

LEEDS SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN

ISSUES AND OPTIONS FOR THE PLAN

Draft April 2013

VOLUME 2: SITE PROPOSALS FOR EACH HOUSING MARKET CHARACTERISTIC AREA 8. OUTER SOUTH

VOLUME 2: SITE PROPOSALS FOR EACH HOUSING MARKET CHARACTERISTIC AREA 8. OUTER SOUTH

| CONTENTS: | PAGE |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| 8.1.0 INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| 8.2.0 RETAIL ISSUES AND OPTIONS | 3 – 4 |
| 8.3.0 HOUSING ISSUES AND OPTIONS | 5 – 14 |
| 8.4.0 EMPLOYMENT ISSUES AND OPTIONS | 15 – 18 |
| 8.5.0 GREENSPACE ISSUES AND OPTIONS | 19 – 23 |

PLANS:

RETAIL: OUTER SOUTH

PLAN 8.2A Rothwell Town Centre

PLAN 8.2B Plan showing Location of Rothwell Town Centre within the Outer South area

HOUSING: OUTER SOUTH

PLAN 8.3 Housing

EMPLOYMENT: OUTER SOUTH

PLAN 8.4 Employment

GREENSPACE: OUTER SOUTH

PLAN 8.5A UDP Greenspace allocations and open space audit sites

PLAN 8.5B Types of Greenspace

8.1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 8.1.1 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.
- 8.1.2 Plans for initial proposals for retail, housing, employment and greenspace are at the end of this document. View the plans on line at www.leeds.gov.uk/ldf. Please note that if you view this document on line, you can access the full site assessments for housing and employment sites. If you do not have access to a computer, you can use computers at libraries. The Council can make further details available on request, but printing costs may be incurred. It is not practical to put all site details in an appendix due to the volume of sites and information involved.
- 8.1.3 The Outer South area is characterised by the Major Settlement of Rothwell and Oulton and a number of smaller settlements including Methley and Mickletown. The area is situated between the M1 to the North and the M62 to the South and is linked by the A639. Green Infrastructure is a feature of the area and the eastern part of the Outer South area falls within the broader corridor of the Lower Aire Valley.

8.2.0 OUTER SOUTH RETAIL ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

- 8.2.1 There is one centre within the Outer South area:
- Rothwell Town Centre (see plan 8.2A)
- 8.2.2 A centre 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). Only minor boundary modifications are proposed to Rothwell's town centre boundary. The former site of Morrisons offers the main opportunity within the centre for new retail proposals.
- 8.2.3 Section 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.

8.2.4 Call for sites

There were no sites submitted within the Outer South area for retail use, or mixed use including retail.

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.

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

8.3.0 OUTER SOUTH HOUSING ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

8.3.1 See Volume 1, pages 18 - 22 for a full explanation of the approach to considering which sites should be allocated for housing. See plan 8.3 Housing showing the sites referred to in this section.

8.3.2 **Total housing target for Outer South** (set out in the Core Strategy = **2,600 units** (**4% of District wide total**))

Total number of dwellings/capacity we are seeking:

The target of 2,600 residential units does not mean that 2,600 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 the table 8.3.1 below and will count towards the overall target. They are shown in lime green on plan 8.3 Housing.

Table 8.3.1

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

| SHLAA Ref | HLA Ref | Address | Capacity | Complete | Under construction | Not started |
|--|---------|---|------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------|
| Allocations - not yet developed | | | | | | |
| 498 | 2201120 | Pottery Lane, Woodlesford | 30 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| 499 | 2201130 | Aberford Road, Woodlesford Road, Woodlesford | 75 | 9 | 0 | 66 |
| 0 | 2201540 | Main Street Mickletown | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 507 | | Main Street, Carlton | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Sites 0.4ha+ with planning permission | | | | | | |
| 269 | 2104930 | Former Methley Infants School, Little Church Lane, Methley, Leeds, LS26 9EF | 12 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| 515 | 2202080 | Bay Horse, Main Street, Mickletown | 22 | 20 | 2 | 0 |
| 519 | 2202190 | Langdale Place Holmsley Lane, Woodlesford | 49 | 46 | 1 | 2 |
| 523 | 2202240 | Pinfold Lane Methley | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 135 | 2202320 | Lofthouse Hall, Leeds Road, Lofthouse | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 133 | 2202430 | Royds Green Farm, Royds Green, Royds Lane, Rothwell, Leeds, LS26 8EZ | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Sites 0.2ha to 0.4ha with planning permission | | | | | | |
| 0 | 2201980 | Sharp Lane, Robin Hood | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 3300 | 2202380 | Former White Hart Hotel, 40 Church Street, Woodlesford | 7 | 0 | 5 | 2 |
| Sites below 0.2ha with planning permission | | | | | | |
| 0 | 2201950 | Swithin Street Rothwell | 14 | 6 | 0 | 8 |
| 0 | 2202010 | Marsh Street, Rothwell | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 0 | 2202260 | The Chapel, Calverley Road, Oulton | 8 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Outer South TOTAL | | | 274 | 81 | 18 | 175 |

The number of dwellings still to be built (still under construction or not started) is 18 + 175 (last 2 totals in table) = 193 dwellings still to be built from existing permissions and allocations.

So, the residual target is 2600 – 193 = **2407 units remaining to find from pool of SHLAA sites as at 31.3.12.**

8.3.3 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 housing 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.

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

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

Table 8.3.2 Sieved out sites prior to site assessments in Outer South.

| SHLAA ref | address | Reason sieved out |
|------------------|--|---|
| 133 | Royds Green Farm Royds Green Oulton Leeds LS26 8EZ | Most of site has permission, but part left over sieved out as not within settlement hierarchy |
| 1006 | Wakefield Road , Rothwell | Not within settlement hierarchy |
| 1249 | Land off Junction 30 M62, Rothwell and Oulton, LS26 | Not within settlement hierarchy |
| 2110 | Rothwell Sports Centre, Oulton, LS26 | Not within settlement hierarchy |
| 3012 | Iveridge Hall, Wakefield Road, Oulton, Leeds, LS26 8EU | Not within settlement hierarchy |
| 3465 | Land off Leadwell Lane, Robin Hood/Rothwell, LS26 | Not within settlement hierarchy |

These sites are shown in purple on plan 8.3 Housing.

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

The sites remaining in SHLAA after taking account of sites in table 8.3.1 and table 8.3.2 are the ones left to assess to see which 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 8.3.3 shows the colour coding and reasons for the sites being within the relevant categories. The colour coding and sites listed are shown on Plan 8.3 Housing.

TABLE 8.3.3: SITES ASSESSED FOR POTENTIAL HOUSING ALLOCATIONS IN OUTER SOUTH

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 1 | 129A | Main Street And Pitfield Road, Carlton, Wakefield | Rothwell | 1.15 | 36 | Brownfield site within existing settlement limits and has well established boundaries. Could potentially improve visual aspect of area if developed. Highways have commented that there is limited frontage with Main Street, so development would need to be combined with the adjacent UDP housing allocation (shown on plan as lime green site 507). |
| 2 | 129B | Main Street And Pitfield Road, Carlton, Wakefield | Rothwell | 4.17 | 110 | This is a PAS (Protected Area of Search) on the UDP, not a site within the Green Belt. The site is flat with no tree cover. However, there is concern over the size of the site in relation to the settlement (Carlton), which falls outside the settlement hierarchy defined in the Core Strategy, hence the site is shown amber. Also, Highways have commented that development would need to be combined with adjacent sites 129A and 507, although there is scope for further access points to Pit Field Road. |
| 3 | 130 | 77 - 79 Aberford Road, Oulton, Leeds LS26 8HS | Rothwell | 1.330 | 50 | Brownfield site in current use with established boundaries. Housing development is likely to improve the visual aspect of area. |
| 4 | 135 | Lofthouse Hall, Leeds Road, Lofthouse | Ardsley and Robin Hood | 2.97 | 9 | Northern third has pp (Under construction) shown as lime green on plan. Southern section of site has 100% mature tree cover which are protected by a group TPO - unsuitable for development. |
| 5 | 136 | Site At Alma Villas, Woodlesford, Leeds, LS26 8PW | Rothwell | 0.725 | 12 | Small part of site in Green Belt. Relatively small site in Woodlesford, well related to existing settlement pattern. Includes a number of mature trees. Highways concerns re Alma Street/Pottery Lane junction. |
| 6 | 143 | Site Of Glenoit And Minerva Mills, Aberford Road, Oulton | Rothwell | 2.317 | 90 | Vacant brownfield site in Oulton, adjacent to canal. Within flood zone 3a (high risk) and 2 (medium risk). The Environment Agency are being consulted on all sites. |
| 7 | 289 | Hunts Farm, Main Street, Methley | Kippax and Methley | 1.154 | 35 | Small part of site is within the Green Belt. Site is currently a mixture of used and un-used agricultural buildings in various states of repair. Development would improve the appearance of the area. Northern edge of the site is in flood zone 3a (high risk), while remainder of site is within flood zone 2 (medium risk). The Environment Agency are being consulted on all sites. |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 8 | 334 | Land Off Fleet Lane, Oulton, Leeds | Rothwell | 3.375 | 104 | Protected Area of Search (PAS) site on UDP. The site is well connected to the built up area and, if built, would be considered a partial rounding off of settlement. Adjacent to conservation area which could be mitigated against through appropriate design. No Highways concerns re access. |
| 9 | 335 | Land Off Royds Lane, Rothwell | Rothwell | 3.766 | 114 | Protected Area of Search (PAS) site on UDP. The site is situated between the existing built up area and Oulton Park and is not Green Belt. Established boundary following the road, playing pitch and golf course. No Highways concerns. |
| 10 | 1030 | Green Lane, Lofthouse, Wakefield - Known as Pymont Farm | Ardsley and Robin Hood | 3.114 | 70 | Green Belt site. The site would extend out into Green Belt to the north and does not relate well to the existing settlement form. Access would need to be provided through an existing dwelling, as the southern access is not wide enough. |
| 11 | 1035 | Land at Fleet Lane / Eshald Lane, Oulton, LS26 8HT | Rothwell | 1.260 | 40 | Green Belt site. Site likely to be contingent on site 334 coming forward (otherwise would constitute ribbon development). Flat, no tree cover, with well defined boundary following road. |
| 12 | 1049 | Haighside south of St Georges Hospital, Rothwell | Rothwell | 11.71 | 307 | Green Belt site. Development of site potentially linked with adjacent site 1058. Site is relatively well connected to the urban area (shares 2 borders) but it is acknowledged that development would have some impact on the purposes of Green Belt in reducing the gap between settlements and potential to lead to sprawl. There are pylons running across the centre of site, which would need to be taken into account at design stage. |
| 13 | 1050 | Land off Westfield Road, Robin Hood Near Rothwell | Ardsley and Robin Hood | 5.719 | 129 | Green Belt site. The site proposed is large in scale and does not connect well to the built up area. Development on this site would result in significant sprawl into the Green Belt in relation to the size of the settlement, crossing the road which at present serves as a strong defensible boundary. |
| 14 | 1058 | Haighside, Rothwell, LS26 | Rothwell | 10.32 | 271 | Green Belt site to the west of Rothwell. Development of site potentially linked with adjacent site 1049. It is acknowledged that development would have some impact on the purposes of Green Belt in reducing the gap between settlements and potential to lead to sprawl. |
| 15 | 1223 | Land north of Watergate, Methley | Kippax and Methley | 7.354 | 168 | Green Belt site. Large site, could set precedent for further sprawl if developed. Highways concerns re accessibility. |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 16 | 1224 | Land south of Church Lane, Mickletown | Kippax and Methley | 7.16 | 161 | Green Belt site. The site is well connected to the built up area and has a clearly defined boundary. Highways concerns re access. |
| 17 | 1225A | Land west of Pinfold Lane, Mickletown | Kippax and Methley | 21.294 | 479 | Green Belt site. The site is contingent on sites 1224 and 1225C coming forward first. Although the site would not set a precedent for unrestricted sprawl, the size and scale of the site is a concern. |
| 18 | 1225B | Land west of Pinfold Lane, Mickletown | Kippax and Methley | 26.03 | 586 | Green Belt site. Large site not in keeping with the surrounding urban area and settlement pattern of Methley. Development would cause merging of Mickletown with Methley. |
| 19 | 1225C | Land west of Pinfold Lane, Mickletown | Kippax and Methley | 2.19 | 49 | Green Belt site. Flat site with no tree cover and well connected to the built up area. However, due to poor access, likely to be contingent on adjacent site 1224. |
| 20 | 1259A | Land adjacent to Haigh Farm, Bullough Lane, Rothwell Haigh LS26 0JY | Rothwell | 5.306 | 139 | Green Belt site. Land to the north of Rothwell. The site does not relate to the existing settlement pattern and development would constitute urban sprawl. |
| 21 | 1259B | Land adjacent to Haigh Farm, Bullough Lane, Rothwell Haigh LS26 0JY | Rothwell | 8.476 | 222 | Green Belt site. Unlike 1259A, site B is better related to the existing settlement layout and contained by the park to the north. |
| 22 | 1261 | Church Farm and surrounding land north of M62, Lofthouse, Wakefield, WF3 3SA | Ardsley and Robin Hood | 6.424 | 144 | Green Belt site, but well contained between motorway and existing settlement, so impact on the purposes of Green Belt is minimal. No suitable access currently - requires land currently occupied by industrial uses to the east of the site. This needs to be resolved in order to favour allocation of site. |
| 23 | 1335 | Mill Pit Lane, Rothwell LS26 | Rothwell | 4.897 | 125 | Green Belt site to the north of Rothwell. Development would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern and constitute urban sprawl. |
| 24 | 1355 | Rear of 26-32 Wood Lane, Rothwell | Rothwell | 1 | 32 | Green Belt site, conservation area, an area of proposed open space (N5 on the existing UDP, see also greenspace section page 21, question G8) and a |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding |
|-----------------------|---|---|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| | | | | | | local nature area. An ancient monument is situated to the south west of site. |
| 25 | 1359 | Rothwell Garden Centre, Wood Lane, Rothwell, LS26 | Rothwell | 1.665 | 52 | Green Belt site. Mixed brown and greenfield site in Rothwell. The site relates well to the settlement being essentially an infill site between existing development and would not set a precedent for sprawl. Only part of the site is in Outer South area, the rest is in East Leeds - capacity and area given are for the proportion within Outer South. (1.49ha, 47 capacity in adjacent hmca) |
| 26 | 1365A | Swithens Lane, Rothwell, Leeds LS26 0BS | Rothwell | 5.19 | 136 | Green Belt site to the south of Rothwell. Development of site A would provide an opportunity for limited expansion. No Highways issues raised. |
| 27 | 1365B | Swithens Lane, Rothwell, Leeds LS26 0BS | Rothwell | 4.655 | 122 | Green Belt site. Development would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern and set a precedent for sprawl. |
| 28 | 2103 | Allotments Copley Lane, Robin Hood, WF3 | Ardsley and Robin Hood | 0.473 | 14 | The site covers the northern section of protected allotment (N1A) land on the UDP. As such housing development is not considered to be appropriate. Highway concerns re access. See also greenspace section, page 22, question G9. |
| 29 | 2104(Part of site in Outer South West area) | Leeds Road Lofthouse, WF3 | Ardsley and Robin Hood | 1.04 | 30 | Green Belt site. Development of the site would mean crossing the disused railway line that runs along the western boundary. This is a strong defensible boundary that if breached could result in a high potential for sprawl into the Green Belt. There is a Local Nature Area in the northern section of the site. Only part of the site is in Outer South, the majority of the site falls within Outer South West area (10.81ha, 243 capacity in adjacent area) |
| 30 | 2107A | Fleet Lane, Woodlesford, LS26 | Rothwell | 6.250 | 164 | Green Belt site. Development would constitute urban sprawl, unrelated to the existing settlement. Highways concerns: no highway frontage and poor accessibility. Site would be affected by HS2 rail line proposals. |
| 31 | 2107B | Fleet Lane, Woodlesford, LS26 | Rothwell | 6.760 | 178 | Green Belt site. Development would constitute urban sprawl, unrelated to the existing settlement. Highways concerns: no highway frontage and poor accessibility. A large part of the site is heavily wooded. Site would be affected by HS2 rail line proposals. |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|---|
| 32 | 2129 | Mickletown Road Methley | Kippax and Methley | 9.779 | 220 | Protected Area of Search (PAS) site on existing UDP, not Green Belt. Flat site currently in use for agriculture. Eastern side of site has substantial tree coverage. This will need to be taken into account in any design stage. Site is encircled by new access road. |
| 33 | 3080 | Land to rear of units at 251 Wood Lane, Rothwell, Leeds, LS26 0RJ | Rothwell | 1.102 | 35 | Green Belt site. Isolated site, unrelated to the existing settlement pattern. Development could set a precedent for urban sprawl. |
| 34 | 3081A(Part of site in the Inner area) | Hope Farm, Wakefield Road, Rothwell, LS26 0RZ | Ardsley and Robin Hood | 10.610 | 279 | Green Belt site. The site is well connected to the urban area. It is a flat site with a long road frontage providing easy access for residential development. The larger site has been split in two and it is considered that the separation of settlements function of Green Belts is maintained by the adjacent field (site B) and the motorway. Part of the site is within Outer South area, part in adjacent Inner Area (3.60ha, 94 capacity in adjacent area). |
| 35 | 3084 | Cemetery Lane, Lofthouse, Wakefield, WF3 3RU | Rothwell | 6.94 | 156 | Green Belt site. Not connected to the urban area, no defensible boundary. Development would constitute urban sprawl. |
| 36 | 3085 | The Grange, 308 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Wakefield, WF3 3QQ | Ardsley and Robin Hood | 10.410 | 234 | Green Belt site. The site is surrounded by development on three sides and this limits the potential for unrestricted sprawl into the Green Belt. No Highways issues raised. |
| 37 | 3088 | Land east of Shop Lane, Lofthouse, Wakefield, WF3 3PD | Ardsley and Robin Hood | 1.147 | 26 | Green Belt site. The site is well contained and this reduces the potential for sprawl and overall impact on the Green Belt. Whilst there are no physical constraints on the site, the site is on the outskirts of the Leeds boundary and in a smaller settlement. |
| 38 | 3093 | Eshald Lane, Woodlesford, Leeds, LS26 8LN | Rothwell | 1.315 | 41 | Green Belt site adjacent to N1 greenspace on the existing UDP. See also greenspace section, page 22, question G10. No definable boundary. The site is heavily wooded. It is considered that development would compromise the setting of the green space and be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern. |

| No. of sites assessed | SHLAA ref and colour coding | Site Address | Ward | Site Area (ha.) | Site Capacity | Summary Reason for Colour Coding |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 39 | 3318 | Victoria Lane Allotments, Rothwell, LS26 | Rothwell | 1.551 | 48 | Protected allotment (N1A) land on the existing UDP. Loss of allotments would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See Greenspace section page 22, question G11) |
| 40 | 3444 | Back Haigh Avenue, Rothwell, LS26 | Rothwell | 0.483 | 15 | Protected allotment (N1A) land on the existing UDP. Loss of allotments would need to be considered through the greenspace review. See Greenspace section page 22, question G12). |
| 41 | 3445A | Leadwell Lane, Robin Hood, near Leeds, West Yorkshire, LS26 | Ardsley and Robin Hood | 2.297 | 60 | Green Belt site. The site is well connected to the urban area and would join up isolated group of houses to the south with the settlement. Low risk of urban sprawl. |
| 42 | 3445B | Leadwell Lane, Robin Hood, near Leeds, West Yorkshire, LS26 | Ardsley and Robin Hood | 4.213 | 111 | Green Belt site, unrelated to the existing settlement pattern. Development would reduce the Green Belt gap between Rothwell and Robin Hood. |
| 43 | 4082 | Windlesford Green Hostel, Woodlesford | Rothwell | 0.7099 | 22 | Vacant brownfield site with good access, appropriate for housing. |

8.3.6 Para 8.3.2 identifies that in this area we need to allocate sites to accommodate 2407 residential units. From table 8.3.3 above, the total capacity from green sites alone is 1211. The total capacity from amber sites is 2042. The total from both green and amber is 3253 which is over and above the 2407 we are seeking, so not all green and amber sites will need to be allocated. At this stage, we are seeking views as to whether we have got the colour coding right and which are the most suitable sites. Alternative sites can also be suggested.

QUESTIONS ON SITES PUT FORWARD TO CONSIDER FOR HOUSING '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.

8.4.0 OUTER SOUTH: EMPLOYMENT ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

See plan 8.4 Employment

8.4.1 The employment sites in Outer South 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 1.4. These sites will count towards the employment requirement. Sites in Aire Valley Area Action Plan area are being dealt with separately under that plan, but the overall total employment provision in Aire Valley will also count towards the employment requirement.

In Outer South these sites are:

Table 8.4.1: Office based development

'Lime Green' sites for office development and sites in Aire Valley

| Site Ref | Address | Site area (ha) | Total floorspace (sq m) | Reason for retention |
|--------------------------|---|----------------|-------------------------|---|
| Lime Green | | | | |
| 2201970 | Adj Dunford House Green Lane Methley LS26 | 0.46 | 270 | Consent has been granted and development is being implemented, albeit slowly. |
| Total | | 0.46 | 270 | |
| Aire Valley Total | | 15.53 | 47,050 | |
| Grand Total | | 15.99 | 47,320 | |

Table 8.4.2: Industrial & Warehousing

'Lime Green' sites for industrial and warehousing development

| Site Ref | Address | Site area (ha) |
|--------------------------|---------|----------------|
| Lime Green | | |
| None | | |
| Aire Valley Total | | 6.14 |
| Grand Total | | 6.14 |

8.4.2 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'. No call for sites submissions for employment or mixed use including employment wholly fall within Outer South. A small part of site CF5M037 falls within Outer South area, but as the majority of the site is in East Leeds area, it is dealt with under this area. There will of course be numerous existing

employment sites both in use or last in use for employment uses 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 8.4.3 below shows the colour coding and reasons for the sites being within the relevant categories. The sites and colour coding are shown on Plan 8.4 Employment.

Table 8.4.3 SITES ASSESSED FOR POTENTIAL EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS IN OUTER SOUTH

| 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 | | | | | | | |
| None | | | | | | | |
| Industry | | | | | | | |
| Green | | | | | | | |
| None | | | | | | | |
| Amber | | | | | | | |
| None | | | | | | | |
| Red | | | | | | | |
| | 2201750 | Pontefract Road Rothwell | 5.03 | | Site visit | Remove | Existing employment site. Propose Remove as not part of additional supply. |

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.

8.5.0 OUTER SOUTH GREENSPACE ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

8.5.1 The two maps 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 Outer South Housing Market Characteristic Area (Plan 8.5A) and 2) the categories or types of greenspace (Plan 8.5B). 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 8.5A. Sites proposed to be deleted will be considered in the context of the surpluses and deficiencies identified in each particular area.

8.5.2 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 |

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 8.5B for completeness.

8.5.3 Quantity

Overall Outer South area is well provided for in terms of some types of greenspace and deficient in others. The background paper provides an analysis of greenspace provision in the 3 wards of Rothwell, Ardsley and Robin Hood and Kippax and Methley. The latter 2 wards fall partly within the Outer South and partly in adjacent areas.

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

Table 8.5.1 Surpluses and deficiencies in different types of greenspace in Outer South

| | 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 (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 and Methley | Deficiency (-0.32ha) | Deficiency (-0.06ha) | Deficiency (-0.21ha) | Surplus (9.2 facilities) | Surplus (0.53ha) | Surplus (12.95ha) |
| Average | Surplus (0.12ha) | Deficiency (-0.32ha) | Deficiency (-0.17ha) | Surplus (3.5 facilities) | Surplus (0.26ha) | Surplus (8.88ha) |

8.5.5 Overall Outer South area 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 area boundary.

8.5.6 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.

8.5.7 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 amenity 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.

8.5.8 A number of greenspace sites have been suggested for housing. The following questions (pages 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.

8.5.9 Quality

Across the Outer South area, 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. There is only 1 allotment scoring 7 or above, only 2 parks and gardens and 2 amenity greenspace areas scoring 7 or above and only 3 natural greenspace areas scoring 7 or above, even though there are 25 natural greenspace sites. The quality of allotments and natural greenspace areas is particularly poor.

8.5.10 Accessibility

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.

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 9). 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 10). 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). 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). 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 11). 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. |