

OUTER SOUTH HOUSING MARKET CHARACTERISTIC AREA

ROTHWELL, ARDSLEY AND ROBIN HOOD AND KIPPAX AND METHLEY WARDS

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Outer South 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 Outer South 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. 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.
- 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 6 Wards that fall to a greater or lesser extent within the Outer South Housing Market Characteristic Area (HMCA). The majority of Rothwell Ward falls within the area, with a significant part of Kippax and Methley Ward and a smaller part of Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward. There are also very small elements of Garforth and Swillington, Middleton Park and City and Hunslet Wards in the Outer South area but these minute areas will be considered in the areas where the majority of those Wards fall.
- 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 3 Wards

- 2.1 Total greenspace in Rothwell, Ardsley and Robin Hood and Kippax and Methley wards is **1,046.288ha** on **235** greenspace sites. Excluding green corridors, cemeteries and golf courses the total is **827.916ha** which relates to **198** 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.

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
Rothwell	20,354
Ardsley and Robin Hood	22,204
Kippax and Methley	21,116

- 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
Rothwell	4,035
Ardsley and Robin Hood	4,867
Kippax and Methley	4,393

- 4.4 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)

There are two standards for the provision of natural greenspace set out in Policy G3, 0.7ha per 1000 population for the main urban area and major settlements and 2ha per 1000 population for other areas. Rothwell is identified as a major settlement in the Core Strategy, therefore natural greenspace provision in the Outer South HMCA has been considered against the 0.7ha standard rather than the 2ha standard

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 three wards in the Outer South HMCA.

Parks and Gardens:

5.2 *Parks and Gardens Rothwell Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
66	John O'Gaunts Recreation Ground	3.699
1009	Fleet Lane Rec	8.189
881	Woodlane Recreation Ground	3.717
817	Carlton Recreation Ground	1.052
92	Springhead Park	22.195
1115	Woodlesford Park	3.913
1099	Wordsworth Drive POS	1.098
	TOTAL	43.863

- 5.2.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $43.863 \div 20.354 = 2.15$ hectares

- 5.2.2 **Conclusions:** Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Rothwell ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard by more than double and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.3 *Parks and Gardens Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1423	Moor Knoll Recreation Ground	0.637
829	Heritage Village POS	0.721
669	Lofthouse Recreation Ground	0.324
39	East Ardsley Recreation Ground	3.563
651	Station Lane Recreation Ground	5.552

400	Smithy Lane Recreation Ground	2.086
656	Main Street - Football Ground	1.041
879	Hopefield POS (2)	0.605
883	Sharp Lane Recreation Ground	1.237
778	Goldsmith Drive	0.393
821	Ouzelwell Green POS	0.430
	TOTAL	16.589

5.3.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $16.589 \div 22.204 = 0.75$ hectares

5.3.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1 hectare per 1000 population, Ardsley and Robin Hood ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of Parks and Gardens.

5.4 ***Parks and Gardens Kippax and Methley Ward***

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1276	Allerton Bywater Playground	0.358
1247	Kippax Sports Centre	1.512
20	Allerton Bywater Sport Ground	5.455
151	Saville Road Recreation Ground	1.375
1234	Kippax Common	5.111
1392	Vandicourt Recreation Ground	0.501
	TOTAL	14.312

5.4.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $14.312 \div 21.116 = 0.68$ hectares

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

5.5 **Parks and Gardens - Overall Conclusions**

5.5.1 If the totals for all 3 wards are added together it creates an overall average standard of **1.12 hectares per 1,000 population**. This is slightly over the Core Strategy standard however this figure is an average so whilst there is considerable provision in Rothwell Ward there is a significant under provision in Ardsley and Robin Hood and Kippax and Methley Wards.

Outdoor Sports Provision

5.6 **Methodology**

5.6.1 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.

5.6.2 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

5.7 **Outdoor Sports Provision Rothwell Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
1113	Royds Lane - Rothwell sports Club
1131	West Riding County Football Association
1222	Rothwell Bowling Club
1101	Hugh Calverley Playing Fields
818	Carlton Cricket Club
819	Carlton AFC
1100	Rothwell Sports Centre
1884	Sherwood Way, Playing Pitch
	TOTAL

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

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	9	10.8
Junior Pitches	1	0.5
Cricket Pitches	3	4.11
Tennis Courts	0	0
Bowling Green	1	0.14
Synthetic Pitches	0	0
Total		15.55

5.7.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $15.55 \div 20.354 = 0.76$ hectares

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

5.8 **Outdoor Sports Provision Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
631	Tingley Athletic
671	Long Thorpe Lane Playing Field
39	East Ardsley Recreation Ground
636	East Ardsley Cricket Club
637	Kirkham Cricket Club
651	Station Lane Recreation Ground
406	Spinkwell Lane Rec Ground
864	Middleton Lane Football Ground (Robin Hood Athleti
865	Northfield Avenue Recreation Ground
668	Westgate Lane Recreation Ground
656	Main Street - Football Ground
883	Sharp Lane Recreation Ground
1841	Forest Ridge Play Area, West Ardsley

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

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	11	13.2
Junior Pitches	3	1.5
Cricket Pitches	1	1.37
Tennis Courts	0	0
Bowling Green	1	0.14
Synthetic Pitches	0	0
Total		16.21

5.8.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $16.21 \div 22.204 = 0.73$ hectares

5.8.3 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

5.9 **Outdoor Sports Provision Kippax and Methley Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME
1276	Allerton Bywater Playground
1385	Ninevah Playing Fields
1350	Allerton Bywater Youth and Adult Centre
20	Allerton Bywater Sport Ground
1188	Methley Warriors Rugby Ground
1202	Methley Cricket Ground
151	Saville Road Recreation Ground
1211	Ledsham Cricket Ground
1213	Micklefield Miners Welfare Rec Ground
1234	Kippax Common
1244	Kippax Welfare Rugby Club
68	Kippax Meadows

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

Type	No.	Area (ha)
Adult Pitches	10	12
Junior Pitches	8	4
Cricket Pitches	5	6.85
Tennis Courts	4	0.3
Bowling Green	6	0.84
Synthetic Pitches	0	0
Total		23.99

5.9.2 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $23.99 \div 21.116 = 1.14$ hectares

5.9.3 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 1.2 hectares per 1000 population, Kippax and Methley Ward falls slightly short of the recommended Core

Strategy standard and so is deficient in terms of the quantity of outdoor sports provision.

5.10 Outdoor Sports Provision – Overall Conclusions

- 5.10.1 All 3 wards are deficient in outdoor sports provision to differing degrees. If the totals for all wards are added together it creates an overall average standard of **0.88 hectares per 1,000 population**.

Amenity Greenspace

5.11 *Amenity Greenspace Rothwell Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1134	Juniper Avenue POS	0.812
872	Carlton Green	0.327
1541	All Saints POS	0.238
	TOTAL	1.377

- 5.11.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $1.377 \div 20.354 = 0.068$ hectares

- 5.11.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Rothwell ward falls excessively short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in the quantity of amenity greenspace.

5.12 *Amenity Greenspace Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
630	The Crescent	0.458
632	Old Library and Hall on Eastleigh Drive	1.202
633	Leigh Road (rear of)	0.248
877	Heritage Village POS (2)	1.730
664	Ramsgate Recreation Ground	0.287
668	Westgate Lane Recreation Ground	0.990
658	Fall Lane	0.298
652	Mill Lane POS	0.543
653	Gordon Street/Brought Street POS	0.274
654	Main Street- Derelict land at the rear of	0.965
665	Meadowgate Croft (2)	0.424
646	Dolphin Beck (1) - Adjacent to	3.224
647	Dolphin Beck (2) - Adjacent to	0.602
876	Robin Hood POS	0.644
	TOTAL	11.889

- 5.12.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $11.889 \div 22.204 = 0.54$ hectares

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

5.13 *Amenity Greenspace Kippax and Methley Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1346	The Staithes	0.905
1348	Millennium Village Flood Area	0.774
1186	Barnsdale Road POS	0.601
1204	Wood Row Rec Ground	0.498
1343	The Staithes	0.803
1176	Hazel House Rec	0.258
1239	Billys Field	0.817
1311	The Square	0.420
TOTAL		5.076

5.13.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $5.076 \div 21.116 = 0.24$ hectares

5.13.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.45 hectares per 1000 population, Kippax and Methley ward falls short of the recommended Core Strategy standard and so is deficient in the quantity of amenity greenspace.

5.14 **Amenity Greenspace – Overall Conclusions**

5.14.1 If the totals for all 3 wards are added together it creates an overall average standard of **0.28 hectares per 1,000 population**. This is less than the Core Strategy standard however this figure is an average so whilst there is sufficient provision in Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward there is a significant under provision in Rothwell Ward and a smaller deficiency in Kippax and Methley Ward.

Children and Young People's equipped play facilities:

5.15 **Methodology**

5.15.1 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.

5.15.2 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.

5.16 **Children & Young People's Equipped Play Facilities Rothwell Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
66	John O'Gaunts Recreation Ground	3.699
875	Bains Terrace POS	0.109
817	Carlton Recreation Ground	1.052
92	Springhead Park	22.195
1115	Woodlesford Park	3.913
	TOTAL	30.968

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	1
Child Play Area	5
Skate Park	2
Teen Shelter	3

TOTAL	11
--------------	-----------

- 5.16.1 **Requirement and provision** – $4.035 \times 2 = 8$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Rothwell Ward is well provided for in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **11** facilities.

5.17 ***Children & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward***

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1423	Moor Knoll Recreation Ground	0.637
829	Heritage Village POS	0.721
669	Lofthouse Recreation Ground	0.324
1083	Nottingham Close POS	0.282
1841	Forest Ridge Play Area, West Ardsley	0.357
778	Goldsmith Drive	0.393
821	Ouzelwell Green POS	0.430
1883	Land opposite Railway Terrace	0.254
	TOTAL	3.398

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

- 5.17.1 **Requirement and provision** – $4.867 \times 2 = 9.7$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward is slightly deficient in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **8** facilities.

5.18 ***Children & Young Peoples Equipped Play Facilities Kippax and Methley Ward***

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1276	Allerton Bywater Playground	0.358
1350	Allerton Bywater Youth and Adult Centre	0.366
20	Allerton Bywater Sport Ground	5.455
1186	Barnsdale Road POS	0.601
1181	Coney Moor Rec ground	0.278
151	Saville Road Recreation Ground	1.375
1185	Longbow Avenue Playgroup	0.476
1309	Roman Road Recreation Ground	0.577
1788	Woodside Playground	0.341
1392	Vandicourt Recreation Ground	0.501
1789	Millennium Village Playground	0.523
1244	Kippax Welfare Rugby Club	4.573
	TOTAL	15.424

Type of Facility	Number
MUGA	3

Child Play Area	13
Skate Park	1
Teen Shelter	1
TOTAL	18

5.18.1 **Requirement and provision** - $4.393 \times 2 = 8.8$ **facilities** are required to meet the Core Strategy standard of 2 facilities per 1,000 children. Therefore Kippax and Methley Ward is very well provided for in terms of Children and Young People's Equipped Play provision as it has **18** facilities.

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

5.19.1 If the totals for all 3 wards are added together it creates an overall requirement for 26.5 facilities and an actual provision of 37 facilities. This exceeds the Core Strategy standard however this figure is an average so whilst there is a surplus of provision in Rothwell and Kippax and Methley Wards, there is an under provision in Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward.

Allotments:

5.20 Allotments Rothwell Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1008	Holmsley Field Lane Allotments	0.460
1112	Springfield Allotments	0.670
916	Wood Lane - Reservoir Allotments	0.494
873	Unicorn Allotments	0.852
874	Spring Well Cottages Allotments	0.395
1118	Windmill Allotments	0.633
1117	Carlton Lane Allotments	0.325
1116	Haigh Road Allotments	0.857
903	Victoria Pit Allotments	1.431
	TOTAL	6.117

5.20.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $6.117 \div 20.354 = 0.3$ **hectares**

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

5.21 Allotments Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
627	Ardsley Common Farm	1.628
628	Common Lane Allotments	1.007
635	Parker Street	0.647
403	Western Road Allotments	0.449
867	Copley Lane Allotments	1.216
868	Copley Lane Grazing Field	0.798
1265	Daisyvale Terrace	0.315
667	Westgate Lane Allotments (Lofthouse Recreation Allotment)	0.320

659	Cave Lane Allotments	1.234
660	Bright Street (Behind)	0.843
650	Dolphine Lane Allotments	0.430
657	Station Lane Allotments	0.314
1542	Common Lane Allotments (South)	0.477
399	Ardsley Mill Allotments	0.219
	TOTAL	9.897

5.21.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $9.897 \div 22.204 = 0.44$ hectares

5.21.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward exceeds the recommended standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of allotments.

5.22 *Allotments Kippax and Methley Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1242	Carters Field Allotments	1.348
1248	Kippax Allotments	1.413
1347	Parklane Allotments	2.159
1701	Pondfields Drive Allotments	0.951
1315	Millennium Village allotments	1.176
1366	Crescent Allotments	0.786
1831	Summer Hill Allotments Methley	0.961
1203	Wood Row Allotments	0.773
1702	Pondfields Drive (East View) Allotments	0.927
1389	Station Allotments	2.237
1520	Butt Hill Allotments	0.873
1243	Gibson Lane allotments	2.782
	TOTAL	16.386

5.22.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $16.386 \div 21.116 = 0.77$ hectares

5.22.2 **Conclusions** -Compared against the standard of 0.24 hectares per 1000 population, Kippax and Methley Ward exceeds the recommended standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of allotments.

5.23 **Allotments – overall conclusions**

5.23.1 If the totals for all 3 wards are added together it creates an overall average standard of **0.5 hectares per 1,000 population** which comfortably exceeds the Core Strategy standard. Indeed, all Wards have a surplus of provision in allotments.

Natural Greenspace

5.24 *Natural Greenspace Rothwell Ward*

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1010	Fleet Bridge Wood	4.382
1123	Fleet Wood	3.997
822	Lee Moor Beck Woods	3.662

1130	Winter Woods /Clumpcliffe Wood	4.162
1132	Almhouse Wood - Rear Methley Lane	13.625
1135	Fleet Lane Woods	23.371
1224	Woodlesford Station	2.891
1223	Bullough Lane Dismantled Railway	1.521
1102	Moss Carr Woods	21.918
878	Rothwell Pastures (4) The Pastures	14.534
1120	Pit Head Wood	14.225
870	Rothwell Pastures Part 2	0.554
148	Rothwell Country Park	52.943
820	Ouzlewell Green (New Woodland - BTCV - Forestry)	2.962
1164	Holy Trinity Church, Church Street	1.698
1121	Eshald Wood	6.573
1119	Water Haigh	7.164
880	Manor Crescent	1.060
1098	Sugar Hill	8.691
1128	Rookely Woods - (Part of the Methley Estate)	11.087
	TOTAL	201.020

5.24.1 Quantity (per thousand people) $201.020 \div 20.354 = 9.88$ hectares

5.24.2 Conclusions - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Rothwell Ward exceeds the recommended Core Strategy standard by a huge margin and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

5.25 Natural Greenspace Ardsley and Robin Hood

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
832	Haigh Wood	1.651
780	Moorknoll Drive (Rear of)	0.864
648	Moor Lane Plantation	10.893
547	Wide Lane - (Opposite)	2.018
884	Kippow Springs / Throstle Carr Beck	13.785
662	Thorpe Wood	14.153
869	Rothwell Pastures Part 1	4.638
649	Simpson Street	11.957
661	Fall Lane Nurseries	0.254
655	Main Street (Site of old pub)	0.377
593	Dunningley Hill Plantation	4.460
645	Dolphin Beck Marsh	5.615
880	Manor Crescent	3.029
882	Sharp Lane/ Lower Thorp Lane	2.646
885	Rothwell Pastures	0.760
394	East Ardsley Reservoir	32.364
395	Haigh Hall Spring Wood Part 1	2.152
396	Haigh Hall Spring Wood Part 2	1.991
397	Haigh Hall Spring Wood Part 3	1.076
1890	Healy Croft, Tingley	0.707
	TOTAL	115.390

5.25.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $115.390 \div 22.204 = 5.2$ hectares

5.25.2 **Conclusions** - Compared against the standard of 0.7 hectares per 1000 population, Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward significantly exceeds the recommended standard and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of natural greenspace.

5.26 **Natural Greenspace Kippax and Methely Ward**

SITE_ID	SITE_NAME	AREA_HA
1351	Station Road	0.619
1378	Lower North (Lake)	5.631
101	Town Close Hills	25.167
72	Letchmire Pastures	11.275
1237	Berryleighs Wood	0.467
1236	Shuttocks Wood	0.580
1209	Sheldon Hill Wood	4.741
1210	Back Newton Lane Wood	2.037
114	Castlehill Woods	23.129
1215	Owl Wood	4.330
1214	Pit Plantation	3.536
1205	Mickletown Ings SSSI	34.095
1249	Bula Close/Sandgate Drive	7.962
1257	Roach Lane Hills	4.709
1307	Ledston Luck	17.612
1308	Ling Close Wood	4.040
1309	Roman Road Recreation Ground	0.577
42	Fairburn Ings Nature Reserve	102.125
1255	Allerton Bywater Primary School (adj to)	0.317
68	Kippax Meadows	9.320
1386	Ninevah Playing Fields (Rear of)	25.985
	TOTAL	288.254

5.26.1 **Quantity (per thousand people)** $288.254 \div 21.116 = 13.65$ hectares

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

5.27 **Natural Greenspace – overall conclusions**

5.27.1 All 3 wards have a significant surplus of natural greenspace provision, however many of the larger sites lie outside the Outer South HMCA. All the areas of 10ha or over in Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward lie outside the HMCA. Kippax and Methley Ward has a particularly large amount of natural greenspace, though 102.125ha of this is Fairburn Ings Nature Reserve which again lies outside the Outer South HMCA. Mickletown Ings SSSI is the only area of natural greenspace of 10ha or over which lies within the HMCA. All of Rothwell's larger sites lie within the Outer South HMCA.

6.0 **Overall summary**

6.1 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
Rothwell	Surplus (1.15ha)	Deficiency (-0.44ha)	Deficiency (-0.382ha)	Surplus of 3 facilities	Surplus (0.06ha)	Surplus (9.18ha)
Ardsley and Robin Hood	Deficiency (-0.25ha)	Deficiency (-0.47ha)	Surplus (0.09ha)	Deficiency of 1.7 facilities	Surplus (0.2ha)	Surplus (4.5ha)
Kippax & Methley	Deficiency (-0.32ha)	Deficiency (-0.06ha)	Deficiency (-0.21ha)	Surplus of 9.2 facilities	Surplus (0.77ha)	Surplus (13.65)
Average	Surplus (0.12ha)	Deficiency (-0.32ha)	Deficiency (-0.17ha)	Surplus of 10.5 facilities	Surplus (0.26ha)	Surplus (8.88ha)

6.2 **Rothwell:** There is a mixture of surpluses and deficiencies across the various greenspace typologies in the area, and a large variation in the amount of surplus/deficient land per type. There is a sizeable surplus of natural greenspace and a smaller surplus of equipped play facilities and allotments which lie within the Outer South HMCA. There may be scope for addressing the deficiencies in outdoor sport and amenity by i) laying out some of the surplus areas of parks and gardens, allotments or natural as parks and gardens or outdoor sport; or ii) laying out new areas which aren't greenspace currently, as and when the opportunity and funding arise. 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.

6.3 **Ardsley and Robin Hood:** Again there is a mixture of surpluses and deficiencies across the various greenspace typologies and a considerable variation in the amount of surplus/deficient land per type. Again there is a noticeable surplus of natural greenspace. Some of this may be suitable for laying out as parks and gardens, outdoor sport or equipped play facilities 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.

6.4 **Kippax and Methley:** This ward is deficient in parks and gardens, outdoor sports and amenity though it has a large surplus of play facilities and natural greenspace, due in part to large sites such as Fairburn Ings Nature Reserve (102.125ha), Mickletown Ings SSS (34.095ha) and Castlehill Woods (23.129ha). All of these except Mickletown Ings lie beyond the Outer South HMCA. Some of this surplus greenspace may be suitable for laying out as parks and gardens, outdoor sports or amenity 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.

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 3 indicates whether the quality of each area of greenspace in the Outer South 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 Rothwell, Ardsley and Robin Hood and Kippax and Methley Wards which fall within the Outer South 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	Children & young People	Allotments	Natural
Number of sites	11	21	9	12	14	25
Number scoring 7 & above	2	9	2	4	1	3
Number scoring below 7	9	11	7	8	13	22
Highest score	7.61	9.	8.38	7.75	7.16	7.23
Lowest score	3.92	1.93	4.16	1.93	2.66	1.93
Average score	5.94	6.29	5.78	6.09	5.37	5.29

- 7.5 **Conclusions:** Overall, the plan and table show a predominance of sites (70 out of 92) which fall below the required quality standard of 7, which indicates an issue of substandard greenspace provision in the Outer South HMCA across all typologies. The lack of good quality allotment and natural greenspace sites is particularly noticeable, even though there is a surplus of allotment and natural greenspace provision across all the Wards.

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**

Apart from a number of properties in Methley and Lower Mickletown, almost all residential properties in the main built up area in Outer South HMCA have access to Parks and Gardens within 720m (a 10 minute walking distance). The more open areas between the main built up settlements are not within 720m of a park and garden.

8.2.2 **Outdoor Sports Provision**

The whole HMCA area is within the required accessibility distance (3.2km) for grass playing pitches, including bowling greens. There are no synthetic pitches. The majority of the HMCA is beyond the required distance for access to tennis courts (720m or 10 minute walking distance). Nevertheless, a significant proportion of the built up area of Rothwell, Woodlesford and Oulton is within 720m of a tennis court.

8.2.3 **Amenity Greenspace**

The Outer South HMCA has relatively few areas of amenity greenspace. This means there are large areas (built up and more open) which aren't within 480m of an area of amenity greenspace. Indeed, most of Rothwell and Oulton are beyond the acceptable accessibility distances.

8.2.4 **Children and Young People's Equipped Play Facilities**

Most of the built up area is within 720m of play facilities, except the western extent of Rothwell therefore there is acceptable access to these facilities. The open areas between Oulton and Methley fall beyond the 720m threshold.

8.2.5 **Allotments**

The vast majority of the main built up area has acceptable access to allotments (960m or 15 minute walking distance). The exceptions are a small area to the south of Rothwell Country Park and parts of Lower Mickletown. The open area between Oulton and Methley also is also beyond 720m from allotments.

8.2.6 **Natural Greenspace**

The majority of the properties in the Outer South HMCA have access to natural greenspace within 720m (a 10 minute walking distance). The majority of the areas which lie outside the 720m buffer have little development, except part of the built

up area of Methley and the far western extent of Rothwell. The vast majority of the HMCA lies within 2km of larger areas of natural greenspace (20ha or more).

- 8.3 **Conclusions:** Most of the built up area within the HMCA has acceptable access to the various types of greenspace, except tennis courts and amenity greenspace. There is a significant shortage of amenity greenspace across the Outer South HMCA and therefore there is poor access for the residents in this area. The least well served areas are parts of Methley and Lower Mickletown which are beyond the accessibility thresholds for parks and gardens, allotments, natural greenspace, amenity greenspace and tennis courts. The western edge of Rothwell is beyond the accessibility thresholds for play facilities, amenity greenspace and tennis courts. There is a need to improve provision in these deficient areas so all areas have a good level of accessibility to all types of greenspace.

9.0 **OVERALL CONCLUSIONS FROM THE GREENSPACE ANALYSIS IN OUTER SOUTH:**

9.1 **Quantity**

- 9.1.1 Overall Outer South HMCA is well provided for in terms of certain types of greenspace, though deficient in others. All 3 Wards have surplus allotments and a significant over provision of natural greenspace against the standards. However it must be noted that much of the natural greenspace which results in this sizeable surplus actually lies beyond the Outer South HMCA boundary.
- 9.1.2 There is a universal shortage of outdoor sports provision across all 3 Wards with a mixture of surpluses and deficiencies across the Wards in parks and gardens, amenity and equipped play facilities. Rothwell is deficient in outdoor sport and amenity whilst Ardsley and Robin Hood is deficient in parks and gardens, outdoor sports and equipped play facilities. Kippax and Methley is deficient in parks and gardens, outdoor sports and amenity. It should be noted that outdoor sport excludes a significant number of sport facilities within education facilities as they have been universally regarded as for the use of the school only and private. In some cases communities will have access to school pitches and facilities therefore these deficiencies may not exist.
- 9.1.3 There is a need to provide certain specific types of greenspace across all 3 wards. This could be achieved by laying out some of the surplus areas of alternative greenspace types e.g. lay out some of the surplus natural greenspace in Kippax and Methley to parks and gardens, outdoor sport or allotments which are deficient. 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**

- 9.2.1 Across the Outer South HMCA, the majority of sites (70 out of 92) are below the required quality standard of 7, which indicates an issue of substandard greenspace

provision across all typologies in the area. The quality of allotments and natural greenspace areas is particularly poor.

9.3 Accessibility

- 9.3.1 Most of the built up area has acceptable access to all types of greenspace except tennis courts and amenity greenspace. Some areas of Methley, Lower Mickletown and western Rothwell are beyond the accessibility standards for certain greenspace types. Provision should be improved in these deficient areas.

10.0 QUESTIONS FOR ISSUES AND OPTIONS

QUESTIONS ABOUT GREENSPACE PROVISION IN OUTER SOUTH

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 Outer South

- G8 Part of the existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) allocation at Land to the rear of 26 – 32 Wood Lane, Rothwell has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 1355, see page 10 Issues & Options). The site was identified as natural greenspace in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this land should be retained as an opportunity for possible future greenspace or could it be released for housing?**

- G9** Part of the existing UDP N1A (allotments) allocation at the Copley Lane Allotments, Robin Hood and the open space to the east identified as allotments in the Open Space Audit, have been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2103, see page 11 of Issues and Options). Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G10** Land at Eshald Lane, Woodlesford which is adjacent to a existing UDP N1 designation and has been identified as natural greenspace in the Open Space Audit, has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 3093, see page 12 of Issues and Options). Do you think this land should be retained in a greenspace use and formally designated as such or be developed for housing?
- G11** The existing UDP N1A (allotments) designation at Victoria Road, Rothwell has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 3318, see page 12 of Issues and Options). It was identified as in an allotment use in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?
- G12** The existing UDP N1A (allotment) designation at Back Haigh Avenue, Rothwell has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 3444, see page 12 of Issues and Options). The site was identified as allotments in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?

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 greenspace	26/16	Wood Lane, Robin Hood	Less than the 0.2ha threshold.