

INNER AREA HOUSING MARKET CHARACTERISTIC AREA

Armley, Beeston and Holbeck, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill, City & Hunslet, Chapel Allerton, Gipton and Harehills, Headingley, Hyde Park and Woodhouse, Killingbeck and Seacroft, Middleton Park and Temple Newsam Wards

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Inner Area Housing Market Characteristic Area and Wards

- 1.1 Plan 1 shows the boundaries of the wards that fall, to a greater or lesser extent, within the Inner Area Housing Market Characteristic Area (HMCA). The plan also shows the areas of greenspace by type that fall in the area.
- 1.2 The greenspace sites shown on the plan and used in the following assessment are those which were identified and surveyed during the citywide Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment (referred to as the Open Space Audit) in 2008 and not the allocated greenspace (N1, N1a, N5 and N6) identified in the UDP Review 2006. Many sites are in both but there are variations which must be noted: 1) some allocated sites are not included (where they have been developed); 2) others appear with amended boundaries; and 3) there are additional sites which are not currently allocated but have been identified through the audit as functioning as greenspace. Plan 2 overlays the existing UDP allocations with the boundaries of the Open Space Audit sites and thereby clearly shows the differences between the two. Appendix 1 contains a list of those allocated sites which do not appear on the plan and the reasons why they are not shown. It is proposed to delete these sites, revise the boundaries of some sites to reflect what is currently on the ground and designate the new sites identified through the Open Space Audit. Housing Market Characteristic Areas are sub-areas recognising the diverse nature and characteristics of market areas across the City. These areas take account of topographical and settlement spatial definitions as well as operational housing markets in terms of house prices and land values. They reflect geographical areas that people tend to associate with finding properties to live in.
- 1.3 Housing Market Characteristic Areas are sub-areas recognising the diverse nature and characteristics of market areas across the City. These areas take account of topographical and settlement spatial definitions as well as operational housing markets in terms of house prices and land values. They reflect geographical areas that people tend to associate with finding properties to live in.
- 1.4 Whilst other subjects have been considered on an HMCA basis, the quantity of greenspace has been analysed according to wards because this allowed a more accurate analysis by ward population figures. The quality and accessibility of greenspace is assessed on an HMCA basis.
- 1.5 There are 11 wards that fall to a greater or lesser extent within the Inner Area Housing Market Area. These are Temple Newsam, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill, City & Hunslet, Chapel Allerton, Killingbeck and Seacroft, Gipton and Harehills, Hyde Park and Woodhouse and Woodhouse, Headingley, Armley, Beeston and Holbeck and Middleton Park.

- 1.6 Where an area of greenspace falls across the boundary of the ward then only the part of the greenspace that falls within the ward has been included in the analysis. Care has been taken to check this would not result in the division of a facility.

2.0 Total Greenspace in 11 Wards

- 2.1 Total greenspace across all wards which fall within the Inner Area HMCA is **1,140.404 ha** on **333** greenspace sites. Excluding green corridors, cemeteries and golf courses the total is **815.951 ha** which relates to **290** sites.

3.0 Core Strategy Policy G3: Standards for Open Space, Sport and Recreation

- 3.1 Policy G3 sets out standards for the following types of greenspace:
- Parks and Gardens
 - Outdoor Sports Provision - excludes MUGAs, single goal ends and golf courses. Includes tennis courts, bowling greens, athletics tracks, synthetic pitches, adult pitches, junior pitches (football, rugby, cricket)
 - Amenity greenspace – excludes cemeteries.
 - Children and young people's equipped play facilities – includes MUGAs skate parks, teen shelters, play facilities.
 - Allotments – both used and unused.
 - Natural greenspace - excludes green corridors.
- 3.2 There are no standards in the Core Strategy for cemeteries, green corridors and golf courses (but these are shown on Plan 1 for completeness).

QUANTITY OF GREENSPACE

4.0 Methodology

- 4.1 The tables below show the breakdown of provision, or **quantity**, for each of the 6 types of greenspace defined in Policy G3 in the Core Strategy. The quantities have been divided by the total population of each ward to give a standard which can be compared against the standards in Policy G3.
- 4.2 The ward population is taken from the ONS Population Census 2011. Ward Populations are as follows:

Ward	Population
Armley	25,550
Beeston and Holbeck	22,187
Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	24,843
Chapel Allerton	23,536
City & Hunslet	33,705
Gipton and Harehills	27,078
Headingley	20,533
Hyde Park and Woodhouse	25,914
Killingbeck & Seacroft	23,749
Middleton Park	26,228
Temple Newsam	21,543

- 4.3 Child populations are taken from the ONS Population Census 2011 and the 2007 mid year estimates. The 2011 census figures are grouped in 5 year categories so there are accurate figures for 0 - 4, 5 – 9 and 10 – 14 year olds. The next category is 15 – 19 year olds so the 2007 mid year estimates have been used to estimate the number of 15 and 16 year olds. These estimates are broken down to individual years so the number of 11 and 12 year olds in 2007 (15 and 16 year olds in 2011) has been added to the 2011 population figures to give an estimate of children and young people by ward. This is set out below:

Ward	Population aged 0 -16 years
Armley	5,104
Beeston and Holbeck	5,087
Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	5,796
City & Hunslet	4,492
Chapel Allerton	4,794
Gipton and Harehills	8,405
Headingley	777
Hyde Park and Woodhouse	2,690
Killingbeck & Seacroft	5,688
Middleton Park	6,387
Temple Newsam	4,625

- 4.4.1 Core Strategy policy G3 identifies the following standards for quantity of greenspace:

Greenspace type	Quantity per 1000 population
Parks and Gardens	1 hectare
Outdoor sports provision	1.2 hectares (excluding education provision)
Amenity greenspace	0.45 hectares
Children and young people's equipped play facilities	2 facilities per 1,000 children (excluding education provision)
Allotments	0.24 hectares
Natural Greenspace	0.7 hectares (main urban area and major settlements, 2 ha other areas)

5.0 Quantities by types and Wards

- 5.1 The quantities of greenspace types compared to the Core Strategy standards are as follows for each of the wards in the Inner HMCA.

Parks and Gardens:

5.2 *Parks and Gardens Armley Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
21	Armley Park	13.693
136	Ley Lane Recreation Ground	1.971
1078	Jaily Fields	1.915
709	Elder Road - Field Opposite	0.280
710	Elder Street - Field On	0.468
1191	Raynville Crescent POS	3.531

TOTAL	21.858
--------------	---------------

5.2.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $21.858 \div 25.550 = 0.855$ hectares

5.2.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Armley Ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.3 *Parks and Gardens Beeston & Holbeck Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
579	Cottingley Drive	9.598
585	Windmill Hill	5.719
14	Holbeck Moor - Towers Side	4.681
15	Holbeck Moor Bowling Club	1.100
28	Beggars Hill	10.314
36	Cross Flats Park	17.299
581	Cardinal Square Recreation Ground (Beeston Juniors)	1.480
583	Old Lane POS / Playing Field	0.993
74	Middleton Park	0.773
Total		51.957

5.3.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $51.957 \div 22.187 = 2.34$ hectares

5.3.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Beeston & Holbeck ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.4 *Parks and Gardens Burmantofts & Richmond Hill*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
437	Nowell Mount	3.702
299	Ebors Playing Fields	3.213
304	Bow Street Rec Ground	1.962
40	East End Park	20.233
	Total	29.110

5.4.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $29.110 \div 24.843 = 1.71$ hectares

5.4.2 Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.5 *Parks and Gardens Chapel Allerton Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
115	Chapel Allerton Park	3.313
1272	Miles Hill	2.089
111	Buslingthorpe Recreation Ground	1.959
87	Potternewton Park	12.606
	Total	19.967

5.5.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $19.967 \div 23.536 = 0.85$ hectares

5.5.2 Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Chapel Allerton ward falls below the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has an under provision in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.6 ***Parks and Gardens City & Hunslet***

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1050	Leasowe Recreation Ground	1.910
1072	Old Run Road	2.896
13	Hunslet Moor	6.114
64	Hunslet Lake	1.971
124	Grove Road Recreational Ground	1.032
1054	Beza Street Recreation Ground	2.328
Total		16.251

5.6.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $16.251 \div 33.705 = 0.482$ hectares

5.6.2 Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, City & Hunslet ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has a deficiency of provision in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.7 ***Parks and Gardens Gipton and Harehills Ward***

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
131	Harehills Park	11.164
22	Banstead Park	2.136
	Total	13.300

5.7.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $13.300 \div 27.078 = 0.491$ hectares

5.7.2 **Conclusions:** Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Gipton & Harehills ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has a deficiency in terms of provision of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.8 ***Parks and Gardens Headingley Ward***

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
25	Becketts Park	2.017
	Total	2.017

5.8.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $2.017 \div 20.533 = 0.1$ hectares

5.8.2 Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Headingley ward falls extremely short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.9 ***Parks and Gardens Hyde Park and Woodhouse Ward***

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
941	Cliff Mount Fields	1.312
141	Lovell Park	1.552
159	Woodhouse Moor Park	19.799
1169	Hartley Avenue Park	1.140
918	Woodhouse Street Recreation Ground	0.939
391	Hyde Park Rec Ground Next to Mosque	0.309
392	Queens Road Recreation Ground	0.644
170	North West Road	0.776
167	Blackman Lane Rec	1.184
393	Burley Lodge	0.997
	Total	28.652

5.9.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $28.652 \div 25.914 = 1.105$ hectares

5.9.2 **Conclusions:** Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Hyde Park & Woodhouse ward fractionally exceeds the Core Strategy standard and so has a marginal surplus in terms of provision of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.10 *Parks & Gardens Killingbeck & Seacroft*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
269	Seacroft Gardens	2.936
254	The Rein - Seacroft	4.663
	Total	7.599

5.10.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $7.599 \div 23.749 = 0.319$ hectares

5.10.2 **Conclusions:** Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Killingbeck & Seacroft ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has a deficiency in terms of provision of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.11 *Parks and Gardens Middleton Park*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
794	Throstle Recreation Ground	6.281
1044	Low Grange View	1.603
1025	Windmill Road Rec	1.489
955	Cranmore Rise	0.464
1072	Old Run Road	9.882
1066	Winrose Crescent	0.874
844	St Peters Playing Field	1.604
74	Middleton Park	142.296
	Total	164.493

5.11.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $164.493 \div 26.228 = 6.27$ hectares

5.11.2 Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Middleton Park ward far exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has a large surplus provision in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens. This surplus of parks and gardens is namely attributable to the presence of Middleton Park itself.

5.12 Parks and Gardens Temple Newsam Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
367	Temple Newsam Road Amenity / Sports Area	2.576
127	Halton Dean - Primrose Valley	34.457
97	Temple Newsam Estate	338.111
	Total	375.144

5.12.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $375.144 \div 21.543 = 17.41$ hectares

5.12.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Temple Newsam ward comfortably exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens. The overwhelming majority of this surplus is attributable to the Temple Newsam estate which is owned by Leeds City Council and is open to the public.

5.13 Parks and Gardens - Overall Conclusions

If the totals for the 11 wards which feature Parks and Gardens within the Inner Area HMCA boundary are added together it creates an overall average standard of **2.66 hectares per 1,000 population**. This is over the Core Strategy standard, however this figure is an average will be distorted by the Temple Newsam Estate.

6.0 Outdoor Sports Provision

6.1 Methodology

6.1.1 Outdoor sports facilities in educational use have been excluded as it cannot be assumed that these are available for the public to use. Golf courses have also been excluded.

6.1.2 There are instances where outdoor sports provision occurs within other primary typologies. We have identified these and used the Sport England Comparison Standards to extract out the size of facilities as follows:

- Playing pitch (adult) = 1.2ha
- Junior pitch = 0.5ha
- Bowling green = 0.14ha
- Tennis court = 0.0742
- Cricket pitch = 1.37ha
- Synthetic turf pitch = 0.7ha

6.1 Outdoor Sports Provision Armley Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
21	Armley Park
1078	Jaily Fields

856	Armley Liberal Bowling Club
137	Armley Lazer Centre
759	Upper Armley Tennis Club
607	Armley - Conservative Club Bowling Green
597	Moorfield Road Pitch
1843	Goals Football Centre

6.1.1 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	6	7.2
Junior Pitches	0	0
Cricket Pitches	0	0
Tennis Courts	10	0.742
Bowling Green	4	0.56
Synthetic Pitches	1	0.7
Total	21	9.202

6.1.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $9.202 \div 25.550 = 0.36$ hectares

6.1.3 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectare per 1000 population, Armley Ward falls significantly short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is severely deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

6.2 **Outdoor Sports Provision Beeston & Holbeck Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
579	Cottingley Drive
585	Windmill Hill
1861	South Leeds Conservative Club
1862	Holbeck Bowling Club
129	Brown Lane East POS
14	Holbeck Moor - Towers Side
15	Holbeck Moor Bowling Club
28	Beggars Hill
36	Cross Flats Park
1316	Leeds United FC - Elland Road
564	Hunslet Nelson Cricket Club
581	Cardinal Square Recreation Ground (Beeston Juniors)

6.2.1 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	11	13.2
Junior Pitches	1	0.5
Cricket Pitches	1	1.37
Tennis Courts	3	0.223
Bowling Green	6	0.84
Synthetic Pitches	0	0
Total		16.133

6.2.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $16.133 \div 22.107 = 0.729$ hectares

6.2.3 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Beeston & Holbeck Ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

6.3 **Outdoor Sports Provision Burmantofts & Richmond Hill**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
437	Nowell Mount
299	Ebors Playing Fields
294	Pontefract Lane (Aysgarth Amenity Space)
345	Osmondthorpe Recreation Ground
521	East Leeds Cricket and Sports Club
236	Cavalier Hill Recreation Ground
297	East Leeds Rugby League Pitch
302	St Agnes Pitch
351	Skelton Road (Private Sports Pitch)
352	Wades Charity Pitches
40	East End Park
322	Irish Centre Sports Pitch

6.3.1 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	12	14.4
Junior Pitches	4	2
Cricket Pitches	0	0
Tennis Courts	0	0
Bowling Green	2	0.28
Synthetic Pitches	1	0.7
Total		17.38

6.3.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $17.38 \div 24.843 = 0.70$ hectares

6.3.3 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

6.4 **Outdoor Sports Provision Chapel Allerton Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
1273	Chapel Allerton Tennis, Squash and Gym Club
1546	Scott Hall Sports Pitches
115	Chapel Allerton Park
496	Yorkshire Amateur FC
1281	Scott Hall Pitches
1175	Newton Road

1167	Meanwood Road
935	Meanwood Road Rugby Club
936	Woodhouse Cricket Club
111	Buslingthorpe Recreation Ground
87	Potternewton Park
1532	Chapel Town Football Youth Development Centre

6.4.1 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	12	14.4
Junior Pitches	1	0.5
Cricket Pitches	3	4.11
Tennis Courts	17	1.26
Bowling Green	4	0.56
Synthetic Pitches	0	0
Total	37	20.83

6.4.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** - $20.83 \div 23.536 = 0.88$ hectares

6.4.3 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Chapel Allerton ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

6.5 Outdoor Sports City & Hunslet

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
912	Skelton Grange Road Pitch
1050	Leasowe Recreation Ground
319	Thomas Danby Pitches
16	South Leeds Sports Centre
13	Hunslet Moor
915	Pepper Road Recreation Ground
64	Hunslet Lake
124	Grove Road Recreational Ground
1053	Hunslet Green (Community Sports Club)
1054	Beza Street Recreation Ground
7	Lady Pit Lane Allotments & POS

6.5.1 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	11	13.2
Junior Pitches	4	2
Cricket Pitches	0	0
Tennis Courts	0	0
Bowling Green	2	0.28
Synthetic Pitches	1	0.7
Total		16.18

6.5.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $16.18 \div 33.705 = 0.48$ hectares

6.5.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, City & Hunslet ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

6.6 Outdoor Sports Provision Headingley Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
893	Headingley Stadium - Rugby Ground
894	Headingley Stadium - Yorkshire Cricket Club

6.6.1 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	1	1.2
Junior Pitches	0	0
Cricket Pitches	1	1.37
Tennis Courts	0	0
Bowling Green	0	0
Synthetic Pitches	0	0
Total	2	2.57

6.6.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $2.57 \div 20.533 = 0.12$ hectares

6.6.3 Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Headingley Ward falls significantly below the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has an extreme under provision in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

6.7 Outdoor Sports Provision Hyde Park and Woodhouse Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
941	Cliff Mount Fields
175	Cambridge Road
159	Woodhouse Moor Park
1822	Willow Road - Rising Sun POS
172	Little London Play Area

6.7.1 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	4	4.8
Junior Pitches	0	0
Cricket Pitches	0	0
Tennis Courts	3	0.223
Bowling Green	3	4.11
Synthetic Pitches	0	0
Total	10	9.133

6.7.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $9.133 \div 25.914 = 0.352$ hectares

- 6.7.3 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Hyde Park & Woodhouse Ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and has a deficiency of provision in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

6.8 **Outdoor Sports Provision Gipton and Harehills Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
265	Fearnville Sports Centre (outdoor sports facilities)
317	Bankside Multi Sport Area
266	Wykebeck North (Fearnville Playing Pitches)
311	Primrose High (Sports Ground Associated With Former)
286	St Nicholas Playing Fields
284	Oak Tree Drive Amenity Space
131	Harehills Park

- 6.8.1 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	14	16.8
Junior Pitches	2	1
Cricket Pitches	0	0
Tennis Courts	7	0.519
Bowling Green	4	0.56
Synthetic Pitches	2	1.4
Total	29	20.279

- 6.8.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $20.279 \div 27.078 = 0.748$ hectares

- 6.8.3 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Gipton & Harehills Ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and has a deficiency of provision in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

6.9 **Outdoor Sports Provision Killingbeck & Seacroft Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
268	Foundry Mill (private pitch off)
269	Seacroft Gardens
272	Foundry Lane (1)
1849	Wyke Beck North - Amenity Space
230	The Green - Seacroft
327	Parklands Football Pitches
1855	Crossgates Bowling Club
250	David Young Playing Fields (East)
254	The Rein - Seacroft
326	Parklands Amenity Space (Seacroft Hall Allotment)

- 6.9.1 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	12	14.4
Junior Pitches	3	1.5
Cricket Pitches	1	1.37
Tennis Courts	0	0
Bowling Green	1	0.14
Synthetic Pitches	0	0
Total	17	17.41

6.9.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $17.41 \div 23.749 = 0.733$ hectares

6.9.3 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Killingbeck & Seacroft Ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and has a deficiency of provision in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

6.10 Outdoor Sports Provision Middleton Park Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
1056	South Leeds Stadium
794	Throstle Recreation Ground
1853	Acre Close, Bowling Green
1072	Old Run Road
797	Blenkinsop Field
35	Cranmore Recreation Ground
844	St Peters Playing Field
846	St Georges Centre
841	Middleton Leisure Centre Pitch 2
1036	Windmill PS
847	Leeds Corinthians RUFC
848	Middleton Leisure Centre Pitch 1
843	Sharp Lane (Belle Isle)

6.10.1 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	13	14.2
Junior Pitches	6	3
Cricket Pitches	0	0
Tennis Courts	6	0.445
Bowling Green	3	0.42
Synthetic Pitches	11	7.7
Total		25.76

6.10.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $25.76 \div 26.228 = 0.98$ hectares

6.10.3 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Middleton Park ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

6.11 Outdoor Sports Provision Temple Newsam Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
367	Temple Newsam Road Amenity / Sports Area
1449	Colton Sports Association
346	Wyke Beck (Halton Moor/Osmondthorpe)
127	Halton Dean - Primrose Valley
1184	Whitkirk
97	Temple Newsam Estate

6.11.1 The quantity of outdoor sports provision on the above sites is as follows:

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	23	27.6
Junior Pitches	2	1
Cricket Pitches	1	1.37
Tennis Courts	4	0.2968
Bowling Green	3	0.42
Synthetic Pitches	1	0.7
Total		31.38

6.11.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $31.38 \div 21.543 = 1.456$ hectares

6.11.3 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Temple Newsam ward slightly exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

6.12 Outdoor Sports Provision – Overall Conclusions

6.12.1 If the totals for all 11 wards are added together it creates an overall average standard of:

$186.257 \div 274.866 = 0.68$ hectares per 1,000 population

This is below the Core Strategy standard. All of the wards, except Temple Newsam, are deficient in outdoor sports provision, falling below the standard of 1.2ha per 1000 population.

7.0 Quantity Amenity Greenspace

7.1 Amenity Greenspace Armley Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1079	New Wortley Shops and CC Adjacent	0.312
784	Strawberry Fields	1.284
791	Stott Street POS	0.446
616	Armley - Charlie Cake Park	0.353
1076	Phil May Court	0.337
615	Mistress Lane (2)	0.293
614	Mistress Lane (1)	0.222
753	Cockshott Drive - Land Off	0.301
859	Clyde Grange	0.268
860	Wortley Heights	0.615
957	Off Tong Road	0.317

584	St Marys Park Crescent	0.205
596	Poplar Court POS (2)	1.597
604	Far Fold Moor (2)	0.771
605	Moor Top Armley Common	2.240
606	Little Moor (4)	0.202
594	Poplar POS	1.127
600	Green Hill Close POS	0.427
601	Hill Top Moor	0.784
1267	Wyther Lane	0.310
	TOTAL	12.411

7.1.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $12.411 \div 25.550 = 0.486$ hectares

7.1.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Armley Ward slightly exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of amenity greenspace.

7.2 **Amenity Greenspace Beeston & Holbeck**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1006	Holbeck Park	0.690
625	Cottingley Road / Drive (Rear of)	2.359
578	Beechcroft View (Rear of)	0.820
8	Waddington's Wildlife Run	1.707
12	Cambrian Street POS	1.593
2	Czar Street	0.204
638	City West One Office Park (1)	1.645
639	City West One Office Park (2)	1.003
1007	Holbeck Stocks Hill	1.100
9	Ingram Road POS	1.092
10	Beeston Road Local Green Space	1.065
1888	Noster Row, Beeston	0.222
Total		13.5

7.2.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $13.5 \div 22.187 = 0.608$ hectares

7.2.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Beeston & Holbeck ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has small surplus provision in terms of the quantity of amenity greenspace.

7.3 **Amenity Greenspace Burmantofts & Richmond Hill**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
292	Easy Road	1.019
334	Torre Drive (Semi - Circle)	0.201
335	Torre Grove	0.619
438	Torre Crescent	0.398
295	Richmond Hill Rec Centre (Next to)	0.197
294	Pontefract Lane (Aysgarth Amenity	1.188

	Space)	
313	Shakespeare Lawn Village Green Area	0.190
373	Cromwell Heights	0.729
305	Grantham Tower Play Area	0.793
309	Scarsgill Close Amenity Area	0.266
523	Neville POS	2.241
310	Beckett Street Amenity Corridor	3.614
306	Saxton Gardens (Dolphins Greenspace)	0.679
298	Richmond Hill Amenity Space	0.510
312	Trent Road (Arcadia Access) - Greenspace west of	1.330
349	Rookwood Road Amenity Space	0.605
382	St Mary's Churchyard	0.507
383	St Marys Street Greenspace	0.313
348	Osmondthorpe Lane and Rookwood Road (Between)	0.301
1530	Glendales Field	0.522
323	Temple View Road Green Space	0.199
324	Raincliffe Road Recreation Ground	0.982
343	Rookwood Crescent	0.384
	Total	17.787

7.3.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $17.787 \div 24.843 = 0.715$ hectares

7.3.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has a small surplus provision in terms of the quantity of amenity greenspace.

7.4 **Amenity Greenspace Chapel Allerton Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1174	Beckhill Fold	0.420
939	Meanwood Road Green Corridor (1)	3.059
1172	Potternewton Heights	0.610
1167	Meanwood Road	1.817
752	Meanwood Valley Model Farm	10.016
1596	Reginald Street	0.845
410	Gledhow Manor Park	1.137
1815	St Martins Institute	0.270
	Total	18.174

7.4.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $18.174 \div 23.536 = 0.77$ hectares

7.4.5 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Chapel Allerton Ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of amenity greenspace.

7.5 *Amenity Greenspace City & Hunslet*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
85	Park Square	0.622
11	Dewsbury Road Traffic Island (Turbine Site)	0.757
3	Lady Pit Lane	0.191
1059	Thwaites Mill Paddock	3.049
178	Drydock POS	0.502
179	City Gate	0.515
182	Merrion Gardens	0.224
84	Parish Church Gardens (Penny Pocket Park)	0.941
1270	Midland Garth POS	0.216
1285	Rocheford Walk POS	1.200
190	Queen Square	0.256
188	Leeds City Office Park	0.266
184	Belgrave Street POS	0.248
177	Calverley Street (Leeds MET)	0.380
1057	Leasow Road Sub Station	0.333
1886	Whitefield Way, Hunslet	0.455
	Total	10.155

7.5.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $10.155 \div 33.705 = 0.301$ hectares

7.5.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, City & Hunslet ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has small deficiency in terms of the amenity greenspace provision.

7.6 *Amenity Greenspace Headingley Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
932	Grosvenor Road Greenspace	0.415
1533	Hinsley Hall	0.529
105	Lupton Flats Greenspace	0.975
	Total	1.919

7.6.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $1.919 \div 20.533 = 0.09$ hectares

7.6.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Headingley Ward falls extremely short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of amenity greenspace.

7.7 *Amenity Greenspace Hyde Park and Woodhouse Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
161	Woodhouse Square	0.256
128	Hanover Square	0.899
917	Cliff Road Greenspace	2.148
180	Mount Preston Street (Leeds Uni)	0.536

388	Woodsley Road (Leeds Uni)	1.208
390	Woodhouse Lane Greenspace	1.525
342	Woodhouse Cliff	0.260
1822	Willow Road - Rising Sun POS	0.854
165	Carlton Gate - Little London	0.964
168	Meanwood Road	1.042
176	Servia Gardens	0.349
173	Oatland Towers	0.543
174	Bagby Fields	0.697
189	Blenheim Square	0.599
1889	St Marks Road	0.774
	Total	12.654

7.7.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $12.654 \div 25.914 = 0.488$ hectares

7.7.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Hyde Park & Woodhouse ward fractionally exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has a marginal surplus in the provision of amenity greenspace.

7.8 ***Amenity Greenspace Gipton and Harehills Ward***

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
318	Gathorne Terrace Amenity Area	0.581
280	Amberton Road	0.527
264	Wykebeck Valley	1.066
285	Coldcotes Circus	0.264
284	Oak Tree Drive Amenity Space	1.451
279	Lawrence Road (backland area off)	0.299
278	Amberton Lane	0.200
338	Hovingham Play Area	0.551
	Total	4.939

7.8.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $4.939 \div 27.078 = 1.82$ hectares

7.8.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Gipton & Harehills ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has a surplus in provision of amenity greenspace.

7.9 ***Amenity Greenspace Killingbeck and Seacroft Ward***

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
249	York Road Bridle Path	0.316
245	Maryfield Avenue	0.333
238	Inglewood Approach North	0.209
369	Beechwood Working Mens Club (land adjacent to)	0.305
237	Inglewood Approach	0.228
240	St James Approach (Backland off)	0.464
267	Foundry Mill View	0.486
270	Foundry Mill Walk	1.366

363	The Oval - Killingbeck	0.197
271	Moresdale Lane East	0.237
272	Foundry Lane (1)	0.432
1849	Wyke Beck North - Amenity Space	3.163
1850	The Green - Seacroft	1.535
243	Lambrigg Crescent	0.540
244	South Parkway	0.230
232	Ironwood Crescent	0.367
233	Foundry Lane (2)	0.812
234	Moresdale Lane (West of York Road)	0.768
229	Beechwood Primary School (Adjacent to)	0.309
264	Wykebeck Valley	2.498
203	Ramshead Drive Open Area	1.295
204	Lime Wood Approach Greenspace	0.357
385	Hansby Bank Green Corridor/Ring Road Seacroft	0.709
252	Brooklands Allotment	0.465
257	Boggart Hill Road - Grassed Area	0.227
256	Boggart Hill Gardens - Open Area	1.764
261	Brooklands Avenue	0.965
227	Ramshead Approach/Training Centre	0.273
226	Ramshead Approach (Open Scrub)	0.367
263	Parkway Grange	0.392
326	Parklands Amenity Space (Seacroft Hall Allotment)	10.932
219	Seacroft Crescent (Former Gala Bingo)	1.246
220	East Dean Drive	0.312
221	Ramshead Approach	3.006
210	Ramshead Drive	2.024
	Total	39.129

7.9.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $39.129 \div 23.749 = 1.64$ hectares

7.9.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Killingbeck & Seacroft ward comfortably exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has a surplus in provision of amenity greenspace.

7.10 **Amenity Greenspace Middleton Park Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1067	Aberfield Drive (rear of)	0.304
1004	Bodmin Crescent	0.434
830	Middleton Park Crescent (rear of)	0.249
793	Sissons Road	0.212
1024	The Clearings POS	0.550
1026	Winrose Drive	0.626
970	South Hill Grove	0.669
914	Middleton Ring Road	2.924

813	Intake Square	0.598
798	Acre Road	0.355
846	St Georges Centre	0.701
996	Belle Isle Road	0.555
799	Middleton Park Green	0.435
	Total	8.612

7.10.1 Quantity (per thousand people) $8.612 \div 26.228 = 0.328$ hectares

7.10.2 Conclusions - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Middleton Park ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has small deficiency provision in terms of the quantity of amenity greenspace.

7.11 Amenity Greenspace Temple Newsam

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
368	Halton Moor Public House (Land to rear of)	1.634
360	Coronation Parade Amenity Space	0.575
275	Cartmell Drive	2.209
289	The Crescent, Selby Road	0.365
365	Selby Road Amenity Space	0.339
1206	New Nemple Gate POS	1.112
1444	Meynell Road	0.378
	Total	6.612

7.11.1 Quantity (per thousand people) $6.612 \div 24.843 = 0.266$ hectares

7.11.2 Conclusions - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Temple Newsam ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has a deficiency in provision in terms of the quantity of amenity greenspace.

7.12 Amenity Greenspace – Overall Conclusions

7.12.1 If the totals for all 11 wards are added together it creates an overall average standard of **0.53 hectares per 1,000 population**. This slightly exceeds the core strategy standard of 0.45 hectares per 1,000 population.

8.0 Quantity Children and Young People's equipped play facilities:

8.1 Methodology

8.1.1 The population figures used for children and young people are an estimate using the 2011 Census figures and the 2007 mid-year estimates. See paragraph 4.3 for a fuller explanation.

8.1.2 The lists below exclude play facilities that are in educational use, since these are only available during the school day and by the children attending that particular school.

8.2 Childrens & Young People's Equipped Play Facilities Armley Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
21	Armley Park
1078	Jaily Fields

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	2
Child Play Area	1
Skate Park	1
Teen Shelter	1
TOTAL	5

8.2.1 **Requirement and provision:** $5.104 \times 2 = 10.2$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Armley Ward is significantly under provided for in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has only **5** facilities, representing 49% of the required amount. There is however a range of facility types.

8.3 *Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Beeston & Holbeck Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
625	Cottingley Road / Drive (Rear of)
579	Cottingley Drive
720	Two Willows Nursery Centre
14	Holbeck Moor - Towers Side
36	Cross Flats Park
74	Middleton Park

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	6
Child Play Area	4
Skate Park	1
Teen Shelter	3
TOTAL	14 FACILITIES

8.3.1 **Requirement and provision** – $5.087 \times 2 = 10$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Beeston & Holbeck Ward has a slight surplus in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **14** facilities, four more than the required amount.

8.4 *Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
335	Torre Grove
437	Nowell Mount
301	St Agnes MUGA
299	Ebors Playing Fields
305	Grantham Tower Play Area
306	Saxton Gardens (Dolphins Greenspace)

304	Bow Street Rec Ground
40	East End Park

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	4
Child Play Area	5
Skate Park	1
Teen Shelter	6
TOTAL	16 Facilities

- 8.4.1 **Requirement and provision** - $5.796 \times 2 = 12$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Ward is well provided for in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **16** facilities, four more than the required amount.

8.5 *Children & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Chapel Allerton Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
115	Chapel Allerton Park
1272	Miles Hill
1281	Scott Hall Pitches
111	Buslingthorpe Recreation Ground
87	Potternewton Park
1596	Reginald Street
1532	Chapel Town Football Youth Development Centre

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	1
Child Play Area	6
Skate Park	1
Teen Shelter	0
TOTAL	8 Facilities

- 8.5.1 **Requirement and provision** – $4.794 \times 2 = 9.59$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Chapel Allerton Ward is under provided for in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has only **8** facilities.

8.6 *Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities City & Hunslet*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
319	Thomas Danby Pitches
16	South Leeds Sports Centre
13	Hunslet Moor
915	Pepper Road Recreation Ground
64	Hunslet Lake
124	Grove Road Recreational Ground

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	6
Child Play Area	4
Skate Park	1

Teen Shelter	0
TOTAL	11 Facilities

- 8.6.1 **Requirement and provision** - $4.492 \times 2 = 9$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore City & Hunslet ward has a slight surplus in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **11** facilities.

8.7 Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Gipton and Harehills Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
266	Wykebeck North (Fearnville Playing Pitches)
354	Gipton Square Play Area
131	Harehills Park
22	Banstead Park
338	Hovingham Play Area

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	4
Child Play Area	5
Skate Park	1
Teen Shelter	0
TOTAL	10 Facilities

- 8.7.1 **Requirement and provision** – $8.405 \times 2 = 17$ **facilities** required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Gipton & Harehills ward has deficiency in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **10** facilities, representing 7 less than the amount required.

8.8 Children & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Headingley Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
216	Headingley Cricket Ground Practice Area

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	3
Child Play Area	0
Skate Park	0
Teen Shelter	0
TOTAL	3 Facilities

- 8.8.1 **Requirement and provision** – $0.777 \times 2 = 1.55$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Headingley Ward has a surplus in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **3** facilities.

8.9 Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Hyde Park and Woodhouse Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
---------	-----------

161	Woodhouse Square
159	Woodhouse Moor Park
1169	Hartley Avenue Park
128	Hanover Square
918	Woodhouse Street Recreation Ground
391	Hyde Park Rec Ground Next to Mosque
392	Queens Road Recreation Ground
172	Little London Play Area
167	Blackman Lane Rec
393	Burley Lodge

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	7
Child Play Area	8
Skate Park	1
Teen Shelter	3
TOTAL	19 Facilities

- 8.9.1 **Requirement and provision** – $2.690 \times 2 = 5$ **facilities** required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Hyde Park & Woodhouse ward has a significant surplus in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **19** facilities, representing 14 more than the amount required.

8.10 *Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Killingbeck & Seacroft*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
269	Seacroft Gardens
250	David Young Playing Fields (East)

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	2
Child Play Area	0
Skate Park	0
Teen Shelter	0
TOTAL	2 Facilities

- 8.10.1 **Requirement and provision** – $5.688 \times 2 = 11$ **facilities** required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Killingbeck & Seacroft ward has significant deficiency in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **11** facilities, representing 9 less than the amount required.

8.11 *Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Middleton Park*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
794	Throstle Recreation Ground
1025	Windmill Road Rec
955	Cranmore Rise
1066	Winrose Crescent

Type of Facility	Number
------------------	--------

MUGA	4
Child Play Area	3
Skate Park	0
Teen Shelter	1
TOTAL	8 Facilities

8.11.1 **Requirement and provision** - $6.387 \times 2 = 13$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Middleton Park Ward is under provided for in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has only **8** facilities.

8.12 *Childrens & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Temple Newsam*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
366	Kyffin Avenue Play Area
360	Coronation Parade Amenity Space
415	East Leeds Leisure Centre - playground adjacent to
97	Temple Newsam Estate

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	1
Child Play Area	4
Skate Park	0
Teen Shelter	2
TOTAL	7 FACILITIES

8.12.1 **Requirement and provision** – $4.625 \times 2 = 9$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Temple Newsam has a deficiency in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **7** facilities.

8.13 **Children and Young People's Equipped Play Facilities – overall conclusions**

8.13.1 If the totals for all 11 wards which feature children and young people's equipped play facilities are added together it creates an overall requirement for 107.69 facilities and an actual provision of 103 facilities. This falls short of the Core Strategy standard however this figure is an average so whilst there is a surplus of provision in City & Hunslet, Headingley and Burmantofts & Richmond Hill wards there is an under provision in other wards.

9.0 **Quantity Allotments:**

9.1 *Allotments Armley Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
825	Armley Ridge Road Allotment Society	1.030
595	Greenthorne Allotments (1)	1.216
815	Stanningley Road Allotments	1.501
1081	St Barts Allotments Wyring Fields	0.488
	Total	4.235

9.1.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $4.235 \div 25.550 = 0.166$ **hectares**

- 9.1.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Armley Ward falls significantly short of the recommended standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of allotments.

9.2 *Allotments Beeston & Holbeck*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
125	Shafton Lane Allotments	1.588
4	Clarkes Field Allotments	3.702
6	Parkside Allotments	1.667
582	Old Lane Allotments	1.798
	Total	8.755

- 9.2.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $8.775 \div 22.187 = 0.39$ hectares

- 9.2.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Beeston & Holbeck Ward exceeds the recommended standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of allotments.

9.3 *Allotments Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
522	Red Road Allotments	1.210
350	Osmondthorpe Allotments	1.492
321	Pontefract Lane Disused Allotments	0.702
	Total	3.404

- 9.3.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $3.404 \div 24.843 = 0.137$ hectares

- 9.3.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Ward has an under provision in the quantity of allotments.

9.4 *Allotments Chapel Allerton Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1589	Bandstand Allotments	1.212
413	Gledhow Valley Allotments	4.292
1173	Meanwood Valley Urban Farm	0.289
	Total	5.793

- 9.4.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** - $5.793 \div 23.536 = 0.25$ hectares

- 9.4.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Chapel Allerton Ward slightly exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of allotments.

9.5 *Allotments City & Hunslet Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1051	Telford Terrace Allotments	0.521

1058	Sandon Mount Allotments (Woodhouse Hill Street)	0.288
7	Lady Pit Lane Allotments & POS	1.914
	Total	2.723

9.51 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $2.723 \div 33.705 = 0.08$ hectares

9.5.2 **Conclusions** -Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, City & Hunslet Ward has a significant under provision in the quantity of allotments.

9.6 *Allotments Gipton and Harehills Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
337	Toll Bar Fields Allotments	0.629
281	Fearnville Allotments (Oakwood Lane Allotment)	2.507
282	Fearnville Road (Overgrown Allotment)	1.312
359	Foundry Place/Drive/Avenue (Allotments Behind) (Gipton South)	1.798
341	Hovingham Allotments	0.525
	Total	6.771

9.6.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $6.771 \div 27.078 = 0.25$ hectares

9.6.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Gipton & Harehills ward fractionally exceeds the Core Strategy requirement for of allotments.

9.7 *Allotments Headingley Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1020	St Anne's Road Allotments	0.556
1021	Ash Road Allotments	4.048
	Total	4.604

9.7.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** - $4.604 \div 20.533 = 0.22$ hectares

9.7.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Headingley Ward falls slightly short of the recommended standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of allotments.

9.8 *Allotments Hyde Park and Woodhouse Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1837	Woodhouse Moor Allotments	2.320
	Total	2.320

9.8.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $2.320 \div 25.914 = 0.089$ hectares

9.8.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Hyde Park & Woodhouse ward falls below the Core Strategy requirement for of allotments.

9.9 Allotments Killingbeck and Seacroft Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
242	St James Allotments	0.228
235	Inglewood Drive (Allotments off)	0.636
	Total	0.864

9.9.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $0.864 \div 23.749 = 0.036$ hectares

9.9.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Killingbeck & Seacroft ward has an undersupply of allotments compared to the recommended standard.

9.7 Allotments Middleton Park Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1032	White House Farm Allotments	1.599
	Total	1.599

9.9.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $1.599 \div 26.228 = 0.06$ hectares

9.9.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Middleton Park Ward has a significant under provision in the quantity of allotments.

9.8 Allotments Temple Newsam

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
248	Byelaw Men's Field Allotments	0.868
1451	School Lane Allotments	0.565
290	Field Terrace (Primrose Lane) Allotments	0.215
	Total	1.648

9.10.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $1.648 \div 21.543 = 0.076$ hectares

9.10.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Temple Newsam ward falls below the recommended standard and so has a deficiency in provision in terms of the quantity of allotments.

9.9 Allotments – overall conclusions

9.10.1 If the totals for all wards are added together it creates an overall average standard of **0.16 hectares per 1,000 population** which falls below the Core Strategy requirement of 0.24ha per 1000 population.

10.0 Quantity Natural Greenspace

10.1 Natural Greenspace Armley Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
505	Dunkirk Hill	1.551
1194	Aston Grove	1.315

478	Kirkstall Valley Nature Reserve Site 1	8.564
479	Kirkstall Valley Nature Reserve Site 2	3.065
1585	Bramley Station (Rear of)	0.740
	TOTAL	15.235

10.1.1 Quantity (per thousand people) $15.235 \div 25.550 = 0.59$ hectares

10.1.2 Conclusions - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Armley Ward falls significantly short of the recommended standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

10.2 Natural Greenspace Beeston & Holbeck

10.2.1 The 2011 PPG17 audit of greenspace across the city showed that there was no natural greenspace in Beeston & Holbeck ward. Therefore there are **0ha** of natural greenspace per 1000 population. This is therefore clearly a failure to meet the Core Strategy standard.

10.3 Natural Greenspace Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
522	Red Road Allotments	1.210
350	Osmondthorpe Allotments	1.492
321	Pontefract Lane Disused Allotments	0.702
	Total	3.404

10.3.1 Quantity (per thousand people) $3.404 \div 24.843 = 0.137$ hectares

10.3.2 Conclusions - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill Ward falls below the recommended standard and so has a deficiency in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

10.4 Natural Greenspace Chapel Allerton Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1545	Scott Hall Drive	2.115
1824	Sugarwell Hill	10.049
408	Chapel Allerton Park Wood	1.150
160	Woodhouse Ridge	0.931
676	Scott Hall Farm	1.594
510	Gledhow Lane Wood	5.086
	Total	20.925

10.4.1 Quantity (per thousand people) – $20.925 \div 23.536 = 0.89$ hectares

10.4.2 Conclusions - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Chapel Allerton Ward exceeds the recommended standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace

10.5 Natural Greenspace City & Hunslet

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
----------------	------------------	----------------

1001	Jack Lane	1.541
999	Haigh Park Road Pond	4.363
	Total	5.904

10.5.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $5.904 \div 33.705 = 0.175$ hectares

10.5.2 **Conclusions** – Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, City & Hunslet Ward falls below the recommended standard and so has a deficiency in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

10.6 *Natural Greenspace Gipton and Harehills Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
375	Wykebeck - York Road to Wykebeck Valley Road	4.909
339	Hovingham Primary Playing Fields (Rear of)	0.362
	Total	5.271

10.6.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $5.271 \div 27.078 = 1.95$ hectares

10.6.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Gipton & Harehills Ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard by some margin and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

10.7 *Natural Greenspace Headingley Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
160	Woodhouse Ridge	10.881
1718	Shire View	1.121
	Total	12.002

10.7.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** – $12.002 \div 20.533 = 0.58$ hectares

10.7.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Headingley Ward falls short of the recommended standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

10.8 *Natural Greenspace Hyde Park and Woodhouse Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
160	Woodhouse Ridge	5.024
	Total	5.024

10.8.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $5.024 \div 25.914 = 1.93$ hectares

10.8.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Hyde Park & Woodhouse Ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard by some margin and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

10.9 Natural Greenspace Killingbeck & Seacroft

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
361	Killingbeck Business Park	0.895
375	Wykebeck - York Road to Wykebeck Valley Road	37.068
225	Ramshead Wood	2.541
202	Lime Pitt Wood	5.961
	Total	46.465

10.9.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $46.465 \div 23.749 = 1.95$ hectares

10.9.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Killingbeck & Seacroft Ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard by some margin and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

10.10 Natural Greenspace Middleton Park Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
561	West Wood	21.976
551	Sissons Wood / Westwood - Dismantled railway next to	6.762
884	Kippow Springs / Throstle Carr Beck	0.258
155	Sissons Wood	5.364
803	Middleton Park Circus (2)	0.363
35	Cranmore Recreation Ground	3.635
843	Sharp Lane (Belle Isle)	12.571
561	West Wood	21.976
	Total	50.929

10.10.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $50.929 \div 26.228 = 1.94$ hectares

10.10.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Middleton Park Ward significantly exceeds the recommended standard and so has surplus in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

11.1 Natural Greenspace Temple Newsam

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
371	Selby Road and Halton Moor Avenue (Junction off)	0.303
346	Wyke Beck (Halton Moor/Osmondthorpe)	24.991
1443	Austhorpe Lane Woodland	2.890
1447	High Bank Approach	0.268
1442	Barrowby Drive	0.407
	Total	28.859

11.1.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $28.859 \div 21.543 = 1.33$ hectares

11.1.2 Conclusions - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Temple Newsam Ward significantly exceeds the recommended standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

11.2 Natural Greenspace – overall conclusions

11.2.1 Across the wards there is an average of 0.71 ha of natural greenspace per 1000 population. This figure is consistent with the Core Strategy standard of 0.7 ha per 1,000 population. It should be noted that this figure is an average of all the wards which fall to a lesser or greater amount within the HMCA. Beeston and Holbeck ward does not have any natural greenspace.

12.0 Overall summary

12.1 The table below summarises the analysis of quantity of provision by greenspace type and Ward.

	Parks and Gardens	Outdoor Sports (excluding education)	Amenity	Children & Young People Equipped Play	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
Armley	Deficiency (-0.145ha)	Deficiency (-0.84ha)	Surplus (0.036ha)	Deficiency (-5.2 facilities)	Deficiency (-0.074ha)	Deficiency (-0.11ha)
Beeston & Holbeck	Surplus (1.34ha)	Deficiency (-0.471ha)	Surplus (0.16ha)	Surplus (12 facilities)	Surplus (0.15ha)	Deficiency (-0.7ha)
Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	Surplus (0.71ha)	Deficiency (-0.32ha)	Surplus (0.265ha)	Surplus of 4 facilities	Deficiency (-0.164ha)	Deficiency (-0.563ha)
Chapel Allerton	Deficiency (-0.15ha)	Deficiency (-0.32ha)	Surplus (0.32ha)	Deficiency (1.5 facilities)	Surplus (0.01ha)	Surplus (0.19ha)
City & Hunslet	Deficiency (-0.518ha)	Deficiency (-0.72ha)	Deficiency (-0.149ha)	Surplus of 2 facilities	Deficiency (-0.16ha)	Deficiency (-0.525ha)
Gipton and Harehills	Deficiency (-0.509ha)	Deficiency (-0.452ha)	Surplus (1.37ha)	Deficiency of 7 facilities	Surplus (0.01ha)	Surplus (1.25ha)
Headingley	Deficiency (-0.9ha)	Deficiency (-1.08ha)	Deficiency (-0.36ha)	Surplus of 1.45 facilities	Deficiency (-0.02ha)	Deficiency (-0.12ha)
Hyde Park and Woodhouse	Surplus (0.105ha)	Deficiency (-0.848ha)	Surplus (0.038ha)	Surplus of 14 facilities	Deficiency (-0.151ha)	Surplus (1.23ha)
Killingbeck & Seacroft	Deficiency (-0.681ha)	Deficiency (-0.467ha)	Surplus (1.19ha)	Deficiency of 9 facilities	Deficiency (-0.204ha)	Surplus (1.25ha)
Middleton Park	Surplus (5.27ha)	Deficiency (-0.22ha)	Deficiency (-0.122ha)	Deficiency of 5 facilities	Deficiency (-0.18ha)	Surplus (1.24ha)
Temple Newsam	Surplus (16.41ha)	Surplus (0.256ha)	Deficiency (-0.184ha)	Deficiency of 2 facilities	Deficiency (-0.076ha)	Surplus (0.63ha)
Average (total figure)	Surplus (1.66ha)	Deficiency (-0.52ha)	Deficiency (-0.08ha)	Deficiency (4 facilities)	Deficiency (-0.08ha)	Requirement met (0.71ha total)

12.2 Armley: Armley ward has deficiencies in all types of greenspace except amenity. There are significant shortages in outdoor sports provision and children's and young people's equipped play facilities.

- 6.2 **Beeston and Holbeck:** Beeston & Holbeck rates well against the standards for most typologies, with surpluses in parks and gardens, amenity space, children and young people equipped play facilities and allotment provision. The ward does however score poorly in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace, with a sum total of 0ha. This shows a serious deficiency, though could be expected of a ward located as close to the city centre as Beeston & Holbeck. The ward has a good surplus of parks and gardens against the benchmark of 1ha per 1000 population set in Policy G3. Some of this may be suitable for laying out as natural greenspace or outdoor sport using the potential methods highlighted above. A comprehensive assessment will be required to determine the most appropriate use of surplus natural greenspace, whether this be for alternative greenspace typologies or potential development which could generate the funds to lay out new areas of greenspace which is currently deficient.
- 6.3 **Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward:** This ward has a mixture of surplus and deficiency across the various typologies. It is deficient in outdoor sports, allotments and natural greenspace, though it has a small surplus of amenity greenspace, children and young people's equipped play facilities and parks and gardens. Some of this surplus amenity greenspace and parks and gardens may be suitable for laying out as outdoor sports facilities, allotment provision or natural greenspace using the potential methods outlined above. A comprehensive assessment will be required to determine the most appropriate use of surplus natural greenspace, whether this be for alternative greenspace typologies or potential development which could generate the funds to lay out new areas of greenspace which is currently deficient.
- 6.4 **Chapel Allerton Ward:** This ward is generally well balanced. It has some slight surplus of amenity greenspace, allotments and natural greenspace but not in any great excess. It has deficiencies in Parks and Gardens, Outdoor Sports and Children's and Young People's Equipped Play.
- 6.5 **City & Hunslet ward:** City & Hunslet ward is deficient in parks & gardens, outdoor sports provision, amenity space, and allotment provision and natural greenspace. The ward fares better in terms of children and young people equipped play facilities provision recording a surplus of 4 facilities. New greenspace could be created in City & Hunslet through either on site contributions or could be delivered by the Council following the payment of commuted sums.
- 6.6 **Gipton and Harehills Ward:** This ward has a high proportion of children and it is not surprising therefore that there is a large deficiency of children's and young people's equipped play facilities. There is some slight excess in allotment provision, amenity and natural greenspace however there are deficiencies in parks and gardens and outdoor sports provision.
- 6.7 **Headingley Ward:** Headingley is the most deficient ward with all typologies except Childrens and Young People's Equipped Play facilities showing a deficiency. There is clearly little scope to address this through changing the type of surplus greenspace to one that is deficient, therefore the situation is reliant on laying out new greenspace. This could be delivered through development though in such a built up area, this would be subject to identifying new sites to lay out as greenspace.

- 6.8 **Hyde park and Woodhouse:** Overall this ward is generally well provided for in terms of greenspace typologies. It has a notable surplus of children's and young people's equipped play facilities.
- 6.9 **Killingbeck & Seacroft:** This ward is very deficient in children's and young people's equipped play facilities, needing a further 9 facilities to meet the core strategy standard.
- 6.10 **Middleton Park:** Middleton Park has deficiencies in outdoor sports provision, amenity space, children and young people equipped play facilities and allotment provision. The ward fares better in terms of park and garden provision and natural open space provision with a healthy surplus of both typologies. Some of this surplus greenspace may be suitable for laying out as outdoor sports, amenity space, children and young people equipped play facilities or allotment provision using the potential methods outlined above. A comprehensive assessment will be required to determine the most appropriate use of surplus natural greenspace, whether this be for alternative greenspace typologies or potential development which could generate the funds to lay out new areas of greenspace which is currently deficient.
- 6.11 **Temple Newsam:** Temple Newsam has a mixture of surplus and deficiency across the various typologies. The ward scores poorly in terms of the quantity of Amenity space, Children & Young People Equipped Play facilities and Allotments, but scores well against the other typologies, especially parks and gardens. The areas where the ward features deficiencies are typical of a ward located as close to the city centre as Temple Newsam. The ward's unusually large surplus of Parks and Gardens is largely attributable to the fact that much of the Temple Newsam estate lies within the ward. Some of this may be suitable for laying out as allotments, Children & Young People's equipped play provision or amenity space. This could be delivered 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.

QUALITY OF GREENSPACE.

7.0 Methodology

- 7.1 Core Strategy Policy G3 identifies the following standards for the quality of greenspace:

Greenspace type	Quality
Parks and Gardens	7
Outdoor sports provision	7
Amenity greenspace	7
Children and young people's equipped play facilities	7
Allotments	7
Natural Greenspace	7

- 7.2 Each type of greenspace should meet a quality score of 7. This score is determined by assessing an area against a number of criteria, such as i) how welcoming; ii) level of health and safety; iii) cleanliness and maintenance; iv) conservation, habitats and heritage.

7.3 Plan 4.5B indicates whether the quality of each area of greenspace in the Inner Area HMCA meets the required standard (a score of 7 and above) or not (a score of 6.9 or below). This only shows those areas of greenspace within the 11 Wards which fall within the Inner Area HMCA boundary. Those areas within those Wards but outside the HMCA boundary are excluded.

7.4 The table below summarises key information about each typology.

	Parks and Gardens	Outdoor Sports	Amenity Greenspace	Children and Young People	Allotments	Natural Greenspace
Number of sites	41	69	115	48	16	19
Number scoring 7 and above	2	11	5	5	2	0
Number scoring below 7	39	58	110	43	14	19
Highest score	7.629	8.45	8.45	8.33	8.16	6.16
Lowest score	2.5	1.9	1.18	1.93	0	0.54
Average score	5.07	5.35	4.88	5.22	4.01	3.90

7.5 **Conclusions:** Overall, the plan and table show quality of all types of greenspace is an issue across the Inner Area HMCA. All types generally fall well below the required score of seven, with only a handful of sites in each type meeting the required standard. In terms of natural greenspace there are no sites at all scoring above seven. This reflects the intensely urban nature of the Inner Area HMCA where there are many competing pressures on limited greenspace.

ACCESSIBILITY OF GREENSPACE

8.1 Core Strategy Policy G3 identifies the following standards for accessibility of greenspace. Each type of greenspace should be within the distance specified.

Greenspace type	Accessibility distance
Parks and Gardens	720m
Outdoor sports provision	Tennis courts – 720m Bowling greens and grass playing pitches – 3.2km Athletics tracks and synthetic pitches – 6.4km
Amenity greenspace	480m
Children and young people's equipped play facilities	720m
Allotments	960m
Natural Greenspace	720m

8.2 Plans which show the required buffers as set out above, for each greenspace type are available. Please contact Leeds City Council directly at ldf@leeds.gov.uk. Some conclusions are drawn out below:

8.2.1 Parks and Gardens

The overwhelming majority of residential properties within the Inner Area has very good accessibility to Parks & Gardens, with the vast majority of the populated areas lying within 720m (a 10 minute walking distance) of parks and gardens.

Only a very small proportion of residential properties fall beyond the 720m (10 minute walking distance) standard.

8.2.2 Outdoor Sports Provision

The whole Inner area is within the required accessibility distance (3.2km) for grass playing pitches, including bowling greens. The northern part of the HMCA is well served by tennis courts and the majority is within the (720m or 10 minute walking distance), with facilities beyond the HMCA boundary in Roundhay also serving the much of the Inner HMCA.

8.2.3 Amenity Greenspace

The Inner HMCA is extremely well served by amenity greenspace, with the majority of most wards able to access some form of amenity greenspace within the 480m buffer.

8.2.4 Children and Young People's Equipped Play Facilities

The Inner Area is almost exclusively within 720m of play facilities, however the northern part of Killingbeck & Seacroft lies fractionally beyond this threshold. Again many facilities which lie beyond the HMCA boundary are within 720m of the Inner Area HMCA boundary and as such they also serve the area.

8.2.5 Allotments

Only the eastern edges of Hyde Park & Woodhouse ward, southern tip of Chapel Allerton ward and western edge of Gipton & Hartehills ward lie beyond the 960m threshold for allotments, with all other areas comfortably meeting the benchmark accessibility figure.

8.2.6 Natural Greenspace

Only the eastern edge of the HMCA lies within the 2ha of natural greenspace within 2km Core Strategy G3 threshold. Parts of the Inner HMCA lie within 720m of natural greenspace, though there are notable differences across the area and many of the wards to the south lie beyond the acceptable accessibility threshold.

- 8.3 Conclusions:** Accessibility to greenspace across the HMCA is generally very good, with most areas lying within the accepted accessibility buffers contained within Policy G3. Accessibility to Natural Greenspace is particularly poor with most of the HMCA lying beyond the acceptable distances set out in Core Strategy Policy G3.

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS FROM THE GREENSPACE ANALYSIS INNER HMCA:

9.1 Quantity

- 9.1.1** The Inner Area HMCA has several deficiencies in terms of quantity across the various greenspace typologies. There is generally a good quantity of park & garden provision and natural greenspace provision, though the HMCA is lacking against core strategy standards in outdoor sports provision, children and young people's equipped play provision and lacking in terms of allotment provision.
- 9.1.2** The most striking deficiency across all of the typologies is in outdoor sports provision. There are very wide discrepancies in provision of children's and young people's equipped play facilities with severe shortages in some wards (Gipton and

Harehills and Killingbeck and Seacroft) and large excesses in other wards (Burmantofts and Richmond Hill and Hyde Park and Woodhouse).

- 9.1.3 All wards suffer deficiencies in different areas but record surpluses in other typologies. In order to rectify some of the deficiencies, the laying out of some of the surplus areas of alternative greenspace types could be one way which would solve the existing deficiencies. Alternatively new areas which aren't greenspace currently 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.

9.2 **Quality**

- 7.6 Across the Inner Area HMCA, the majority of sites (283 out of 308) 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.

9.3 **Accessibility**

- 9.3.1 Accessibility to all types of greenspace is generally good across the Inner Area HMCA. Temple Newsam ward generally features much better access to all types of greenspace (with the exception of natural greenspace), however this is largely attributable to the typologies represented by the Temple Newsam estate.

10.0 **QUESTIONS ABOUT GREENSPACE PROVISION IN INNER.**

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 Inner

- G8. The majority of the existing UDP N6 (playing pitch) designation at Merlyn Rees High School, Belle Isle Road has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 252, see page 12 of Issues and Options). The whole SHLAA site was identified as outdoor sport in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?**
- G9. Part of the existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Land South Of Blenheim Middle School, Cambridge Road has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 370, see page 12 of Issues and Options). It was identified as outdoor sport in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?**
- G10. A small part of the existing UDP N1 greenspace designation and the existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) designation at Boothroyd Drive, Meanwood have been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 1098 see page 13 of Issues and Options). The small part of the N1 designation within the site was no identified in the Open Space Audit and only a small area towards the south east corner of the N5 designation was identified as natural greenspace in the Open Space Audit. Do you agree this land could be developed for housing rather than being left as a possible future greenspace opportunity?**
- G11. Part of the existing UDP N6 (playing pitches) designation at Land to the east of Oakwood Lane, Leeds (Part of St Nicholas church site) has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 1152, see page 14 of Issues and Options). This site and the site to the west were identified as outdoor sport in the Open Space Strategy. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?**
- G12. The existing UDP N1A (allotments) designation at Meanwood Road, Meanwood has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2077, see page 14 of Issues and Options). It was identified as allotments in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?**
- G13. The existing UDP N6 (playing pitches) designation at the Former Matthew Murray High School, Holbeck has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2079 see page 15 of Issues and Options). It was identified as outdoor sport in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?**

- G14.** The existing UDP N1 greenspace designation and the existing UDP N6 (playing pitches) designation at Land to the south of Boggart Hill Gardens have been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2147B, see page 15 of Issues and Options). The N1 site was identified as amenity greenspace in the Open Space Audit whilst the N6 site was identified as outdoor sport. Do you think these site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G15.** The existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Land to the south of Kentmere Approach has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2147D, see page 15 of Issues and Options). It was not identified in the Open Space Audit and therefore is proposed for deletion. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G16.** Part of the existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Ramshead Approach, Seacroft has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2149, see page 16 of Issues and Options). It was identified as amenity greenspace in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G17.** The existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at South Parkway, Seacroft has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2150C, see page 16 of Issues and Options). It was identified as amenity greenspace in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G18.** The existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Cambridge Road has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 3197, see page 17 of Issues and Options). It was identified as amenity greenspace in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G19.** Part of an existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Land to the west of Ring Road (Seacroft) has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 4099, see page 18 of Issues and Options). It was identified as green corridor in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G20.** Part of an existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Land to the north of Lime Pits Wood has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 4100, see page 19 of Issues and Options). It was identified as part amenity and part natural greenspace in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G21.** The existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Ramshead Wood has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 4101, see page 19 of Issues and Options). It was identified as natural and amenity greenspace in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?

- G22.** The existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Land to the west of Ramshead Drive has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 4102, see page 19 of Issues and Options). It was identified as amenity greenspace in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G23.** Part of the existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Land at North Parkway has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 4107, see page 19 of Issues and Options). It was identified as outdoor sport in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G24.** Part of the existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Land to the west of the former East Leeds Family Learning Centre has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 4113, see page 19 of Issues and Options). It was identified as amenity greenspace in the Open Space Audit along with land to the east. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G25.** The majority of the existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Land at Lambrigg Crescent has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 4114, see page 20 of Issues and Options). It was identified as amenity greenspace in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G26.** Part of the existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Land to the east of the Dennis Healey Centre has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 4115, see page 20 of Issues and Options). It was identified as outdoor sport in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G27.** The existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Land adjacent to Inglewood Drive has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 4122, see page 20 of Issues and Options). It and a small further area to the west were identified as amenity greenspace in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G28.** Part of the existing UDP N1 greenspace designation at Winrose Drive, Middleton has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 4125, see page 21 of Issues and Options). It was identified as a local park in the Open Space Audit. 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	2/24	Carr Crofts, Armley	Developed - Armley Leisure Centre
N1	2/9X	Redcote lane, Armley	Difficult to access due to electricity plant, railway and canal
N1	4/2	Colwyn Terrace/Trentham Street, Beeston	Less than the 0.2ha threshold.
N1	7/1	Model Farm/Scott Hall Family Nursery Centre, Scott Hall	Less than the 0.2ha threshold.
N1	7/3	Stainbeck Lane, Meanwood	Less than the 0.2ha threshold.
N1	8/21	Dewsbury Road Roundabout, Beeston	Area surrounded by motorway and slip road, inaccessible.
N1	8/22	Hunsley Moor Roundabout, Hunslet	Area surrounded by motorway and slip road, inaccessible.
N1	15/21	Middleton Road, Middleton	Partially developed for access road and parking. Remaining area less than 0.2ha.
N1	15/22	Middleton Road, Belle Isle	Less than the 0.2ha threshold.
N1	28/3	Kentmere Approach, Seacroft	Cleared housing site which has been top soiled and seeded rather than a greenspace use.
N1	29/6	Woodhouse Moor North, Woodhouse Moor	Less than the 0.2ha threshold.
N1A	15/4X	Moor Road, Hunslet	Developed – employment use
N5 (proposed open space)	13/6X	Meanwood Road Rugby Club, Meanwood Road, Meanwood	Thick tree belt not in a greenspace use.
N6 (playing pitch)	12/7x	Oakwood Primary School, North Farm Road, Oakwood	Developed – Oakwood Primary School
N6 (playing pitch)	16/0	198/200 Spen Lane, West Park	Developed – roofing company with car parking
N6 (playing pitch)	25/9X	YMCA Sports Ground, Tyas Grove, Richmond Hill	Developed for housing.

N6 (playing pitch)	25/10X	Mount St Mary's High School, Willis Street, Richmond Hill	Developed – Mount St Mary's High School
N6 (playing pitch)	29/1X	Primrose High School, off Moorehouse Grove, Burmantofts	Much of area had been used for car parking when the school was open. Remainder of site not capable of providing outdoor sport facilities. School now closed.
N6 (playing pitch)	29/2X	Shakespeare Primary School, Shakespeare Avenue, Burmantofts	Developed – Shakespeare Primary School