

LEEDS SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN

ISSUES AND OPTIONS FOR THE PLAN

DRAFT April 2013

VOLUME 2: SITE PROPOSALS FOR EACH HOUSING MARKET CHARACTERISTIC AREA 3. EAST

VOLUME 2: SITE PROPOSALS FOR EACH HOUSING MARKET CHARACTERISTIC AREA 3. EAST:

CONTENTS:	PAGE:
3.1.0 INTRODUCTION	3
3.2.0 RETAIL ISSUES AND OPTIONS:	3 - 5
3.3.0 HOUSING ISSUES AND OPTIONS:	6 - 14
3.4.0 EMPLOYMENT ISSUES AND OPTIONS:	15 - 18
3.5.0 GREENSPACE ISSUES AND OPTIONS:	19 - 23

PLANS:

RETAIL: EAST

PLAN 3.2A Cross Gates Town Centre

PLAN 3.2B Halton Town Centre

PLAN 3.2C Plan showing all centres and 'call for sites' submissions

HOUSING: EAST

PLAN 3.3 Housing

EMPLOYMENT: EAST

PLAN 3.4 Employment

GREENSPACE: EAST

PLAN 3.5A UDP Greenspace allocations and open space audit sites

PLAN 3.5B Types of Greenspace

3.1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 3.1.1 Volume 1 of the Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options sets out the approach and an overview for each topic which will be included in the final Site Allocations Plan. The plan will cover Retail, Housing, Employment and Greenspace allocations. Please see Volume 1 in conjunction with the area proposals for a full understanding of the context and work involved in producing the Issues and Options for the plan.
- 3.1.2 Plans for initial proposals for retail, housing, employment and green space are at the end of this document. View the plans on line at www.leeds.gov.uk/ldf. Please note that if you view this document on line, you can access the full site assessments for housing and employment sites. If you do not have access to a computer, you can use computers at libraries. The Council can make further details available on request, but printing costs may be incurred. It is not practical to put all site details in an appendix due to the volume of sites and information involved.
- 3.1.3 The East Leeds area is characterised by an area which covers the eastern parts of the Main Urban Area of Leeds (including the communities of Cross Gates, Austhorpe and Colton), together with Temple Newsam Park and the major employment area of Cross Green. Major transport infrastructure falls within the area, including the M1, together with major rail links. Within the area, the Wyke Beck Valley also forms an important part of the wider network of Green Infrastructure.

EAST

3.2.0 EAST RETAIL ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

- 3.2.1 Both Cross Gates and Halton are identified as town centres, offering a wide range of goods and services. Cross Gates is the larger of the town centres, although recent developments at Halton have improved the retail offer. No new centres are proposed in this area. There are two centres within the East area:
- Cross Gates Town Centre (see Plan 3.2A)
 - Halton Town Centre (see Plan 3.2B)
- 3.2.2 For each centre a review of the centre boundary and survey of current uses has been undertaken. This has involved redefining the boundaries of town centres to accommodate retail development within centres. The council is not allocating sites for retail in these centres but making boundary changes may provide scope to accommodate additional retailing. The survey of uses has been used to determine the primary shopping area and frontages (primary and secondary). It is proposed to expand the Cross Gates boundary to include existing retail uses on the fringe of the centre and a small opportunity site on the ring road, near the rail station. The Halton boundary has been expanded slightly to reflect recent developments and further opportunities in the centre.
- 3.2.3 Volume 1 page 16 defines these as:
- Primary Shopping Areas (PSA)**
This is the area where retail development and activity is concentrated.

Frontages

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

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

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

3.2.4 Call for sites

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

There were six sites submitted within the East area:

Site Name	REF	Ward	Nearest Centre	Distance to Edge of Centre buffer (m) ¹	Sequential Location	Comment
Land Parcel 9786, Knowsthorpe Lane, Leeds	CFSM026	Garforth & Swillington	Halton	1,941	Outside Centre & 300m Buffer	Mixed use submission for employment, housing and retail. Will be assessed through Aire Valley AAP.
Land At Junction Coal Road/Ring Road, Seacroft, Leeds	CFSM025	Cross Gates & Whinmoor	Seacroft	183	Outside Centre & 300m Buffer	Mixed use submission for employment and retail. Limited demand for additional floor space in this area to 2026. Currently a small oversupply. Sequentially inappropriate.
Pontefract Lane / Newmarket Approach, Leeds	CFSM048	Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	Hunslet	1,139	Outside Centre & 300m Buffer	Mixed use submission for employment and retail. Will be assessed through Aire Valley AAP.
Sites at Cross Green/Knowsthorpe Way/Cross Green Way/Cross Green Approach/Knowsthorpe Road LS9	CFSM045	Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	Hunslet	519	Outside Centre & 300m Buffer	Mixed use submission for employment and retail. Multiple sites. Will be assessed through Aire Valley AAP.
Skelton Gate, Leeds	CFSM037	Garforth & Swillington	Rothwell	1,645	Outside Centre & 300m Buffer	Mixed use submission for employment, housing and retail. Will be assessed through Aire Valley AAP. Small area of site in

¹ The buffer is 300m from the identified edge of centre. Sites with 0 metres, are within the centre or within the buffer. The figure is the distance from the buffer. To calculate the distance from the closest identified centre, add 300 metres.

Site Name	REF	Ward	Nearest Centre	Distance to Edge of Centre buffer (m) ¹	Sequential Location	Comment
						the Green Belt falls within the Site Allocations plan area.
Land At Haigh Park Road, Stourton, LS10 1RT	CFSM002	City & Hunslet	Hunslet	1,161	Outside Centre & 300m Buffer	Mixed use submission for employment, housing and retail. Will be assessed through Aire Valley AAP.

See plan 3.2C showing the location of the 'call for sites' submissions in the table above.

QUESTIONS ON RETAIL ISSUES AND OPTIONS

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

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

Use plans to support your comments where possible.

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

Use plans to support your comments where possible.

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

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

3.3.0 EAST HOUSING ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

3.3.1 See Volume 1, pages 18 - 22 for a full explanation of the approach to considering which sites should be allocated for housing. See plan 3.3 Housing showing the sites referred to in this section.

3.3.2 **Total housing target for East** (set out in the Core Strategy) = 11,400 units (17% of District wide total)

Total number of dwellings/capacity we are seeking:

The target of 11,400 residential units does not mean that land for 11,400 new units has to be allocated for housing. From the overall total, existing allocations (previous UDP housing allocations not developed) and planning permissions with units still remaining to be built as at 31.3.12 will be deducted. These sites are listed in table 3.3.1 below and will count towards the overall target. They are shown in lime green on plan 3.3 Housing.

Table 3.3.1.

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

SHLA A Ref	HLA Ref	Address	Capacity	Complete	Under construction	Not started
Allocations - not yet developed						
795	3200110	Red Hall Lane LS17 and adjacent part of 797 (500 total for this plus SHLAA site 2062)	400	0	0	400
796	3200120	Grimes Dyke York Road LS14	364	0	0	364
797	3200330	East Leeds Extension* - northern half	1325*	0	0	1325*
797		East Leeds Extension – Southern half	3000	0	0	3000
844	3401770	Seacroft Hospital LS14	530	0	0	530
Sites 0.4ha+ with planning permission						
2144	2104850	Land At Cartmell Drive, Halton, Leeds*	31*	0	0	31*
799	3200363	Whinmoor Way (PFI C) LS14	213	98	36	79
802	3200368	Swarcliffe Avenue (PFI E) LS14	27	0	2	25
803	3200371	Elmete Towers (PFI Q) LS14	65	35	0	30
804	3200373	Mill Green Garth (PFI L1) LS14	60	55	2	3
353	3203450	Barrowby Lane LS15	11	0	0	11
281	3203470	Manston Lane (Vickers) LS15	151	0	1	150
Sites 0.2ha to 0.4ha with planning permission						
0	2104360	Pepper Road LS10	2	0	0	2
3182	2104800	Rocheford Court, Pepper Lane, Hunslet*	23*	0	0	23*
3219	3200364	Ash Tree Grove (PFI F) LS14	14	0	5	9
3227	3203440	Naburn Approach LS14	12	8	4	0
East Leeds TOTAL			6228	196	50	5982

* Rocheford Court, Pepper Lane, Hunslet - site split between Inner Area (3 units) and East Leeds (23 units)

* East Leeds Extension - site split between Outer North East (675 units) and East Leeds (1325 units), total of 2000 units

* Land At Cartmell Drive, Halton, Leeds - site split between Inner Area (31 units) and East Leeds (31 units)

The number of dwellings still to be built (still under construction or not started) is 50+ 5982 (last 2 totals in table) = 6032 dwellings still to be built from existing permissions and allocations.

So, the residual target is $11400 - 6032 = 5368$ units remaining to find from pool of SHLAA sites as at 31.3.12, minus sites in Aire Valley.

Aire Valley Area Action Plan (AAP)

The area that falls within the Aire Valley AAP is not to be included within the Site Allocations Plan, but will be considered within the area action plan.

SHLAA sites within the area but that also fall within Aire Valley AAP boundary likely to be allocated for housing in the area action plan will also have to come off the total capacity figure to find.

So $5368 - 2328$ from likely housing allocations in the part of the housing market characteristic area that falls within the Aire Valley boundary = **3040 units to find from remaining pool of SHLAA sites.**

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

3.3.4 **Sites 'sieved out' of the assessment process (removed from further consideration)**

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

No sites have been sieved out within the East Leeds area.

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

The sites remaining in SHLAA after taking account of sites in table 3.3.1 are the ones left to assess to see which may have potential as housing allocations. A site assessment methodology has been developed. The site proforma including the Green Belt Review Assessment is attached at Volume 1 Appendix.

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

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

Green – sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing.

Amber – sites which have potential but there may be issues which need to be resolved, or the site may not be in such a favoured location as those highlighted in green.

Red – sites which are not considered suitable for allocation for housing.

Table 3.3.2 shows the colour coding and reasons for the sites being within the relevant categories. The colour coding and sites listed are shown on Plan 3.3 Housing.

TABLE 3.3.2: SITES ASSESSED FOR POTENTIAL HOUSING ALLOCATIONS IN EAST

No. of sites assessed	SHLAA Ref and colour coding	Site Address	Ward	Site Area (ha.)	Site Capacity	Summary Reason for Colour Coding.
1	267	Wykebridge Depot, Killingbeck Bridge, LS14	Killingbeck & Seacroft	0.64	23	Vacant brownfield site. Suitable in principle for residential development.
2	282	Manston Lane	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	6.299	189	Brownfield site. Planning permission granted for residential development 14/11/2012 (application no. 08/00298/OT).
3	807	Strikes, Red Hall Lane, LS17	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	0.782	20	Planning permission granted for residential development 20 units 17/08/2012 (11/05078/FU).
4	1094A (Part of Site in Outer North East area)	Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	377.67	9914	Site 1094 has been split into two as part B is not connected to A. If site A is developed the site would link Scholes with the boundary of the allocated East Leeds extension effectively merging Scholes with the main urban area, contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belt, to prevent the coalescence of settlements. Significant highway concerns relating to access, impact on local network and relationship to the proposed East Leeds Orbital Route.
5	1094B	Between Red Hall Lane and Manston Lane	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	0.939	34	Site 1094B is situated between a beck on the northern boundary and residential development on the southern boundary. The site has no direct road access.

No. of sites assessed	SHLAA Ref and colour coding	Site Address	Ward	Site Area (ha.)	Site Capacity	Summary Reason for Colour Coding.
6	1295B	Land to the east of Skelton Lake	Garforth & Swillington	28.470	620	Green Belt site. Development of the site would represent a rounding off the urban area (subject to existing development site 1295a being developed for residential). The canal to the south and neighbouring sites to the east and west would ensure that a low potential for future unrestricted sprawl exists. The site would need to share services, such as a primary school, health and local shopping with the adjacent site and wouldn't be sustainable as a stand alone site. The site adjoins sensitive natural habitats along the River Aire corridor and includes areas of mature woodland, which would require mitigation. The site is also located on a plateau which has been formed by deposited materials and will necessitate ground investigations.
7	1297	Former Vickers Tank Factory Site, Manston Lane, Cross Gates	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	21.491	645	Former Vickers Factory. Outline application for residential (C3), employment (B1c), health centre (D1), foodstore (A1), ancillary uses (A1/A2/A3/A4), community building (A4/D2), associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure. Application pending (09/04999/OT). Development of the full site is subject to the implementation of the Manston Lane Link Road.
8	1359	Rothwell Garden Centre, Wood Lane	Rothwell	3.156	83	Green Belt site. Development would effectively round off the settlement and would not set a precedent for further sprawl.
9	2039	Thorpe Park, undeveloped non-submitted land	Temple Newsam Cross Gates and Whinmoor	34.667	200	Thorpe Park site. Outline Planning Application pending for mixed use development comprising offices (business park) (B1A), (B) and (C), retail and bar/restaurant (A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5), hotel (C1), leisure facilities (application no. 12/03886/OT). The western part of the site is currently designated as proposed greenspace on the existing UDP (see also greenspace section, page 22, question G8), the eastern part is allocated for employment on the existing UDP. The site could link in with residential development to the north in the allocated east Leeds extension, so development for residential could also have potential subject to the provision of the Manston Lane Link Road and East Leeds Orbital Route.
10	2040 (Most of site within Outer South East area)	Temple Point, Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton	Garforth & Swillington	0.255	8	Planning permission granted for residential development August 2012.

No. of sites assessed	SHLAA Ref and colour coding	Site Address	Ward	Site Area (ha.)	Site Capacity	Summary Reason for Colour Coding.
11	2062	Redhall (East Leeds Extension)	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	215.57	100	Part Green Belt site (northern section, majority of site is an employment allocation on the existing UDP. The site is within the current planning brief for the East Leeds extension alongside the wider Redhall site and would be suitable for residential development in principle subject to the provision of the section of the East Leeds Orbital Route which would run through the site.
12	2086	Barrowby Lane, Manston, LS15	Temple Newsam	21.173	553	Green Belt site. The site is contained by strong defensible boundaries to the north and south east (major roads) so release of the site would not set a precedent for further Green Belt sprawl. The site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP. (See also greenspace section, page 22, question G9). Situated to the east of Cross Gates, development would be dependent on site 2039 coming forward first, to join the site up more with the existing urban area. Any development would be subject to provision of Manston Lane Link Road and East Leeds Orbital Route.
13	2087	Crawshaw Wood, north of Barrowby Lane, Garforth, LS25	Temple Newsam	11.26	266	Green Belt site. The site is isolated and not related to the existing settlement. Development would significantly reduce the Green Belt gap between Cross Gates and Garforth, contrary to one of the purposes of Green Belts in preventing the coalescence of settlements. The proposed HS2 rail route runs through the site. Significant highway concerns regarding access and accessibility.
14	2090A	Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton, LS15	Temple Newsam	6.27	165	Site 2090 has been split into 2. Site A is within the Green Belt, but has a road frontage and is well related to the existing settlement form. Development could retain openness and views across the Temple Newsam estate. The site is also designated as proposed open space (N5) on the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 22, question G10.

No. of sites assessed	SHLAA Ref and colour coding	Site Address	Ward	Site Area (ha.)	Site Capacity	Summary Reason for Colour Coding.
15	2090B	Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton, LS15	Temple Newsam	87.32	2292	Site 2090 has been split into 2. Site B is within the Green Belt and the majority of the site is designated as proposed greenspace (N5) on the existing UDP (See also greenspace section, page 22, question G10) and there is a Local Nature Area and Site of Ecological and Geological Importance within the site and three ancient monuments to the west. There are public footpaths running across the site and through to Temple Newsam, and important views across the estate. Significant highway concerns regarding accessibility and impact on local network.
16	2144	Cartmell Drive, Halton Moor	Temple Newsam	6.871	310	The site is designated as greenspace (N1) on the existing UDP. Loss of greenspace will need to be assessed in the greenspace review. See also greenspace section, page 22, question G11. However, the site is part of a wider area of greenspace to the west. Development would not encroach too much into this larger area as the valley is wider at this point. The site was formerly identified as a possible housing site on the now withdrawn EASEL (East and South East Leeds) Area Action Plan.
17	3079	Land to the north east of Bell Hill Industrial Estate, Rothwell	Rothwell	3.023	79	Green Belt site. Whilst the site would be contained by the motorway to the north and existing development to the south west surrounding uses are an industrial estate, so it is not considered suitable for a residential use. Development would be dependent on the adjacent site coming forward for access requirements.
18	3111	Moorhouse Farm, Wakefield Road, Garforth, LS25 1AS	Garforth & Swillington	5.824	153	Green Belt site. By itself the site is not well related to the settlement, but development could be considered if developed alongside sites 1100, 1044 or 3112. If these sites were put forward for development then this site would effectively round off the settlement.
19	3118	Land east of York Road, Seacroft, Leeds, LS14 2AD	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	3.31	87	The site is within the urban area. It is allocated as a park and ride site on the existing UDP.

No. of sites assessed	SHLAA Ref and colour coding	Site Address	Ward	Site Area (ha.)	Site Capacity	Summary Reason for Colour Coding.
20	3119	Hobberley Cottage/The Wellington(PH), Whin Moor Lane, Shadwell, Leeds, LS17 8LU	Cross Gates and Whinmoor	2.422	64	Green Belt site. Development of the site alone would represent an isolated 'island' of development within Green Belt. However, development in conjunction with site 2062 would effectively 'round off' the settlement pattern. Existing uses within the site including a public house and residential properties to the west and east.

CALL FOR SITES:

21	CFSM032	Thorpe Park Business Park, Leeds	Cross Gates and Whinmoor / Temple Newsam / Garforth and Swillington	39.548		Mixed use submission for residential (dwelling no's not specified), industrial (B1b/c or B8, offices B1a). Any development would be subject to the provision of the Manston Lane Link Road and East Leeds Orbital Route. (See also site 2039 above).
----	---------	----------------------------------	---	--------	--	--

3.3.6 Para 3.3.2 identifies that in this area we need to allocate sites to accommodate 3040 residential units. From table 3.3.3 above, the total capacity from green sites alone is 1688. The total capacity from amber sites is 1445. The total from both green and amber is 3133 which is over the 3040 we are seeking. At this stage, we are seeking views as to whether we have got the colour coding right and which are the most suitable sites. Alternative sites can also be suggested.

QUESTIONS ON SITES PUT FORWARD TO CONSIDER FOR HOUSING 'GREEN' SITES

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

Yes/No

Reason

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

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

'AMBER' SITES

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

Yes/No

Reason

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

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

'RED' SITES

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

Yes/No

Reason

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

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

OTHER SITES?

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

PHASING

H11. The Site Allocations Plan will need to also identify phasing of housing allocations (see Volume 1 page 20). The phases are:

Delivery/development in the short term, 0-5 years

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

Delivery/development in the long term, 10 + years

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

GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES (See Volume 1, para 8.18)

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

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

ELDERLY ACCOMMODATION (See Volume 1, para 8.19)

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

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

3.4.0 EAST EMPLOYMENT ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

See Plan 3.4 Employment

3.4.1 The employment sites in East have been assessed to determine their total contribution towards an overall district requirement of **1,000,000 sq m** office based development and **493 hectares** of industrial and warehousing. Sites which either have planning permission for employment uses (as at 31.3.12) and/or are allocated for employment as part of the existing development plan and are to be retained for employment are shown as lime green on plan 3.4. These sites will count towards the employment requirement.

In East these sites are:

Table 3.4.1: Office based development
'Lime Green' sites for office development.

Site Ref	Address	Site area (ha)	Total floorspace (sq m)	Reason for retention
Lime Green				
3203254	Plot 3175 Century Way Thorpe Park LS15	0.64	3000	Consent 09/00829/RM for office block replaces previous approval on same site. Site identified separately to identify it as part of the supply.
3203250	Plot 4500 Century Way Thorpe Park LS15	1.99	7463	Part of Thorpe Park which is key business park.
3202740	Coal Road Seacroft LS 14	3.65	11510	Scores well for employment use but permission granted for part employment part car dealership.
3203100	Thorpe Park Selby Road LS15	34.75	104240	A good employment site which benefits from an outline planning permission. M1 junction to be upgraded.
3203252	Plot 4400 Park Approach Thorpe Park LS15	0.96	360	Part of Thorpe Park which is key business park.
3203123	Colton Mill Bullerthorpe Lane LS15	0.16	60	Current site with planning permission for employment purposes
Total		42.15	126633	
Aire Valley Total		0.42	3720	
Grand Total		42.57	130353	

Table 3.4.2: Industrial & Warehousing
'Lime Green' sites for industrial and warehousing development.






Site Ref	Address	Site area (ha)	Reason for retention
Lime Green			
3200011	Manston La Sandeas Way LS15	1.00	Site is currently in use for HGV storage or similar in connection to adjacent user. Accessible site within an employment area.
Total		1.00	
Aire Valley Total		206.07	
Grand Total		207.07	

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

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

Table 3.4.3 below shows the colour coding and reasons for the sites being within the relevant categories. The sites are shown on Plan 3.4 Employment.

Table 3.4.3 SITES ASSESSED FOR POTENTIAL EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS IN EAST

Colour code	Site Ref	Address	Site area (ha)	Total floorspace (sq m)	Assessment type	Conclusion	Reason for colour coding
Offices							
Green							
None							
Amber							
None							
Red							
	3203180	Red Hall Red Hall Lane LS17	9.71	3641	ELR	Remove	Offices not acceptable in this location (NPPF) and other B1 uses not realistic here. Option for residential use in line with adjacent land.
Industry							
Green							
	3203490	R/O Woodville Garage York Road Whinmoor LS14	0.42		ELR	Retain	Consent 08/05072/FU for industrial units; expires 23/11/2011.
	3203171	Land Off Bullerthorpe Lane LS15	0.06		Site assessment	Retain	UDP Policy E18 allocation with no planning permission at 31/3/2010.
Amber							
None							
Red							
	3203230	Former Vickers Defence Factory Manston Lane LS 15	18.05		Site assessment	Remove	Residential scheme (08/03440/OT) approved 16/3/2009 for adjoining site 3203231.
	3203231	Residential Scheme At Former Vickers Defence Factory Manston Lane LS 15	6.30		ELR	Remove	Consent for residential: 08/03440/OT refers.

QUESTIONS ON SITES PUT FORWARD TO CONSIDER FOR EMPLOYMENT

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

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

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

Yes/No

Reason

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

3.5.0 EAST GREENSPACE ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

3.5.1 The two plans at the end of this document show 1) greenspace sites currently designated through the UDP Review 2006 and sites identified through the open space audit in the East Housing Market Characteristic Area (Plan 3.5A) and 2) the categories or types of greenspace (Plan 3.5B). There are two elements to consider, firstly the changes being proposed to the allocated greenspace as a result of the 2011 Open Space, Sport & Recreation Assessment (*hereafter referred to as the 'Open Space Audit'*) and secondly the implications of the subsequent assessments undertaken in relation to surpluses and deficiencies, quality and accessibility to greenspace. Sites that are proposed for deletion following the Open Space Audit are listed at the end of this document and are the sites which are not overlain by hatching on Plan 3.5A. Sites proposed to be deleted will be considered in the context of the surpluses and deficiencies identified in each particular area.

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

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

3.5.3 There are no standards in the Core Strategy for cemeteries, green corridors and golf courses, therefore there is no analysis of surpluses and deficiencies for these typologies. They are, however, shown on Plan 3.5B for completeness.

3.5.4 Quantity

The table below sets out the amount of surplus land or the deficiency in provision for each greenspace type.

Table 3.5.1 Surpluses and deficiencies in different types of greenspace in East

	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
Cross Gates & Whinmoor	Deficiency (-0.574ha)	Deficiency (-0.17ha)	Surplus (0.49ha)	Deficiency of 2 facilities	Deficiency (-0.24ha)	Deficiency (-0.198ha)
Temple Newsam	Surplus (16.41ha)	Surplus (0.256ha)	Deficiency (-0.184ha)	Deficiency of 2 facilities	Deficiency (-0.076ha)	Surplus (0.63ha)
Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	Surplus (0.71ha)	Deficiency (-0.32ha)	Surplus (0.265ha)	Surplus of 4 facilities	Deficiency (-0.164ha)	Deficiency (-0.563ha)
City & Hunslet	Deficiency (-0.518ha)	Deficiency (-0.72ha)	Deficiency (-0.149ha)	Surplus of 2 facilities	Deficiency (-0.16ha)	Deficiency (-0.525ha)
Middleton Park	Surplus (5.27ha)	Deficiency (-0.22ha)	Deficiency (-0.122ha)	Deficiency of 5 facilities	Deficiency (-0.18ha)	Surplus (1.24ha)
Garforth & Swillington	Deficiency (-0.48ha)	Deficiency (-0.05ha)	Deficiency (0.29ha)	Deficiency of 7 facilities	Surplus (1.2ha)	Surplus (7.52ha)
Rothwell	0ha within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary
Killingbeck & Seacroft	0ha within HMCA boundary	0.14ha for area within HMCA	0.394ha within HMCA boundary	0 facilities within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary	0ha within HMCA boundary
Average (total figure)	Surplus (3.357ha)	Deficiency (0.793ha)	Deficiency (0.394ha)	Deficiency of 6 facilities	Deficiency (0.096ha)	Surplus (0.83ha)

NB: *There are no areas of greenspace within the Rothwell ward which fall in the East area . A very small area of Killingbeck & Seacroft ward falls within the East Area however this does contain several greenspace sites. To maintain accuracy an average figure has not been calculated for this ward as it would present an inaccurate picture of Killingbeck & Seacroft's true average quantity of provision.

3.5.5 The East area 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 area 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. 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.

3.5.6 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.

- 3.5.7 It should be noted that the East area includes some of the land that is within the Aire Valley Area Action Plan. This means that there may be opportunities to provide greenspace in the Aire Valley Action Plan area that will help to meet deficiencies in types of greenspace within the East area.
- 3.5.8 A number of greenspace sites have been suggested for housing. The following questions (page 21 and 22) seek views as to whether the sites should be retained for their current or alternative greenspace use, or might be better used for housing in preference to land elsewhere within the area.

3.5.9 Quality

Across the East area, the majority of sites (65 out of 81) 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 parks and gardens, natural greenspace and allotment sites is particularly noticeable.

3.5.10 Accessibility

- 3.5.11 Accessibility to all types of greenspace is generally good across the East area. Temple Newsam ward generally features much better access to all types of greenspace, however this is largely attributable to the typologies represented by the Temple Newsam estate.

QUESTIONS ABOUT GREENSPACE PROVISION IN EAST

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 East:

- G8. A small part of the existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) designation at Thorp Park has been put forward as part of a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2039, see page 9). It was not identified as in a greenspace use in the Open Space Audit and has clearly not been delivered through Policy N5, therefore it is proposed to delete the allocation. Do you agree this land could be developed for housing rather than being left as a possible future greenspace opportunity?**
- G9. The existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) allocation at Barrowby Lane, Manston has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2086, see page 10). It was not identified as in a greenspace use in the Open Space Audit and has clearly not been delivered through Policy N5, therefore it is proposed to delete the allocation (called Thorp Park for greenspace purposes). Do you agree this land could be developed for housing rather than being left as a possible future greenspace opportunity?**
- G10. The existing UDP N5 (proposed greenspace) designation at Bullerthorpe Lane, Colton has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2090A and 2090B, see page 10 & 11). The majority of the site and additional land were identified as a city park (Temple Newsam) in the Open Space Audit. Do you think this site could be developed for housing or should it be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies)?**
- G11. Part of the existing UDP N1 designation at Cartmell Drive, Halton has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 2144, see page 11). The majority of the site was identified as natural greenspace 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	15/8/2	A61/M1 traffic island	Traffic island surrounded by M1 and A61, inaccessible
N1	15/27	Stourton Sidings	Area surrounded by motorway roundabout, inaccessible.
N1	15/28	Stourton Sidings,	Area surrounded by motorway and slip road, inaccessible.
N5 (proposed open space)	m256	Thorp Park	Partly rough ground and partly agricultural fields. Not in a greenspace use.