and cycle access along the canal towpath as detailed in section 3.5.9. However, it should be borne in mind that the canal is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest to the west of the railway crossing and so we would wish to see any improvements to access avoid any negative impacts to flora and fauna.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>	<p>The comments support the approach to the canal taken by the WLG SPD. Any improvements proposed would need to be looked at as they came forward taking in to account the designation of the canal as a Site of Special Scientific Interest.</p>

Rep No: 0060 Highways Agency

WL9-13	A Well connected City	<p>1) Taken by itself, regeneration of the West Leeds Gateway area and any associated housing and employment development is unlikely to be of a scale that will have a significant impact on the Strategic Road Network. However, additional trips combined with those from new developments throughout the City including the wider Leeds-Bradford corridor proposals will have an impact. The focus for our comments are therefore directed towards the Core Strategy.</p> <p>2) The Armley Gyratory is a key location on the city's highway network and any disruption to traffic has implications for the wider network. We anticipate that access arrangements for development of the British Gas site and any at-grade pedestrian and cycle facilities forming part of a route linking Armley and New Wortley with the city centre will be designed in a way that avoids any deterioration of traffic conditions on the Gyratory.</p>	<p>1) Noted. The consultee will be informed of future Core Strategy consultation and be able to comment on the potential impact of the policies contained within it.</p> <p>2) Should works be undertaken at the British Gas site Highways will consulted as to the potential impact of any work.</p>	<p>1) No change.</p> <p>2) No change.</p>
--------	------------------------------	---	---	---

Rep No: 0099 English Heritage					
Intro	Introduction		We welcome the recognition of the important contribution that the area's historic assets can make towards reinforcing the distinct character of an area, to the quality of its communities and to the future economic well-being of this part of Leeds. Overall, we consider that the SPD sets out an appropriate strategy for the management of the area's historic environment.	noted.	N/A

Rep No: 0338 British Waterways

WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds	<p>1. The SPD acknowledges the role the canal can play in delivering many of the objectives set out in Para 1.6. We recommend that the scope of this policy is widened to include infrastructure e.g. locks waterway wall and towing path. 'Planning a future for the inland waterways' (AWAAC, Dec 2001) states that the waterways corridors have a useful role to play in widening travel choices, providing opportunities for cycling, walking, alternative public transport and green routes. To ensure long term use of towpaths as sustainable route, investment and maintenance are needed'. It should be recognised that whilst waterside developments and regeneration schemes benefit from their waterside location, they can place extra liabilities and burdens on the waterway infrastructure, such as towing paths. As such it is important that policies are framed to support the imposition of conditions or requirements for planning obligations/developers contributions to mitigate the impact on the waterway infrastructure.</p> <p>2. WL7 - Following from WL6, developer contributions will play a key role in improving linkages between and along green spaces and routes identified on diagram 7. One important aspect to consider is the long term maintenance of these routes and these issues need to be factored into any agreements negotiated with developers.</p>	<p>1. Policy WL6 seeks environmental improvements to the canal. It is not felt necessary to be specific in the policy as to what improvements are sought as this will be on a case by case basis. This will be negotiated between the council and the developer when an application is submitted.</p> <p>2. All green space contributions made through S106s are subject to a 10 year maintenance fee, therefore the issue is already covered in other planning documents.</p>	<p>1. No Change.</p> <p>2. No Change.</p>
WL9-13	A Well connected City	<p>WL10 We strongly support this policy which aims to continue the work already undertaken on repairing and upgrading the towing path of the Leeds and Liverpool Canal. Again, developer contributions will be a key factor in the success of the policy, and we are working with the developer and LCC on a current planning application on the old Yorkshire Chemicals site to achieve towing path improvements along this section of the canal.</p>	Noted.	No Changes.

Rep No: 0806 National Grid Property Holdings Ltd (via Indigo Planning)

WL32	An Attractive place to live and work - Mixed Use	<p>C The Gyratory and the training site are both within the ownership of National Grid. Remove all reference to training centre and centrica. Objection to WL32 criteria 5 which also relates back to WL11. Recommend clarity within the text that there is not an absolute moratorium on development in the absence of a remodelled gyratory, but rather as a requirement to consider whether there are opportunities available to improve the gyratory as and when development proposals are brought forward. Recommend in addition to this that the requirement would not necessarily be triggered in association with the stand alone development of the land to the west of the gyratory.</p>	<p>Comments noted regarding ownership. To separate the training centre from the car parking would prevent a comprehensive redevelopment of the whole site from occurring and instead result in piecemeal development that will not address the issues of the Gyratory.</p> <p>To amend policy WL32 in line with the above comments would result in a policy that no longer has the aim to address the highway issues of the Gyratory when the opportunity arises. It is accepted that it may not be possible to address the highway concerns about the Gyratory, therefore if, when an application is submitted to the Council for redevelopment of the site, it can be justified that it is not possible to reconfigure the Gyratory, alternative approaches to address accessibility will be considered.</p>	Remove references to British gas and centrica.
------	---	--	--	--

Rep No: 1922 The Coal Authority

WL19-34

As noted in our response to consultation in June 2009 on the West Leeds Gateway Submission Area Action Plan, there are coal resources capable of extraction using surface mining methods across the entire West Leeds Gateway Area. The Supplementary Planning Document identifies twelve potential new housing sites with capacity for 784 dwellings, as well as promoting new employment development across the West Leeds Gateway area, together with a mixed use residential/employment redevelopment of the British Gas site and the gyratory.

The Brownfield redevelopment proposals set out in the SPD would provide the potential for prior extraction of surface coal resources, thus ensuring that this national resource is not sterilised, whilst addressing potential land instability issues within the SPD area. The Coal Authority has issued licenses for incidental coal extraction that has been viable as part of redevelopment proposals in urban area on relatively small sites, down to 0.06ha. We would therefore seek to acknowledgement in the SPD of the presence of surface coal resources across the whole West Leeds Gateway area and the inclusion of a requirement for developers to give due consideration to prior extraction of surface coal resources in the area, in line with MPS1.

REASON: To ensure that the SPD reflects the guidance in MPS1 relating to the role for prior extraction to prevent the potential sterilisation of mineral resources.

Comments noted. Minerals extraction covered in other documents.

No change

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds		<p>As noted in our response to consultation in June 2009, as a result of the presence of surface coal resources we have records of coal mining activity having taken place in the SPD area. This coal mining activity has left a legacy of mine entries and areas of shallow coal workings, concentrated in the south east of the West Leeds Gateway area.</p> <p>The coal mining legacy is concentrated therefore on the Wortley Recreation Ground. Our records indicate the presence of three mine entries within the boundary of the recreation ground, and underground coal workings at shallow depth are likely to be present across the area. The Coal Authority is therefore concerned to ensure public health and safety on this site.</p> <p>We note that the Council has identified this recreation ground as a priority area for greenspace improvements, and would request that ground conditions and land stability are given due consideration as part of any improvement works in the interest of public safety, in line with PPG14.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is currently endeavouring to meet with and provide our coal mining legacy data to all 180 coalfield LPAs and MPAs to assist Councils with their development control functions. We are due to meet LCC later this month and will offer our coal mining legacy data free of charge. This will identify to the Council the position of the mine entries and extent of shallow coal workings within the boundary of Wortley Recreation Ground.</p> <p>Given the concentration of coalmining legacy issues within the boundary of Wortley Recreation Ground. The Coal Authority recommends that the following paragraph is added to Section 3.4.9 of the Supplementary Planning Document highlighting the issue and giving a commitment to ensuring public health and safety is maintained on the site.</p> <p>"There are recorded mine entries and underground coal mine workings at shallow depth present within Wortley Recreation Ground.</p>	Comments noted. Covered in other planning documents.	No change

Q No	Question	S/O Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
		<p>Ground conditions and land stability will therefore be considered as part of any future improvement works to the site to ensure public safety."</p> <p>REASON: In order to ensure that the SPD appropriately identifies where potential issues of land instability exist in the West Leeds Gateway area resulting from the past coal activity in line with the requirements of PPG14.</p>		

Q No Question S/O Representor comments Officer comments Suggested changes

Rep No: 2029 The Theatres Trust				
WL35	An Attractive place to live and work -Edu/Communit	No comments	No comments	None

Rep No: 2442 Theaker Lane Tenants Association

WL14-18	Vibrant Town Centre and Local Centres	<p>Although, most of the signage has been removed, Mike's Carpets still presents a neglected and poverty stricken appearance. This can be said, too, of the former Theaker Lane Clinic, not mentioned in the document, and the Gelder Road units, including the public toilets. These three are now more emphatic black spots following the very welcome improvements to Armley Town Street.</p> <p>We urge the Council to press for speedy action on number 2 Branch Road, and the Clinic, where planning permission has been granted. We suggest that the Council concentrates more on the role of Gelder Road as a parking area than on the units. Some refurbishment of the public toilets would, however, be welcome.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Policies WL16 and 17 encourage the redevelopment of 2 Branch Road and the Gelder Road units. The Theaker Lane Clinic benefits from planning permission for redevelopment.</p>	No change.
WL19-31	An Attractive place to live and work - Housing	<p>Although the land at Far Fold is suitable for housing, we object strongly to access being taken from Theaker Lane. As the flats in Winker Green Mills are sold Theaker Lane will receive a heavy influx of traffic as it is. The Highways Department has recently improved the lot of residents with its traffic calming measures; it seems a pity to spoil this good work.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The policy has been written with full consultation with the Highway Department with no objections to the access onto Theaker Lane being raised. Any proposed development would be subject to detailed highway considerations including safety and capacity issues.</p>	No change
WL35	An Attractive place to live and work -Edu/Communit	<p>West Leeds has no F.E College within its boundaries and suffers from a paucity of provision. The site of Silver Royd Scholl offers an opportunity to redress this shortage. We would like to see an emphasis on training in craft skills which have been significant in this area. The regeneration of Armley promises to offer new employment opportunities but these area almost wholly in the services sector. Some effort needs to be made to ensure a more balanced economy.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Policy WL35 safeguards the site of former Wortley High School from development with potential reuse, if there is an educational need, as a college.</p>	No change
WL9-13	A Well connected City	<p>We welcome the continued in investigation into the possibility of a rail halt in Armley. We would stress, however, that such a halt should be on the Calderdale Line as near as possible to the new Leisure Centre and the proposed new Supermarket. We see few people being attracted to a halt on the Airedale Line.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There are ongoing discussions regarding the location of a new train halt with issues such as proximity to key activity 'hubs' being a consideration</p>	No change

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Rep No: 2577 Miss Sandra Cleavin

WL1-2	West Leeds - A Place to be proud of	There is a lot of history in and around Armley, which should be improved. By improving the shopping centre at Armley Town Street, more people will be attracted to shop there and boost trade and employment	Comments noted	No change
WL19-31	An Attractive place to live and work - Housing	<p>Rather than removing properties and redeveloping, properties should be retained and refurbishment. This would continue the strong community spirit in the area.</p> <p>If houses are to be built anywhere in the area they should be affordable, to rent or buy, and fit in with the existing surroundings. We want to remain as a community, not be divided.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The amount of property clearance has been scaled back. The removal of a small number of properties is key to the overall regeneration of the area.</p> <p>The sites at Farrow Road and Highfield Gardens would be developed through the Council's Affordable Housing Strategic Partnership. The Council's Affordable Housing Policy will apply to the remaining sites.</p>	No change
WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds	<p>1. Greenspaces should be preserved possibility with some improvements. Greenspace is healthy and pleasant to look upon in a largely built up area. I think the 'Gassy Field' should be left as a green area so people can walk, sit, children play on (maybe some seating etc?). I believe, at the moment, housing is to be developed there? If it is, it should not take up all the area - some greenspace space should be left. We need more greenspace not less.</p> <p>2. Original plans for 'Phil May Court' to be built on have been removed. Support for this</p>	<p>1. Comments noted. The development of Gassy Fields would require alternative and improved facilities being provided elsewhere.</p> <p>2. Comments noted</p>	<p>1. No change</p> <p>2. No change</p>
zz		There should be more dog bins in the area	Comments noted.	No change

Rep No: 2597 Yorkshire Forward

WL14-8		<p>The measures outlined within the WLGSPD will help to support the economic renaissance of this part of Leeds and generally consistent with the objectives of the Yorkshire Forward Corporate Plan. In addition, proposals to improve the links between West Leeds Gateway area and other central parts of the city will help to improve the economic opportunities available to residents; this aligns well with Yorkshire Forward's Corporate Plan which seeks to support the development of new industries and the creation of jobs.</p> <p>We support the measures outlined in WL15 for improving the quality of the town centre, such measures are important in helping to make the area more attractive to inward investors and will help to encourage existing businesses to make further investments in the area.</p>	Comments noted	No change
WL32	An Attractive place to live and work - Mixed Use	<p>It is important that LDF documents reflect new economic climate, and takes account of how the area may change over time, and considers how new industries can be encouraged and fostered within the West Leeds Gateway area. We, therefore, welcome the consideration given within WL32 to the potential need to redevelop the British Gas site during the lifetime of the plan.</p>	Comments noted	No change
WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds	<p>Whilst we generally welcome the approach used to identifying potential improvements to the levels of green space provision within West Leeds, greater gains might be achieved by considering open space within the broader concept of Green Infrastructure. We consider that both the policies and the supporting text would benefit from including a greater emphasis on the role that green infrastructure can play in boosting economic performance by providing a high quality environment which helps to attract inward investors and retain existing businesses.</p>	Comments noted. The economic benefits of improved green infrastructure is covered in the supporting text.	No changes

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
WL9-13	A Well connected City		The Agency welcomes Policy WL11, which seeks to promote sustainable transport by improving access through the area for pedestrians and cyclists by promoting a key range of highway improvements. It would also be helpful to consider how innovative forms of transport provision such as car clubs and community transport where appropriate, especially within new residential and mixed-use developments, can be developed.	Comments noted. Provision for innovative forms of transport within new housing developments are covered in separate planning policy.	No change.

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Rep No: 2598 Mr Xavier Chevillard

WL19-31	An Attractive place to live and work - Housing	As a local resident, I am encouraged by the inclusion of the New Wortley Plan as a supporting document. One item on Holdforth Place that is not in your plan is the compulsory purchase of land next to Wellington Stores so that it comes back within the plans and consultation for regeneration.	Comments noted.	No change
WL32	An Attractive place to live and work - Mixed Use	It appears that Centrica have renewed the lease of the site they are using. There is one wedge of land at the NW end of the site, bordering Canal Street. We are told this is part of Centrica, but not maintained by anyone. It is an eyesore and should be dealt with.	If the part of the site is owned by Centrica it can be brought into any future redevelopment of the site as supported by policy WL32	No change

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
------	----------	-----	----------------------	------------------	-------------------

Rep No: 2599					
CABE					
zz			No specific comments provided - general Core Strategy writing advice given	Comments noted.	No change

Rep No: 2608 Mr Stuart Garforth

WL14-18	Vibrant Town Centre and Local Centres	Mike's Carpet - frankly yes an eyesore but an Armley institution just as much as the Library. Keep it with its signage. In fact list it and its signage.	Comments noted. The property is Grade II listed and much of the signage has been removed. The building is considered to be an important 'gateway' into Armley.	No changes
WL19-31	An Attractive place to live and work - Housing	<p>I wish to see no building on any current Greenfield sites</p> <p>Far Fold - the entire site which has been left in its current condition for considerable time, needs to be designated greenfield, and the entire area opened up as a green link between the moor ACRT land and the park with an underpass under Stanningley Road.</p> <p>WL25 - I am now aged 55 and to my knowledge it has been a scrap yard all my life, why change now? It must have lots of wildlife in it. Any person who has rented or purchased property nearby has done so or should have been aware that this yard exists.</p>	<p>Comments noted. There are only limited proposals to development greenfield sites, with any loss of green amenity space mitigated by the requirement to provide alternatives or improvements elsewhere.</p> <p>The site at Tong Road detracts from the area and its redevelopment will overcome this whilst providing additional housing.</p>	No change

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds		<p>Armley Moor - a bit concerned about the hinted control of grazing. I am a Freeman of Armley and have unfettered grazing rights on this moor. These rights are ancient ones and I would object to anyone saying that I had to seek someone's permission to graze animals/domestic stock on the moor or indeed any other portion of ACR land i.e. Far Fold, Moor Top, Charlie Cake Park etc. Likewise the right to drive animals in Armley on the road.</p> <p>St Bartholomew's Church Yard - I have graves in that yard and would be deeply disturbed if the land was interfered with. Bad enough the grave stones disappearing as they have done!</p> <p>Noted far too much emphasis on children and young people and their needs. Lots of other people in fact more have needs more than this group, and they need taking into account. For instance as I suggested above, I have lived in Armley a very long time, I crossed Stanningley Road when it had a national speed limit on it, never mind green crossings. This is an important highway, the traffic needs to flow unabated on it and certainly without further hindrance being introduced deliberately.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The proposal for Armley Moor are for improvements and control of unauthorised grazing - this will not affect established rights.</p> <p>St Bartholomew's Church Yard remains protected and will not be developed.</p>	No change

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Rep No: 2674

Mr P W Wood

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
Intro	Introduction		<p>1.6 Key Purpose and Objectives of the SPD</p> <p>1. Provide a catalyst to promote improved joint working...</p> <p>In light of the new government's intention to reduce spending the WLG initiative could hit the buffers. There is a danger this report will be buried in a filing cabinet.</p> <p>2. Improve the vitality and viability of Armley Town Centre... Recently completed improvements to Armley Town Centre are welcome. Hope that businesses within conservation area will be spurred to undertake external improvements to premises. Planning application for supermarket on foundry site in Carrcrofts is welcomed. If successful will mean the semi-derelict foundry complex will be swept away. There are other pockets of dereliction which mar the locality which need to be dealt with which are omitted by the report (north side of junction of Modder Place.Carr Crofts, and northern end of Carr Croftseast side (close to junction with Town Street)).</p> <p>3. Improve the built environment... When Cllr Carter launched the WLGAAP, there was design competition for Mistress Lane area, but faded into obscurity. Have yet to see 'high quality design' in any part of west Leeds, never mind the WLG zone. Critical of new Armley Sports Centre and Armley Moor Health Centre. Little attempt to provide buildings which enhance the streetscape and show evidence of attention to detail. Also ensure projects are completed in accordance with planning consent, e.g. no. 236 Tong Road. The report highlights need for environmental improvements to Armley Road and Amberley road. The same case can be made for entire length of Tong Road and Wellington Road as well as much of Oldfield Lane. In the short term where there are grassy plots introduce flower beds. If and when proposals brought forward to improve local centres, provide flowerbeds (tubs) and hanging baskets. Specify a decent standard of paving to replace ubiquitous blacktop and perhaps 3D art</p>	<p>1. There is no intention that the SPD will be forgotten about. The delivery of initiatives is an important element of the planning process (Local Development Framework). The Strategic Delivery and Investment Plan is provided in Appendix 1 which sets out timescales for the delivery of the SPD's initiatives. Whilst it is acknowledged that some of the proposals are long term, a number of the proposals are already being progressed including improvements to Armley Town Centre.</p> <p>2. Comments noted. The site of the planning application for the new supermarket includes land on the northern side of the junction of Modder Place/Carr Crofts. There are a number of sites within the WLG area which are subject to dereliction. It has not been possible to identify all of them individually in the SPD.</p> <p>3. Comments noted. The first phase of the improvement works to Armley Town Centre including repaving and new railings has been completed and funding has been secured through the Townscape Heritage Initiative for improvements to Armley Conservation Area including Branch Road. The Council would welcome discussions with Asda regarding improvements to the Netto site.</p> <p>4. It is acknowledged that significant work needs to be undertaken to improve access to Armley Mills. This will be considered as part of the Planning Brief for the site.</p> <p>5. The suggested sites for new children's play will be considered separately outside the work of the SPD, as and when money is available to provide new facilities. Cabbage Hill falls outside the boundary of the SPD. Work is ongoing to improve this area of informal open space.</p> <p>10. There are no current plans to bring forward the redevelopment of the Holdforth Place site, particularly given the current market conditions. The future redevelopment of the Gassy Fields site will be subject to detailed planning considerations including access arrangements. Para. 3.7.28 states that loss of greenspace should be compensated for by either an improvement in quality or its replacement within the same community. The wording of WL29 reflects this.</p> <p>11. Comments noted regarding suggested improvements and the bus and rail network. The City Council is unable to influence the cost of bus fares. With</p>	<p>1. No change 2. No change 3. No change 4. No change 5. No change 10. No change 11. No change</p>

Q No	Question	S/O Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
------	----------	--------------------------	------------------	-------------------

work could be introduced. The WLG area and rest of west Leeds have yet to benefit from any investment to upgrade local centres, in contrast to other parts of the city, so this element of the plan ought to be a priority.

For the Oldfield Lane local centre, the city council might discuss possible environmental improvements with ASDA, if not a complete redevelopment of the present NETTO site and adjacent shops, to provide a much improved local centre, when the company takes controls of the NETTO chain.

regard to alternative sites for rail halts, these are detailed suggestions which would have to be raised with Metro

4. Help to rejuvenate Armley Mills...
 Initiatives to improve the appeal of the industrial museum are to be welcomed. Possible pedestrian and cycle links between Armley and Kirkstall via the mill and Cardigan Fields will require extensive ramped sections to overcome significant change in level between canal and river, and a new river bridge. The site is poorly served by public transport. No bus links to Burley and Headingley, with their large populations of culturally aware students and young people, might be encouraged to visit the museum with better access.

5. Improve the quality and usability of greenspace...
 Suggested sites for play areas on out of use land adjacent to Armley Sports Centre and land adjacent to Thornhill Road/Kilburn Road. Welcomes improvements to Wortley Recreation Ground. Poor condition reflects badly on the City Council, which has diverted resources to more affluent districts. The West Leeds Country Park project has so far been no more than a labelling exercise, with negligible investment to improve footpaths and earmarked open spaces in inner West Leeds, e.g. Cabbage Hill

10. Support the improvement of the existing housing stock...
 Demolition of the T blocks on the New Wortley estate has been completed. The WLG Report (Strategic Investment and Delivery Plan) shows that new housing may not be built on these until 2012 at the earliest. Is it in the best interests of residents to leave a demolition site at the heart

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
			<p>of the estate (even if soiled and seeded) for as long as six years. The City Council and officers should spell out implications of the development of Gassy Fields, in particular traffic. Where will suitable replacement greenspace for gassy fields be found within New Wortley?</p>		
			<p>11. Improve accessibility for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users...</p> <p>The WLG report states that the area is 'well connected' to other parts of the city, but at the same time notes that roads, railways, the river and the canal are significant barriers to swift and safe movement. The aspirational Green Links on Diagram 7 will provide improved routes between New Wortley and Kirkstall Road/Burley as long as suitable connection sections can be created to link Armley Road and the canal towpath (not shown on Diagram 7). These links rely on civil engineering works which will be very expensive to undertake. The WLG also refers to a 'planned green viaduct'. Funds would be better employed enlarging the foul pedestrian tunnel which provides an unsavoury link between the gyratory footpath network and Whitehall Road. Wider pavements (properly guarded) at existing and dangerous pinch points at rail bridge abutments should be provided for pedestrians and cyclists. Bus services are only any use between 07.00-18.00hrs on weekdays. No direct bus service links to Burley, Woodhouse or the university campuses, and only one bus per hour towards Kirkstall, Headingley and north Leeds. Given fares are already unreasonably high, the local bus network does not offer an attractive alternative transport option to those currently using their cars for work and leisure. Residents suffer the ill effects of pollution caused by excessive volumes of motor traffic which surges through the area on a daily basis.</p> <p>With reference to access to the rail network, the wording regarding the feasibility of delivering improved connectivity between Leeds and Bradford, is a long-winded statement hedged around conditions of all sorts, which leads to the conclusion that the provision of a rail halt for Armley has a low priority. The thrust of policy for the local rail network within West Yorkshire has been to meet the needs of longer distance</p>		

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
			<p>commuters travelling into and out of Leeds. Leeds and particularly inn city Leeds has scarcely any access to the local rail network. Put forward two potential rail halt sites. On the Airedale line, site in the vicinity of the proposed 'green bridge' intended to link New Wortley to Armley Road. There are four tracks here carrying both Airedale Line and Harrogate Line services. In the past there were six tracks. With some realignment there will be space to insert two platforms. These platforms might best be sited to serve the Harrogate Line trains with crossovers to allow some, but not all Airedale Line trains to call (perhaps the half hourly Leeds-Shipley-Bradford service, this would allow connections to/from other Airedale Line services at Shipley). The proposed 'green bridge' could serve to give access to platforms. Parking spaces could be made available off Armley Road or at the New Wortley side of the bridge. On the Calderdale Line, a potential site adjacent to Amberley Road might be investigated. There is a two track formation here, but at one time there were four tracks, so there would be space to construct platforms. Ramped access would be required from street level, but no footbridge would be needed. This would be a less expensive option than the Airedale Line site. The site is within ten minutes walk of Armley Town Centre and close to Wortley Local Centre.</p>		

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Rep No: 5108

West Leeds Gateway Programme Board

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds	O	<p>Overall, as chair of the WLG Programme Board, I am pleased to see the production of a document which supports the regeneration of the West Leeds Gateway and which has the potential to act as a marketing prospectus for potential investors. However, I wish to pick up formally on specific points relating to green space designations which I have raised on a few occasions during discussions at the WLG Board meetings.</p> <p>My main concern is that across the city there is a large amount of land identified as green space in planning policy terms, but which is either previously developed with no rationale for it to be classified as green space, inappropriate and failing to serve any particular green space purpose or of generally poor quality. I welcome the PPS17 audit which has been undertaken and the fact that some changes have been made between the publication of the final version of the WLG AAP and this version of the SPD. However, I would like to raise the following sites in particular, and question the rationale for their green space designation. Green space in my view should be of good quality, well maintained and clearly available for public use. A wider debate needs to take place to identify which areas of green space are important, which can be invested in and which can potentially be given up and reclassified to pay for such investment. I do appreciate that the SPD cannot allocate land and that much of the green space outlined below has the protection of policy N6 of the UDP.</p> <p>Proposed Green space at Wortley Heights</p> <p>It is clear that this area of proposed green space provides pedestrian connectivity between the adjacent sports and social club and their associated playing pitch facilities and nearby residential properties including the nearby tower blocks. However, this is very poor quality green space in my view, which is clearly the target for</p>	<p>Wortley Heights - This new area of greenspace has been identified in order to continue the green link/pedestrian link shown in both the SPD and the West Leeds Country Park. Whilst it is acknowledged that investment would be needed to improve the quality of the greenspace, this is a long term plan for improvement. Funding e.g. S106 money could be used from new development in the area e.g. the New Wortley estate to upgrade the greenspace.</p> <p>Theaker Lane - As part of discussions with developers of the Far Fold site, the design of the scheme will need to be considered carefully including how the site will relate to the area of greenspace on Theaker Lane. The scheme should be designed so that the new dwellings face onto the greenspace/Theaker Lane. This would address building security (secure by design) and general design principles.</p> <p>Ley Lane - The greenspace has an important function for active play. The piecemeal removal of small areas of greenspace should not be considered in advance of the Site Allocations DPD.</p>	No change

some anti-social activities, evidenced by the use of large palisade fencing to prevent vehicular access and protection of the adjacent residential properties. Through allowing a small scale development of this site, the urban grain could be completed and the pedestrian routes incorporated into the scheme. Significant capital investment is required and an appropriate management regime adopted to ensure that this area, if allocated as green space, is used appropriately and does not provide a threatening experience for users and nearby residents. Given the availability of public funding over coming years this will not happen without developer contributions from the development of part of this site.

Theaker Lane Armley (to south of WL.19)

The development of the Far Fold site (WL 19) requires a new access to be created across a strip of N6 green space to the south of the site, to allow vehicular access from Theaker Lane. However, without extending the WL19 site up to the boundary with Theaker Lane, there is a high risk that developments will turn their back on this area of green space and Theaker Lane. To ensure a more comprehensive development of this site, extending the WL19 boundary will provide developers with the opportunity to front development onto Theaker Lane. The area is in no way short of green space with Armley Park to the north and Armley Moor to the South, where a significant refurbishment scheme is proposed. This would provide a high quality setting for the development which could provide the green links set out in Diagram 7 in the draft SPD between the more substantial areas of adjacent green space. The large grass verge of Theaker Lane which is allocated as green space is not well used due to the amount of open space in the area, with people using the pavement along Theaker Lane rather than cutting across the grass.

Ley Lane (Priority for Green space Improvement)

There is scope on the Ley Lane site for small scale development along the western boundary. The green space at present is not well overlooked and as such becomes the focus for some anti-social behaviour. By allowing some development, this would will help to fund further improvements to the green space whilst increasing security of the area, making the green space more attractive to use for longer periods of the day and by a broader range of people.

As I am sure you are well aware, I do feel that there is real scope for the development of a 'Khaki land' classification in order enable a more creative approach to develop. West Leeds is replete with green space and I genuinely believe that any modest reduction in the quantum through selective, high quality development, would actually improve the variety and quality of the green space offer in the area.

Rep No: 5144 Ms Amanda Willis

WL19-31	An Attractive place to live and work - Housing	<p>○ No housing on Mistress Lane green area please. It's a wonderful open space - why not leave it so.</p>	<p>It is recognised that the grassed area at Mistress Lane does have some value, however it is an informal area of landscaping which has been provided temporarily before the site's redevelopment is progressed. The site is an important development site and financial costs have already been incurred in the demolition of the maisonettes which will have to be reimbursed through the redevelopment scheme.</p>	No change
WL9-13	A Well connected City	<p>○ Some of the money being spent should be allocated for children's play equipment on the open space (Strawberry Field?) adjacent to St Bartholomews church. There is no where in this area of Armley for children to play on swings etc, nor for mothers/grannies to take their small children. The nearest is in Gotts Park, which is not only a long way, but also involves crossing the very busy Stanningley Road. I think it should be an essential part of the plan. I note that the expression 'improve greenspaces' is used. So please improve that greenspace, not with daffodils! But with playground equipment.</p>	<p>Comments noted about the need for new children's play facilities in the Armley area. This is an issue which can be addressed outside the work of the SPD as and when money is available to provide new facilities.</p>	No change

Rep No: 5205 Leeds Local Access Forum

WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds	S	<p>Section 3.4 - WL3, WL4, WL7</p> <p>The Leeds Local Access Forum (LLAF) supports the SPD, in particular the theme 'A Green and Healthy West Leeds' and the respective proposals. In respect of protecting greenspaces, the LLAF wishes to add that where greenspace meets the legal definition of open space, which includes land to which the public has access, including that used for public recreation, it is afforded some further protection. If the local authority wishes to sell or develop any such land it must first advertise it and consider objections to it. If any such land in private ownership is acquired by compulsory purchase powers the legislation requires that compensatory land will be provided.</p>	Comments noted.	No change
-------	---	---	---	-----------------	-----------

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Rep No: 5550

Owner of Former Theaker Lane Clinic (via ID Planning)

8

O

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
WL14-18	Vibrant Town Centre and Local Centres	O	<p>1. The Need to Promote Sustainable Forms of Development All the existing Town Centres within the West Gateway benefit from exceptional public transport links. Whilst it is accepted and acknowledged that car ownership levels are lower in these areas than the north of Leeds, the key problem with long stay parking is not one that is caused by the residents of the area. It is often caused by commuters who drive to the edge of the centre area so that they can benefit from excellent public transport links into Leeds City Centre. Through identifying suitable development opportunities within the Gateway, there are also opportunities then promote how development could be delivered. For example, all development within the defined town and district centres should seek to minimise the amount of private parking in order to encourage residents and visitors to use the public transport available. There could therefore be comments in relation to the provision of parking facilities within the town centres which in turn would assist developers and investors in drawing up schemes and proposals for the area. In relation to Armley, with the completion of the new sports centre and future retailing proposals there are clear opportunities to enhance the amount of parking for the town centre. At present however development within the town centre is instead being stifled by the requirements to provide parking off street which ultimately stagnates development. At the Theaker Lane site, the requirements to provide a significant amount of parking in the town centre results in a significant amount of the available development space being removed. The values of the end units in these kinds of location are not comparable with the City Centre and on that basis the requests for such provisions undermine the ability to deliver the site, which is much needed at this moment in time. Nonetheless, regard should also be had to those forms of development that could be encouraged to be car free, i.e. care facilities, sheltered housing or other types of specialist accommodation.</p> <p>2. The need to identify potential development</p>	<p>1. Section 3.6.10 of the SDP highlights that the existing parking issues need improved management arrangements, including more short stay parking spaces. It is not the role of the SPD to provide alternative standards for parking provision.</p> <p>2. It is not considered necessary to promote specific development sites within town and local centres within the West Leeds Gateway area. A key objective of section 3.6 of the SPD is to promote improvements to the visual appearance of Armley Town Centre through the town and district centre regeneration scheme and townscape heritage initiative. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Theaker Lane clinic site does need redevelopment it is not necessary to specifically identify it as a development site in the SPD. The site already has planning permission for redevelopment. If an alternative scheme is being considered this is for detailed consideration by planning and highway officers rather than inclusion in the SPD.</p> <p>With regard to the town centre boundary, the proposed extensions to the boundary reflect existing town centre uses i.e. the one stop centre and new Armley leisure centre rather than promoting additional land for inclusion in the town centre. It is not considered necessary to extend the boundary up to Theaker Lane as requested.</p>	<p>1. No change</p> <p>2. No change</p>

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
			<p>or improvement sites within Armley Town Centre. There are significant opportunities within the town centre and these should be identified and expressed accordingly. The SPD should be used as a guide for setting out how sites within the centre could be developed in order to aid the regeneration of the area. Specific design and form comments are made in relation to the area's existing housing allocations and, as such, this should be followed through in the identification of suitable sites within all Town Centres that could help facilitate new growth and investment. The Theaker Lane site is an opportunity to encourage the extending of the built form down Theaker Lane towards the north which in turn would then draw a clear link between the commercial operations within the Town Centre and the adjacent residential properties, i.e. a blending of the two functions in order to draw the relationship closer. By extending the Town Centre boundary further this point has already been identified as an opportunity by the Authority but it is considered that the SPD should go further in its encouragement. The SPD should be an overtly positive and proactive document rather than a set of policies and statements which seek to prevent development rather than encourage it.</p>		

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Rep No: 5662 Centrica Plc (via BNP Paribas)

WL32	An Attractive place to live and work - Mixed Use	Support for the allocation for mixed use but requests that within WL32 it also states that the 'Use of the site by British Gas for employment and training purposes and other related uses will continue to be supported until redevelopment takes place' to support any future applications for development relating to the existing use. Request that the SPD will state that it will support the relocation of the company from the site wherever possible.	No need to state in the document that the Council will support the continued use of the site for training. If an application for planning permission for an extension is made it will be assessed on its own merits in accordance with the development plan. It is not an issue for the SPD that the Council will assist in the relocation of the company. If and when the time comes to relocate the British Gas operation, the Council will assist where possible.	No change
------	---	--	--	-----------

Rep No: 5671 Barratts Leeds (via ID Planning)

WL14-18	Vibrant Town Centre and Local Centres	<p>All the existing Town Centres within the West Gateway benefit from exceptional public transport links. Whilst it is also widely accepted and acknowledged that car ownership levels are lower in these areas than say other areas or suburbs in Leeds. The Oldfield Lane site is within a short distance of the City Centre where visitors can benefit from the vast array of amenities available. Through identifying suitable development opportunities within the Gateway, there are also opportunities to promote how development could be delivered. For example, all development within the defined town and district centres should seek to minimise the amount of private parking in order to encourage residents and visitors to use the public transport available while developments outside the town centres should still seek a lower than necessary provision of parking in order to encourage the use of the public transport network. Accordingly, regard should also be had to forms of development that could be encouraged to be car free, i.e. proposals for care facilities, sheltered housing or other types of specialist accommodation.</p>	It is not the role of the SPD to provide alternative standards for parking provision.	No change
---------	--	--	---	-----------

Q No	Question	S/O Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
WL19-31	An Attractive place to live and work - Housing	<p>With reference to Oldfield Lane site for housing WL22. Whilst the general approach of the SPD is welcomed, as ultimately there is a significant need to drive forward the future development and regeneration of the area as a whole, there needs to be more focus as to how the delivery of specific sites and areas can be encouraged which in turn would assist the Council with their aims in encouraging the private sector to invest in Armely and the adjacent settlements. Number of comments relating specifically to material planning considerations which should be considered as alterations/additions to the SPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The need to understand the economic complexities attributed to the development of new residential properties, especially in light of the recession and continued economic uncertainty. One of the key considerations is the ability to bring a scheme forward and its viability which is affected by the planning gain that an LPA may seek to attach to the grant of planning permission, e.g. affordable housing, public open space, education and highway improvements. There should be a suitably worded paragraph within the proposed SPD that specifically deals with the viability of development within the West Leeds Gateway. The LPW should therefore be encouraged to fully accept the submission of viability studies from a developer or applicant which clearly sets out the costs of bringing the site forward. Included in such an assessment would be the development costs (site purchase, remediation, preparation, construction) in addition to the estimated returns from the sale of the properties to be constructed. There could be an issue whereby the level of contributions sought from an applicant make a scheme economically unviable. This should not be the aim of the Authority and, in particular, in an area such as the West Leeds Gateway. There is an overriding need and desire to facilitate and thus deliver physical development and regeneration. The Authority should be the facilitators of development and where it can be demonstrated that a request for planning gain makes a scheme unviable, the Council should seek to remove that requirement or work in a partnership with the developer so as to ensure that any scheme and regeneration benefits derived from it are 	<p>It is accepted that the current economic conditions have created uncertainty in the market and that developers are concerned about the viability of development schemes. This is an issue which is applicable across the Leeds district. The Council is already accepting the submission of viability assessments as part of planning applications in order to determine whether developer contributions for e.g. affordable housing and greenspace can be justified in financial terms. However each site has to be considered separately having regard to individual circumstances. It is not necessary or appropriate to include a paragraph in the SPD referring to viability of development within the West Leeds Gateway.</p>	No change

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
			<p>delivered.</p> <p>Reference to requirements of Circular 05/05 and the Community Infrastructure Levy. WL6 and WL37 are considered to be unacceptable and should be either amended to reflect comments or removed completely.</p>		
WL37	An Attractive place to live and work - Signage	O	<p>With reference to WL37, the provision of signage on the highway, or directional signage for visitors to the area is a matter for the Local Authority. It is not for the development community to provide funds to the Authority to support the enhancement of signage within the area. This is a statutory responsibility of the Council as the Highway Authority and as such the Council have in place powers and resources to undertake improvements where necessary.</p>	<p>WL37 states that developer contributions would only be sought "where appropriate". Examples of development schemes where contributions could be sought include town centre improvements/redevelopment schemes. Improved signage is an important element of promoting Armley Town Centre and such schemes would benefit from improved signage. It is not considered necessary to revise WL37.</p>	No change
WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds	O	<p>With respect to WL6, this approach is considered to be wholly unjustifiable and therefore not acceptable. The LPA should, where possible, enhance access to the canal. However such measures should be secured through agreement with British Waterways and / or those developments which have a direct link to the canal. This should therefore be revised accordingly.</p>	<p>It is accepted that the wording of WL6 could be more specifically worded. Developer contributions would only be sought where the test of Circular 05/05 could be justified so that not all developments would be required to make contributions, only those lying adjacent to the canal. Contributions would only be sought where appropriate.</p>	<p>Insert new sentence at end of para. 3.4.16 "The historic interest in the canal should also be promoted through environmental improvements, directional signage and visitor information. Where appropriate, developer contributions will be sought from sites lying in proximity to the canal". Renumber WL6 as WL5 and move forward to follow para. 3.4.16. Revise renumbered WL5 "The council will also seek, either directly or through developer contributions where appropriate..."</p>

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Rep No: 5691 LCC - Flood Risk Management

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds		<p>I am not aware of any input from Flood Risk Management (formerly Land Drainage) but the only reference to flooding or drainage issues I could find were contained within a short section on page 32, these were 3.4.18 and WL5. however these are under a section "River Aire and Leeds-Liverpool Canal Corridor" in a chapter "3.4 A Green and Healthy West Leeds".</p> <p>I find it quite surprising that Flood Risk, which is an important Planning consideration, get squeezed away in this manner. There are a number of positive issues that could have been raised in this document about the way we are looking to deal with flood issues - such as the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and the Council's wish to make more of the use of water (in line with Government Policy contained in Making Space for Water.)</p> <p>This sort of guidance document lays down the way any development should be looking at these sort of issues and the use of SuDS and it being incorporated into Green Infrastructure and Public Open Space should be seen as a positive item.</p> <p>As for what you have said in para 3.4.18 and WL5, these are miss-leading - the flood risk may not be the highest in the district but there are flood risks for surface water run-off across the area and also the development of sites within this area can have a substantial affect on flood risk in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Therefore we need to be saying "that due to the topography of this area the major flood risks tend to be at the northern and south-western parts of the site, where the area falls to the lower areas around the River Aire and Farnley Balancer/Beck. However flood risk can effect anywhere and therefore all development shall consider flood risk and Flood Risk Assessments, as per PPS25, shall be prepared - these should examine the flood risk to the site and also the impact of the development on surrounding areas.</p> <p>The Council has adopted Minimum Development Control Standards for Flood Risk, which shall be</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the first sentence of para.3.4.18 may be misleading. That flood risk can occur from surface water run-off and the development of sites can create flood risks in surrounding areas. However it is not the purpose of the SPD to provide detailed guidance on flood risk, which is an issue which should be dealt with on a city-wide basis. The Core Strategy is the most appropriate document for addressing the flood risk issue (including guidance on SuDS incorporated into green infrastructure and public open space). However the wording of the SPD could be revised to more closely reflect these comments. The Farnley Balancer/Beck falls outside the SPD area.</p>	<p>Revise para.3.4.18 to reflect suggested amendment.</p>

Q No	Question	S/O	Representor comments	Officer comments	Suggested changes
			<p>adhered to. Furthermore the use of SuDS is to be adopted where possible - it is likely to become mandatory as part of the Flood & Water Management Act 2010."</p> <p>Then WL5 can remain as it is, pointing out that a more comprehensive level of assessment is required.</p>		

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Rep No: 5829 Mr Tony Greenwood

WL9-13	A Well connected City	S	I am very impressed with the SPD especially the plans for 'green links' to the town centre and the proposed signalisation of Copy Hill/Oldfield lane/Tong Road junction. The para 3.5.13 concerning Amberley Lane, should this not be Amberley Road?	Thank you. Correct about Amberley Road	Change reference at 3.5.13 to Amberley Road.
--------	------------------------------	---	---	---	--

Rep No: 5830 St Bartholomews Church

WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds	<p>1. 3.4.8 The churchyard-graveyard is privately owned containing burials and is protected because of the listing of the church. We acknowledge the help we receive from Leeds City Council in maintaining the graveyard.</p>	<p>The churchyard/graveyard is recognised as greenspace in accordance with the definition set out in PPG17. It therefore requires protection in its own right. The issue of ownership is irrelevant to land use designations.</p>	<p>1. Retain proposal to designate as greenspace in accordance with 3.4.8.</p>
		<p>2. Policy WL3 Allotment plot to the west of Wesley Road. This plot is privately owned, with no designated access to it. Records show that these allotments fell out of use more than 20 years ago and the area is wasteland. There is a history of planning application approval for a sheltered housing scheme, granted in the mid 1980s.</p>	<p>2. The allocation carries forward a designation from the LUDPR 2006. Private ownership is not a reason not to include this land neither is the fact that they are now disused as they could be brought back into use. There is a recognised demand in the area for allotments. Access is denied due to the fencing around the site which could be removed to provide access.</p>	<p>2. No change. The WLSPD carries forward the LUDPR 2006 allocation.</p>

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes

Rep No: 5831 Diocese of Ripon & Leeds

WL3-8	A Green & Healthy West Leeds	3.4.8 The churchyard-graveyard is privately owned containing burials and is protected because of the listing of the church. We acknowledge the help we receive from Leeds City Council in maintaining the graveyard.	The churchyard/graveyard is recognised as greenspace in accordance with the definition set out in PPG17. It therefore requires protection in its own right. The issue of ownership is irrelevant to land use designations.	Retain proposal to designate as greenspace in accordance with 3.4.8.
-------	---	--	--	--

Rep No: 5832 LCC - Highways and Transportation

WL9-13	A Well connected City	<p>1.26 - welcome statement. In order to maintain the adopted highway as effectively as possible it is important that 'standard' materials are specified and high quality materials are kept to a minimum.</p> <p>3.6.20 Any enhancements would have to come with their own funding and whole life costs taken into consideration.</p> <p>3.7.52 most of the signs on the highway are strictly controlled. If there is going to be a new tier of signing to improve an areas image, responsibility for its maintenance needs to be determined.</p> <p>64 A.3 Department of Transport is actually the Department for Transport</p>	<p>Comments duly noted.</p> <p>1.26 does not preclude the use of standard materials if these are the best choice in the interests of peoples safety.</p> <p>3.7.52 Noted. Will agree who will maintain the signage.</p>	<p>Amend page 64 para. A.3 to read 'Department for Transport'</p>
--------	------------------------------	---	---	---

Q No

Question

S/O Representor comments

Officer comments

Suggested changes