LEEDS SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN

ISSUES AND OPTIONS FOR THE PLAN

DRAFT April 2013

VOLUME 2: SITE PROPOSALS FOR EACH HOUSING MARKET CHARACTERISTIC AREA
1. AIREBOROUGH

VOLUME 2: SITE PROPOSALS FOR EACH HOUSING MARKET CHARACTERISTIC AREA
1. AIREBOROUGH:

CONTENTS: **PAGE:**

PLANS:

1.1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 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.

1.1.2 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.

1.1.3 The Aireborough area is characterised by the major settlements of Guiseley, Yeadon and Rawdon, with open land linking to Hawksworth Moor to the west and to the Wharfe Valley to the north. The area is served by the A65 and A658 and also has Leeds Bradford International Airport (LBIA) (an important transport hub for Leeds and the city region as a whole) within its boundary.

1.2.0 AIREBOROUGH RETAIL ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

1.2.1 The main retail centres are at Guiseley and Yeadon. There are four centres within the Aireborough area:

- Guiseley Town Centre (see plan 1.2A)
- Oxford Road, Guiseley Lower Order Local Centre (see plan 1.2B)
- Leeds Road, Rawdon Lower Order Local Centre (see plan 1.2C)
- Yeadon Town Centre (see plan 1.2D)

1.2.2 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). The proposed boundary to Guiseley has been revised to exclude residential properties and include the leisure centre car park. Yeadon's boundary has been revised to include the existing retail properties stretching up High Street to the west and a potential redevelopment opportunity off Albert Terrace.

1.2.3 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.

1.2.4 Call for sites

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

Site Name	REF	Ward	Nearest Centre	Distance to Edge of Centre buffer (m)[1]	Sequential Location	Council Comments
Green Lane Business Park, (Former Naylor Jennings mill buildings) and associated land, Yeadon, Leeds, LS19 7BU	CFSR007	Guiseley & Rawdon	Yeadon	234	Out of Centre	Sequentially inappropriate. Highways access issues for retail use. Requires evidence that highways solution is achievable to determine deliverability. Site is also being considered for housing. (See page 11, SHLAA site ref 1308)
Junction of Green Lane and the A65 (New Road) Yeadon, Leeds, LS19 7DA	CFSR003	Guiseley & Rawdon	Rawdon	285	Out of Centre	Sequentially inappropriate. Highways access issues for retail use. Consider for alternative employment uses.
Guiseley Retail Park, Park Road, Guiseley	CFSR0010	Guiseley & Rawdon	Guiseley	0	Within Guiseley Town Centre	Seeking other unspecified commercial uses. Council does not have any proposals to alter boundary in respect to this site. Retail units within site are now identified as primary frontage.

See plan 1.2E 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)

[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.

1.3.0 AIREBOROUGH HOUSING ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

1.3.1 See Volume 1, pages 18 - 22 for a full explanation of the approach to considering which sites should be allocated for housing. See plan 1.3 Housing showing the sites referred to in this section.

1.3.2 **Total housing target for Aireborough** (set out in the Core Strategy) = 2,300 units (3% of District wide total)

Total number of dwellings/capacity we are seeking:
The target of 2,300 residential units does not mean that land for 2,300 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 1.3.1 below and will count towards the overall target. They are shown in lime green on plan 1.3 Housing.

Table 1.3.1.
Table illustrating existing permissions and allocations as at 31.3.12. These sites are shown in lime green on the plan.

SHLAA SITE REF	ADDRESS	TOTAL CAPACITY OF SITE	NO. OF DWELLINGS COMPLETED AS AT 31.3.12	NO. OF DWELLINGS UNDER CONSTRUCTION AS AT 31.3.12	NO. OF DWELLINGS NOT STARTED AS AT 31.3.12
Housing Allocations (not yet developed)					
741 (2801880)	Greenlea Road Yeadon	30	0	8	22
742 (2801900)	Netherfield Road Guiseley	98	0	0	98
Sites 0.4ha + with planning permission					
738 (2800320)	Cromptons Netherfield Road Guiseley	228	112	27	89
271 (2802480)	Springhead Mills Springfield Road Guiseley	54	0	0	54
34 (2701490)	Riverside Mills Low Hall Road Horsforth	Site straddles hmca boundary. Total capacity is 150, but no of dwellings within Aireborough is approximately 60 (detailed planning application awaited)	0	0	60
734 (2800270)	High Royds Bradford Road	560	223	174	163
3122 (2802430)	Haworth Court, Chapel Lane, Yeadon	21	0	0	21
Sites 0.2ha to 0.4ha with planning permission					
3229 (2700340)	Batter Lane Rawdon	22	18	4	0
0 (2802400)	Parkside Works Otley Road Guiseley	7	0	0	7
3187 (2802450	Station Garage Henshaw Lane Yeadon	5	0	0	5
Sites below 0.2ha with planning permission					
0 (2700370)	26-28 New Road Side Horsforth	5	0	0	5
0 (2802390)	107 Queensway Yeadon	9	0	0	9
0 (2802490)	The Drop Inn 29 Town Street Guiseley	6	0	0	6
TOTAL:		1105	353	**213**	**539**

The number of dwellings still to be built (still under construction or not started) is 213+ 539 (last 2 totals in table) = 752 dwellings still to be built from existing permissions and allocations.

So, the residual target is 2,300 – 752 = **1548 units remaining to find from pool of SHLAA sites as at 31.3.12.**

1.3.3 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.

1.3.4 **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 1.3.2 Sieved out sites prior to site assessments in Aireborough

SHLAA ref	address	Reason sieved out
63	Cragg Wood	Not within settlement hierarchy
1017	Land at Hawksworth	Not within settlement hierarchy
1186	Land at Cross Lane	Not within settlement hierarchy
1189	Land at Bramston Lane	Not within settlement hierarchy
1254	Land at Moor Lane	Not within settlement hierarchy
1326	Land at Town End	Not within settlement hierarchy
2161	West of Westfield Mount	SSSI

These sites are shown in purple on Plan 1.3 Housing.

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

The sites remaining in SHLAA after taking account of sites in table 1.3.1 and table 1.3.2 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 1.3.3 shows the colour coding and reasons for the sites being within the relevant categories. The colour coding and sites listed are shown on Plan 1.3 Housing.

TABLE 1.3.3: SITES ASSESSED FOR POTENTIAL HOUSING ALLOCATIONS IN AIREBOROUGH

No. of sites assessed	SHLAA ref and colour coding	Site Address	Ward	Site Area (ha.)	Site Capacity	Summary Reason for Colour Coding
1	12	Adjacent To Ivy House, Off Larkfield Drive, Rawdon	Guiseley & Rawdon	0.45	6	Access would require removal of existing dwelling. There is a Tree Preservation Order over the site, however, the site has only limited tree cover and this could be considered in detailed design.
2	180	Brookfield Nursing Home, Swaine Hill Terrace, Yeadon	Guiseley & Rawdon	0.419	7	Set within Nunroyd Park the site is surrounded by N1 green space. The building is a positive building set within the conservation area and should be retained if possible. Conversion of the existing building would be the best use for the site, this would not require allocation. Adopted highway would need extending but acceptable in highway terms.
3	1103	Harry Ramsdens off Bradford Road, Guiseley	Guiseley & Rawdon	0.26	4	Planning permission implemented but not complete. Site boundary amended to delete retail element from site. Site considered suitable for residential development, and has extant permission.
4	1104	Greenside Farm, Yeadon, LS19	Guiseley & Rawdon	2.222	58	Green Belt site. Existing city farm on site. Development of site 1104 in isolation would constitute urban sprawl, but development along with sites 2162 and 3033 would be contained by development on 3 sides. Highways consider that the site can be suitably accessed.
5	1113	Land at Silverdale Avenue, Guiseley	Guiseley & Rawdon	1.981	71	Loss of allotments would need to be considered through the greenspace review. (See Greenspace section page 23 question G8)
6	1148	Land off Thorpe Lane / Bradford Road Guiseley	Guiseley & Rawdon	20.539	539	Green Belt site. Development of the site would result in a breach of Thorpe Lane, an important boundary preventing sprawl towards Bradford. The Green Belt is necessary to prevent coalescence between settlements of Guiseley and Menston. The site is attractive and a designated Special Landscape Area. Part of the site is also N6 greenspace in the current UDP (see question G9, page 24). Development would require footway improvements on Thorpe Lane and access through High Royds site.

No. of sites assessed	SHLAA ref and colour coding	Site Address	Ward	Site Area (ha.)	Site Capacity	Summary Reason for Colour Coding
7	**1180A**	Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20	Guiseley & Rawdon	1.164	37	Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development due to Highways concerns and the fact that development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. A comprehensive development along with sites 1311A & 2163A would be appropriate. Site A (the northern section) has a road frontage and relates well to the urban area, when considered with 1311A and 2163A. This smaller site (ie site A) will put less pressure on the road network. Traffic calming in Silverdale Estate would be required.
8	**1180B**	Land off Coach Road, Guiseley LS20	Guiseley & Rawdon	2.7265	72	Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development due to Highways concerns and the fact that development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. The quality of the road network would prevent a large development (both A and B) in this area.
9	**1194**	Land at Thorpe Lane - Hawksworth Lane, Guiseley LS20	Guiseley & Rawdon	2.224	58	Green Belt site. The site is not considered to be well connected to the urban area. Thorpe Lane is a main road and acts a strong defensible boundary that should not be breached. Development of the site would set a precedent for urban sprawl.
10	**1199 (most of the site is in the adjacent area – North)**	Moseley Wood Gardens	Otley and Yeadon	1.528	27	The majority of the site is a Protected Area of Search (PAS) site in the UDP, so not within the Green Belt. Most of the site falls within North Leeds area, but capacity and area have been split between Aireborough and North Leeds on a pro-rata basis. However, the part of the site within Aireborough is Green Belt. The railway is considered to form a strong defensible boundary which would prevent further sprawl. Capacity limited to 200 due to access constraints (split over the two areas).
11	**1221**	Gill Lane, Yeadon LS19	Guiseley & Rawdon	5.908	155	Green Belt site. Well contained site with strong connections to the urban area. Site does not perform well against the purposes of Green Belt. Access onto A65, limited frontage onto Gill Lane.
12	**1255A**	Land at Shaw Lane, Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon	Guiseley & Rawdon / Otley & Yeadon	6.838	180	Green Belt site. Site 1255 has been split into two sections, as the northern section is not considered suitable for development. By splitting the site in two the southern section relates better to the settlement and a lower capacity puts less pressure on the existing highway network. Development of site A would constitute urban sprawl.

No. of sites assessed	SHLAA ref and colour coding	Site Address	Ward	Site Area (ha.)	Site Capacity	Summary Reason for Colour Coding
13	1255B	Land at Shaw Lane, Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon	Guiseley & Rawdon	8.924	200	Green Belt site. Site 1255 has been split into two sections, as the northern section is not considered suitable for development. By splitting the site in two the southern section relates better to the settlement and a lower capacity puts less pressure on the existing highway network. Single point of access from Banksfield Mount limits site capacity.
14	1256	Land at Wills Gill off Carlton Lane, Guiseley.	Guiseley & Rawdon	11.095	289	Green Belt site. The site is not well connected to the urban area, and would not constitute rounding off of the settlement. As such development would represent urban sprawl. The site has access constraints.
15	1308	land to the Rear of and including Naylor Jennings Mill Off Green Lane , Yeadon	Guiseley & Rawdon	5.964	126	Brownfield site in urban area. There are some restraints on site (large ponds and trees) but these could be mitigated against and would not prevent the site coming forward.
16	1311A	Land to the South of Coach Road, Guiseley	Guiseley & Rawdon	1.192	38	Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 2163A would be appropriate. Site A (the northern section) has a road frontage and relates well to the urban area, when considered with 1180A and 2163A. This smaller site (ie site A) will put less pressure on the road network. Traffic calming in Silverdale Estate would be required.
17	1311B	Land to the South of Coach Road, Guiseley	Guiseley & Rawdon	1.206	38	Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development. Development of site B would extend further into the green belt and not relate well to the existing settlement pattern.
18	2038	Low Mills, Guiseley	Guiseley & Rawdon	7.228	144	This is a brownfield site currently allocated for employment use in the existing UDP. The site would require significant works to enable residential development. The site dips into a valley through the centre which may limit the potential capacity. However, the site is not in the green belt and is well contained. Highways have raised concerns regarding access and accessibility of the site; Milners Road and Ghyll Road both lack good footway provision, Milner Road would need land from the Council's waste site for widening.

No. of sites assessed	SHLAA ref and colour coding	Site Address	Ward	Site Area (ha.)	Site Capacity	Summary Reason for Colour Coding
19	**2118**	Haw Lane, Yeadon	Otley & Yeadon	2.277	60	The site is a Protected Area of Search (PAS) site in the existing UDP, but has since received designation as a Village Green and so is not considered suitable for development.
20	**2119**	Canada Road, Rawdon	Guiseley & Rawdon	1.088	34	The site is a Protected Area of Search (PAS) site in the existing UDP. Whilst the site is considered to be well related to the urban area, Highways object to development of the site due to poor visibility of site access.
21	**2160 (Part of site in North area)**	Ling Bob, Scotland Lane, Horsforth	Otley & Yeadon / Horsforth	27.584	724	Green Belt site. The capacity and site area has been split - 27.6ha, 724 capacity in Aireborough, 45.33ha, 1189 capacity in North Leeds. Development of such a large site would represent unrestricted urban sprawl and Highways objections include local congestion that would arise if developed.
22	**2161**	West of Westfield Mount, Yeadon	Guiseley & Rawdon	3.173	83	Part Green Belt. The site has no road frontage and would require the development of the adjoining SHLAA site 2038 for access purposes. The western section of the site is a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and could not be developed. The eastern section is covered in dense trees and is also considered unsuitable.
23	**2162**	North of Warm Lane, Yeadon	Guiseley & Rawdon	2.753	72	Green Belt site. Development of site 2162 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, but development along with sites 1104 and 3033 would be contained by development on 3 sides. Highways consider that the site can be suitably accessed.
24	**2163A**	Sodhall Hill, South of Park Road, Guiseley	Guiseley & Rawdon	2.895	76	Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development. A comprehensive development along with sites 1180A & 1311A would be appropriate. Site A (the northern section) has a road frontage and relates well to the urban area, when considered with 1180A and 1311A. This smaller site (ie site A) will put less pressure on the road network. Traffic calming in Silverdale Estate would be required.
25	**2163B**	Sodhall Hill, South of Park Road, Guiseley	Guiseley & Rawdon	1.299	76	Green Belt site. The site has been split in two as the southern section is considered unsuitable for development due to Highways concerns and the fact that development would not be well related to the existing settlement pattern. The quality of the road network would prevent a large development (both A and B) in this area.

No. of sites assessed	SHLAA ref and colour coding	Site Address	Ward	Site Area (ha.)	Site Capacity	Summary Reason for Colour Coding
26	**3026**	Land between Mire Beck and Ings Lane	Guiseley & Rawdon	11.334	535	Green Belt site. Site is well contained. Development would round off the settlement. Highways concerns about local road congestion, mitigation measures would be required.
27	**3028**	Kelcliffe Mount/West View, Kelcliffe Lane, Guiseley, LS20 9DE	Guiseley & Rawdon	15.083	396	Green Belt site. Visible location above the urban area. Development would constitute urban sprawl, unrelated to the existing settlement pattern. Highways issues re access.
28	**3029**	Land south of Wills Gill, Guiseley, LS20 9NG	Guiseley & Rawdon	5.059	133	Green Belt site. The site has been redrawn to exclude the residential properties along Wills Gill. The site is well connected to the urban area but does perform a role in safeguarding the countryside from further sprawl.
29	**3030**	Yeadon Banks, Haw Lane, Yeadon, LS19 7	Otley & Yeadon	3.835	101	Green Belt site. Part of the site also falls within the designated Village Green. Development of the site in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern and constitute urban sprawl.
30	**3031**	Ghyll Mount, Yeadon, LS19 7GA	Guiseley & Rawdon	1.309	41	Green Belt site, not particularly well related to the existing settlement pattern. Highways concerns re access - adoptable highway not considered achievable.
31	**3033**	High Fold Farm, Warm Lane, Rawdon, LS19 7DN	Guiseley & Rawdon	8.16	214	Green Belt site. Development of site 3033 in isolation would be unrelated to the existing settlement pattern, but development along with sites 1104 and 2162 would be contained by development on 3 sides. Highways consider that the site can be suitably accessed.
32	**3034 (Small part of site within North Leeds area)**	Cold Harbour Farm, Bayton Lane, Yeadon and Rawdon Billings	Guiseley & Rawdon / Otley & Yeadon	56.25	1888	Green Belt site. The site covers the area commonly known as Rawdon Billings and envelopes Billing Hill, a protected nature area. The site is large and development would have a serious impact on the openness of the Green Belt and result in a large area of urban sprawl. The area and capacity of has been split - 2.66ha, capacity of 70 in North Leeds housing market characteristic area, majority (56.25ha) in Aireborough.

No. of sites assessed	SHLAA ref and colour coding	Site Address	Ward	Site Area (ha.)	Site Capacity	Summary Reason for Colour Coding
33	3326	Land north of Bayton Lane, Rawdon	Otley & Yeadon	7.643	200	Green Belt site. The site contains a Site of Ecological or Geological Interest (SEGI) and is not considered suitable for development.The area not covered by a SEGI is separated from the settlement and given the sensitive nature of the area development is not considered appropriate.
34	3329	Land to rear of 22-66 Layton Lane, Rawdon, Leeds	Horsforth	3.57	93	Green Belt site. The site is well contained due to the trees along the eastern boundary, which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and provide natural screening. Due to the enclosed nature of the site, development would have limited impact on the Green Belt. The adopted spur road between 24&26 Layton Lane is wide enough to create access to the site, access also available between 64 & 68 but is private. A single point of access would be adequate for the proposed level of development c100 units.
35	3331	Land at Knott Lane/Layton Lane, Rawdon, Leeds, LS19 6JW	Horsforth	1.011	21	Green Belt site, but well contained and would not constitute sprawl if developed. Could be developed along with site 4095; the sites would need to jointly provide a realignment of Knott Lane to provide a 90 degree approach to the A65. Accessibility by public transport and to facilities is good.
36	3366	Harrogate Road, Yeadon (adjacent to Airport)	Otley & Yeadon	3.9	102	Green Belt site. Self contained between existing housing and airport runway. Development would constitute rounding off of settlement. Site would need to be accessed from a new roundabout on Victoria Avenue.
37	4019	Kirkland House, Queensway, Yeadon	Guiseley & Rawdon	0.465	17	Brownfield site located in residential area. Site was formerly in residential use as a care home. Residential use therefore considered acceptable and no Highways issues raised.
38	4020	Hollins Lane/Hawstone Avenue, Guiseley	Guiseley & Rawdon	3.043	80	Green Belt site. Development would form an extension to the existing residential area on the eastern boundary. However, development could set a precedent for unrestricted urban sprawl.
39	4043	Ings Lane, Guiseley	Guiseley & Rawdon	3.57	94	Green Belt site. Site is contained by existing development & the railway line and so relates relatively well to the existing settlement. Sufficient frontage for access, would require footway on frontage and crossing points to footway opposite. Accessibility to public transport poor, other facilities acceptable. Development of site 3026 first is considered preferable.

No. of sites assessed	SHLAA ref and colour coding	Site Address	Ward	Site Area (ha.)	Site Capacity	Summary Reason for Colour Coding
40	**4095**	Land to west of Knott Lane, Rawdon	Horsforth	1.925	61	Green Belt site. Site is well contained by existing development and would not constitute sprawl if developed. Could be developed along with site 3331; the sites would need to jointly provide a realignment of Knott Lane to provide a 90 degree approach to the A65. Accessibility by public transport and to facilities is good.

1.3.6 Para 1.3.2 identifies that in this area we need to allocate sites to accommodate 1548 residential units. From table 1.3.3 above, the total capacity from green sites alone is 806. The total capacity from amber sites is 1487. The total from both green and amber is 2293 which is over and above the 1548 we are seeking, so not all green and amber sites will eventually need to 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.

1.4.0. AIREBOROUGH EMPLOYMENT ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

See Plan 1.4 Employment

1.4.1 The employment sites in Aireborough 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.

In Aireborough these sites are:

Table1.4.1: Office based development
'Lime Green' sites for office development.

Site Ref	Address	Site area (ha)	Total floorspace (sq m)	Reason for retention
Lime Green				
2900890	Warren House Lane Harrogate Rd Yeadon LS19	0.80	3000	Forms part of a UDP allocation as a Key Business Park.
2801002	Ph3 Rawdon Park Green Lane Yeadon	0.25	510	Current site with outstanding planning permission for employment purposes.
TOTAL		**1.05**	**3510**	

Table1.4.2: Industrial & Warehousing
'Lime Green' sites for industrial and warehousing development.

Site Ref	Address	Site area (ha)	Reason for retention
Lime Green			
2801642	Adj Westfield Mills Yeadon	0.12	Current site with outstanding planning permission for employment purposes.
2901210	White House Lane Yeadon LS20	4.60	Retain the site as whilst it has topographical issues it has good access and whilst out of centre it is in a good strategic location.
2900893	Airport West Ph3 Warren House Lane Yeadon LS19	0.55	Not a particularly sustainable site. However given its location within a Key Business Park (UDP allocation) retain for employment purposes.
2900895	Airport West Ph4 Warren House Lane Yeadon LS19	0.84	No other type of built form would be acceptable in this location.
2900891	Coney Park Harrogate Rd Yeadon LS19	16.50	Temporary uses on site would not preclude future development.
TOTAL		**22.61**	

1.4.2 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 Aireborough. 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 1.4.3 below shows the colour coding and reasons for the sites being within the relevant categories. The sites are shown on Plan 1.4 Employment.

Leeds/Bradford International Airport (LBIA)

1.4.3 The Core Strategy recognises the importance of LBIA to Leeds and the wider City Region economy. Core Strategy Policy SP 12 indicates that continued managed growth will be supported. This could entail not only increased passenger growth and the additional facilities associated with this but also the development of complementary employment proposals that benefit from or are attracted by immediate proximity to the airport. The airport could further develop its role to become an employment hub. There is already some land in the vicinity of the airport which could be available for such development but additional growth could require a change to green belt boundaries. Potential most obviously exists to the north of the airport, immediately to the east of the existing employment sites. Any significant development would be contingent on major highway and public transport improvements, would need to recognise and take account of local impacts and could only be developed following extensive dialogue with neighbouring communities.

In addition the LBIA would be encouraged to recognise their role as an influential neighbour within both north Leeds communities and the city as a whole.

Table 1.4.3 SITES ASSESSED FOR POTENTIAL EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS IN AIREBOROUGH

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							
	2802330	Office Element High Royds Hospital	1.23	4612.5	ELR	Remove	Not deemed to be an acceptable location for office use. Subsequent consent for residential granted.
Industry							
Green							
None							
Amber							
None							
Red							
	2802310	Low Mills Guiseley Ls19 *	7.20		ELR	Remove	The site has been available for over 20 years and will not come forward for employment use because of issues over contamination and access.
	2800611	Lcc Depot Off Green Lane Yeadon	1.37		ELR	Remove	Site is not available as currently used by Leeds City Council as a Highways Depot. No plans for relocation.

*SHLAA site also being considered for housing (see page 13, SHLAA site 2038)

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.

E5. Do you consider that in addition to the growth of airport operations to support increased passenger numbers and subject to highway and public transport improvements there is scope for additional employment uses beyond the airport operational land boundary that might be attracted by proximity to LBIA? Do you have any views on the scale and location of such development?

1.5.0 AIREBOROUGH GREENSPACE ISSUES AND OPTIONS:

1.5.1 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 Aireborough Housing Market Characteristic Area (Plan 1.5A) and 2) the categories or types of greenspace (Plan 1.5B). 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 1.5A. Sites proposed to be deleted will be considered in the context of the surpluses and deficiencies identified in each particular area.

1.5.2 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 1.5B for completeness.

1.5.3 **Quantity**

Overall Aireborough is well provided for in terms of greenspace, especially if cemeteries and golf courses are taken into account (for which there are no set standards for provision). The background paper provides an analysis of greenspace provision in the 3 wards of Guiseley and Rawdon, Horsforth and Otley and Yeadon. The latter 2 wards fall partly within Aireborough and partly in adjacent areas.

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

Table 1.5.1 Surpluses and deficiencies in different types of greenspace in Aireborough

	Parks and Gardens	Outdoor Sports (excluding education)	Amenity	Children & Young People	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
Guiseley & Rawdon	Surplus (0.6ha)	Deficiency (-0.2ha)	Surplus (0.17ha)	Requirement met	Deficiency (-0.06ha)	Surplus (0.35ha)
Horsforth	Deficiency (-0.08ha)	Surplus (0.05ha)	Deficiency (-0.25ha)	Deficiency of 2.8 facilities	Deficiency (-0.07ha)	Surplus (3.03ha)
Otley & Yeadon	Surplus (0.36ha)	Deficiency (-0.2ha)	Surplus (0.15ha)	Surplus (4.8 facilities)	Surplus (0.15ha)	Surplus (9.49ha)
Average	Surplus (0.29ha)	Requirement met	Surplus (0.02ha)	Surplus (2.1 facilities)	Surplus (0.01ha)	Surplus (0.08ha*)

* NB: Figure minus Otley Chevin and Otley Sand & Gravel Pits

1.5.5 There is a mixture of surpluses and deficiencies across wards and types of greenspace. Horsforth is deficient in the most types, however the amount by which the ward is deficient is comparatively small in relation to amenity space and allotments. 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.

1.5.6 There is a need to provide more 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 Horsforth to parks and gardens, amenity, children and young peoples equipped play facilities 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.

1.5.7 A number of greenspace sites have been suggested for housing. The following questions (pages 23 and 24) 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.

1.5.8 **Quality**

Overall, the majority of sites (64 out of 73) fall below the required quality standard of 7, which indicates an issue of substandard greenspace provision across all wards and typologies. There are no natural or amenity greenspace sites scoring 7 or above and only 1 site each of parks and gardens, children and young peoples play facilities and allotments.

1.5.9 **Accessibility**

Most of the built up area within the Aireborough area boundary has acceptable access to the various types of greenspace, except tennis courts. The least well served are parts of Tranmere Park on the western edge which are beyond the acceptable distances for children and young people's equipped play facilities, allotments and natural greenspace. In addition, an area of Rawdon/Yeadon around Green Lane, Harrogate Road and Batter Lane has substandard access to amenity greenspace. 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.

QUESTIONS ABOUT GREENSPACE PROVISION IN AIREBOROUGH.

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 Aireborough

G8 Most of the existing UDP N1A (allotments) designation at land at Silverdale Avenue, Guiseley has been put forward as a possible housing site (SHLAA ref 1113, see page 8). The majority of this site was identified as allotments in the Open Space Audit however they are now disused. Do you think this land should be retained as greenspace (in one of the identified typologies) or released for housing?

G9 The existing UDP N6 (playing pitchs) designation at High Royds Hospital and the surrounding open space identified as amenity greenspace in the Open Space Audit, has been put forward as a possible housing site along with land to the south (SHLAA ref 1148, see page 8). Open space provision has been reconfigured within the High Royds development site however do you think this particular 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	1/10	Nunroyd Beck, Yeadon	Less than 0.2ha threshold.
N1 Greenspace	1/18x	Tranmere Court (off Bradford Road), Tranmere Park, Guiseley	Partially developed and partially in private rear gardens.
N1 Greenspace	1/31	Rockfield Terrace, Yeadon	Partially incorporated into private gardens and partly laid out as hard standing for car parking. Remaining open grassed area below the threshold of 0.2ha.
N1 Greenspace	1/34	Blake Crescent, Yeadon	2 sites less than 0.2ha threshold.
N1A Allotments	1/20	High Royds Hospital	Open space been reconfigured through approved scheme and provided elsewhere on the site.