



## Garforth Neighbourhood Planning Forum

Garforth Neighbourhood Planning Forum would like to submit the following comments and observations on the Leeds City Council Site Allocation Plan in general and also specifically address proposals for site HG2-124 (1232b) Stourton Grange Farm South, Selby Road/Ridge Road.

The number system used attempts, where possible, to follow that used in the LCC response form

### Part 2.1

Our comments relate to the Leeds Site Allocation Plan

### Part 2.2

We are responding to a specific site HG2-124 (1232b,) Site address Stourton Grange Farm South, Selby Road/Ridge Road

We do not agree with the proposed use of this site. We wish to comment on the site assessment and requirements

- **Green belt.**

1. It is 99.88% green belt.
2. We consider it to be a massive extension which would result in an isolated development not connected to Garforth as there is only one boundary with an existing barrier of Garforth Cliff, gardens with mature trees and no connecting roads
3. It would not check the unrestricted sprawl of Garforth to the east as the possible site to the north would be classed as infill
4. If developed this site would lead to the coalescence of Garforth and Micklefield at Peckfield Business Park( see LCC interactive map ) .
5. It would not assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment as there is the strong defensible boundary of Garforth Cliff between this proposed site and Garforth with a footpath across.
6. The site includes an area of ancient woodland ( Stubbs Wood) which has a TPO and other significant protected and unprotected trees and hedge cover at all boundaries.
7. This site is classified as grade 2 agricultural land (95.75%).
8. The boundary road to the east of the site is a Roman road which would need to be modified to accommodate this large development safely. This is the only historic feature of the site. Development would not preserve this ancient road.
9. Development of this site would not assist urban regeneration as it is actively farmed arable land .

Together these qualities/properties perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

- **Local services. (identified on site1232B requirements/ assessment)**

1. Apart from identifying green belt there are no other UDP designations completed.

2. The nearest train station is >1km – >2km for many residents of this proposed site
3. bus stop >0.7km
4. The nearest shopping centre is Micklefield. The next nearest shopping centre is Kippax High Street. Third nearest shopping centre is Garforth Main Street
5. Public transport comments are unclear but state that it fails to meet standards, given a rank score of 2.
6. Access comments, the site requires multiple access points which cannot be made through the western boundary into Garforth.
7. There are no completed assessments for
  - 1)network rail,
  - 2)Yorkshire water,
  - 3)Environment agency
  - 4)Education
  - 5)Flood risk
  - 6)Gas
  - 7)Electric
  - 8)Fire & Rescue
  - 9)Telecoms

- **Highways. Garforth already has existing major traffic problems**

- Tailbacks of vehicles for half a mile wanting to exit the northbound carriageway of the M1 at junction 47
- The A1 M1 intersection has a major limitation that has serious implications for traffic flow around Garforth. Traffic leaving the northbound carriageway of the M1 at junction 47 has to travel 5/6 miles on local roads to join the A1 southbound. This problem also equally applies to traffic leaving the A1 northbound wishing to join the M1 southbound.
- There is severe traffic congestion on all routes surrounding Garforth, A63- A642- A656 at peak periods. This is exacerbated whenever there are disruptions eg road works, drainage repairs and accidents when traffic comes to a standstill on all routes in and out of Garforth.
- a. Congestion on the Main Street/ Aberford/Wakefield road (A642) and Lidgett Lane/ Selby Road (A63) at all times
- The A656 and A63 are accident blackspots
- The A656 is a Roman road and in our view is an historic monument requiring protection

The Highways Agency has already acknowledged significant network capacity issues with this site. All of the following road improvements would be necessary:

1. Restructuring the A1/M1 intersection to include a southbound link
2. Improvements to junction 47 entry and exit slip roads on both carriageways
3. A new dual carriage way link from junction 47 to the A63 preserving the Roman Road (A656)
4. A new dual carriageway from junction of the A642 and A63 ( southwest of Garforth) to the Peckfield roundabout A63 and A656
5. A relief road in the south of the HMCA joining M1 junction 45 to Allerton Bywater on the northern side of the river Aire

This major infrastructure would need to be put in place prior to any housing development.

- **UDP designations.** There are no identified requirements
  1. for green space ( all topographies )

2. retail ,
3. educational
4. healthcare
5. other community buildings required for a large development

- **Schools.** There are educational facilities mentioned in the site assessment,
  1. There is no mention of timescale when schools would be built, which has implications for children living in Garforth
  2. No allocation ( hectares)has been identified within the site specifically for education
  3. Regardless of new educational facilities proposed for this site we believe Garforth Academy will still be the first choice for parents putting more pressure on existing educational facilities.
  
- **Boundary, site assessment** see map The north west corner of the site contains the following which are not mentioned
  1. **Stubb Wood** the ancient protected woodland
  2. Further south along the identified boundary are mature trees providing landscaping to the housing below Garforth Cliff. Unless the site boundary is modified to protect all trees and woodland, they could be removed by the developer.
  3. This site includes some land to the west (not clearly identified on the site map) which is in different ownership and permission to develop has not been granted.
  4. The site runs alongside the Roman Road
  5. There is a footpath running north/ south along the western edge of the site which has not been identified on this site map, but identified on OS maps
  
- **Ecology site assessment:**

There are several groups of trees, bushes and hedgerow cover along all the site boundaries which play a vital role in carbon absorption, noise reduction and landscaping. These need to be protected, as if removed will take many years to replace.

**Our comments relate to the Sustainability report: relating to site 1232B**

We have reviewed the sustainability appraisals for site and would like to make the following observations on the criteria below taken from the Table 2 SA objectives, Table 4 scoring criteria, Appendix 10 ( summary of significant effects of the site allocation) and Appendix 11 (SA definition of significant negative effects and associate mitigation)

SA objective	Our comments
<p><b>SA9 Community cohesion</b>                      Scored a double negative identifying that the site is considered to be significantly out of scale with settlement</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We agree that new large housing allocations potentially challenge the social cohesion of existing communities.</li> <li>2. We agree with the significant negative effects identified and consider that the scale of the site should be reduced significantly as the proposal represents a 41% increase in housing numbers in Garforth.</li> <li>3. The core strategy states that the largest settlement takes the largest allocation but this has not been adhered to elsewhere in the city – see our appendix 1.</li> </ol>
<p><b>SA11 minimise pressure on greenfield land.</b>                      Scores a double negative identifying that it is a greenfield/greenbelt site.</p>	<p>There are brownfield sites within the Garforth area and in the Outer South East HMCA that have been identified by LCC for other purposes (employment / industrial and retail ) ( SA report Appendix 3) These sites have not been developed during the past</p>

<p>Appendix 11 states that this issue cannot be addressed on site and should identify alternative brownfield sites</p>	<p>20 years and could be proposed for a change of use. ( Spatial Policy EC3 Part A (i) )</p>
<p><b>SA14 Improve Leeds ability to manage extreme weather conditions including flood risk</b> This is scored a positive as the site is classified as flood zone 1</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We challenge the relevance of this score in improving Leeds ability to manage flood risk. The housing area below Garforth Cliff along with other areas in Garforth, experience repeated incidences of flooding whenever there is heavy rain.</li> <li>2. The recent development on the side of Garforth Cliff has exacerbated this problem.</li> <li>3. We have been informed by the planners that the surface water from this site 1232B will at some point feed into the existing Garforth drainage system which is already overloaded.</li> </ol>
<p><b>SA18 Reducing pollution</b> This is scored as a zero. Criteria for this score relates to the development being situated outside 50 m of a motorway or 30 m of a major A road. Otherwise mitigation measures are necessary</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We challenge this score as the southern boundary will border the A63 Leeds to Selby Road (a major trunk road). Homes close to this road will suffer increased air pollution from the heavy traffic.</li> <li>2. 800 m from the eastern boundary there is an industrial waste site with an asbestos licence. There is a history of fumes from this site causing problems for Micklefield residents and 1232B will suffer in the same way depending on wind direction</li> </ol>
<p><b>SA 19 maintain and enhance landscape</b> This is scored as a zero, because there are no existing landscaping features to be retained. The UDP , core strategy policies and Neighbourhoods for Living SPG should be applied to assess landscape value</p>	<p>We challenge this score as the site contains several TPOs and an ancient woodland</p>
<p><b>SA20 consider scale of site in relation to existing settlement</b> This is scored a negative indicating it is a large greenfield site out of character with existing settlement, and the number of new housing allocations potentially challenge the object of retaining local distinctiveness particularly in outlying areas..</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We challenge this score which we think should be scored a double negative as it will disproportionately increase the housing by 41%. No other settlement/ town in the outer areas of the city has been asked to receive this number of new houses by a considerable margin. Garforth has been asked to take double the number of houses allocated to Morley, ten times more than Wetherby and 17 times more than Otley.</li> <li>2. 1232B is isolated from Garforth, being nearer to Micklefield and Kippax high streets than Garforth Main Street</li> </ol>
<p><b>SA21 Maintain and conservation</b> This is scored zero on the basis that it does not contain a heritage asset</p>	<p>We need to challenge this score as the eastern edge of the site is a Roman Road. Until now it has been open countryside and therefore protected from abuse. 1232B is planned to be built right up to this road and introduce significant additional traffic. Dozens of Roman sites have been discovered in and around Garforth and each one has been built over. We fear that close to the road significant Roman remains will be lost forever.</p>
<p><b>SA22A make efficient use of energy and natural materials</b> This is scored a double negative as it is grade 2 agricultural land in cultivation</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The NPPF para 112 states that where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, <u>LPA's should seek areas of poorer quality land in preference. There is no evidence that this work has been undertaken.</u></li> <li>2. The reason for its inclusion in the consultation is 'it is a local preference' We are not aware that a survey has been undertaken to</li> </ol>

substantiate this statement and no references are given. The Garforth neighbourhood Planning Forum was not consulted. Analysis of the earlier consultation feedback reveals that less than 1 percent of residents support this site

**Core strategy - Spatial policies - comments on 1232B**

Policy	Our Comments
<p><b>Spatial policy 1</b>  <b>Location of development.</b>                      To take advantage of existing services (i) the largest amount of development will be located in the main urban area and major settlements</p> <p>(iii) For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods</p> <p>(viii) to undertake a review of the green belt</p>	<p>(i)Garforth has been identified as a major settlement but our existing services are oversubscribed and infrastructure is overloaded. This policy is not adhered to with other settlements. See SA 20 above and appendix 1</p> <p>(iii) This statements relates to SA9 and SA20 above both of which have been scored a double negative for site 1232B</p> <p>(viii) a green belt review has not been undertaken. Green belt is an environmental constraint in the NPPG</p>
<p><b>Spatial policy 6 housing requirement and allocation of housing land</b></p> <p>(i) Sustainable location which meets standards of public transport accessibility, supported by existing or access to new local facilities and services</p> <p>(ii) Preference for brownfield and regeneration sites</p> <p>(iii) Least impact on green belt purposes</p> <p>(iv) Opportunities to reinforce or enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>(i)Nearest bus stop identified is 732.3 metres, nearest bus services to Leeds involves walking to Ninelands Lane ( or 166/163. Railway access will be &gt;2km for some residents. Services at peak times, particularly rail services are severely strained</p> <p>(ii)In Garforth brownfield sites appear not to have been considered for allocation. We are concerned that they will be developed for housing without the required planning permission following recent government legislation. Brownfield sites in outer south east HMCA have also not been considered</p> <p>(iii) This site would have a major impact on the main purposes of the green belt and would join Garforth to Micklefield.</p> <p>(iv) There is no evidence that site 1232B would enhance/reinforce the distinctiveness of Garforth. The opposite would occur.</p>

<p>(v) The need for realistic lead-in times.</p> <p>(vi) Generally avoiding or mitigating areas of flood risk</p>	<p>(v) 1232b has been placed in phase 1. Given the lack of services and infrastructure this is not a realistic lead in time.</p> <p>(vi) Whilst site 1232B is not within a flood risk zone, development on this site (above Garforth Cliff ) currently used for growing crops would inevitably exacerbate the current surface water flooding experienced by properties on land below the Garforth Cliff and Severn Drive.</p>
<p><b>Spatial policy 7 distribution of housing land and allocations</b> Table 3 identifies the outer south east HMCA with 7% and outer north east with 8%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We note that the outer north east HMCA has been allocated a very similar number of houses but is approximately double the land mass of the outer south east</li> <li>• Garforth has been allocated 83% of new housing for the outer south east HMCA see map 7.</li> <li>• There has not been a local housing needs assessment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Spatial policy 10 Green belt</b> A review of the green belt will need to be carried out to accommodate the scale of housing... (iv) sites assessed against the purpose of including land in the green belt (NPPF )</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of green belt land for Site 1232b also removes the primary purposes of the green belt policy as it would join Garforth and Micklefield .</li> <li>• 1232A would no longer have a green belt role and lead to further development ( as rounding up )in a site to the north of 1232B</li> </ul>
<p><b>Spatial policy 11 transport infrastructure priorities</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site requirements for 1232B do not have any comment from Network Rail.</li> <li>• It is noted that Highways England Identify site 1232B as a major concern. It would be imperative for transport infrastructure to be put in place ahead of development</li> </ul>
<p><b>Spatial policy H1 managed release of sites</b> (ii) Locations with best public transport accessibility (iii)Locations with best accessibility to local services</p> <p>(iv) Locations with least impact on green belt objectives.</p> <p>(v)Consideration will be given to bring forward large sites to facilitate early delivery</p>	<p>(ii) site 1232B does not meet this requirement</p> <p>(iii) site 1232B does not meet this requirement as Garforth infrastructure and all services are severely overstretched Garforth with 2 railway stations and proximity to M1 would appear to be well supplied, however the reality of accessing these services needs to be acknowledged as they are at capacity and daylong parking is already taking place along major A roads in the area.</p> <p>(iv) site 1232B has a major impact on the main green belt purpose to prevent coalescence as LCC have not identified any brownfield sites.</p> <p>(v)Site 1232B would need major infrastructure to make the site sustainable. To commence in phase 1 will result in major disruption to all the surrounding area.</p>
<p><b>Policy H4 housing mix</b> Developments over 250 units, developers should submit a housing needs assessment.....</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although no local housing needs assessment has been undertaken, LCC (Table 4) has already identified the housing mix.</li> <li>• The requirements of the local community have not been determined.</li> <li>• The requirements for site 1232B do not state this as a necessity for developers.</li> <li>• It is our view that a full housing needs assessment should be</li> </ul>

	undertaken for Garforth before any development.
Policy P11 conservation ... historic environments and landscape will be conserved and enhanced	The east boundary of site 1232B is a Roman road and the site contains ancient woodland ( Stubbs Wood) There is no mention of the need to conserve the above
Policy G2 creation of new tree cover  States that loss of harm to Ancient Woodland and Veteran trees will be resisted	Site 1232B has Ancient Woodland and Veteran trees which carry TPOs. However these are not mentioned on either the site assessment or site requirements. The site boundary should be changed to preserve the existing tree cover
Policy G3 standards for open space, sport and recreation  5.5.11 average household size 2.4 is used to convert the green space standards	Site 1232B 2.4 x 2314 = 5553 individuals (assume 1000 children) will require Parks & gardens = 5.5 ha Outdoor sports provision = 6.6 Amenity = 2.74 Children’s play = 2 facilities Allotments = 1.32 Natural green space = 11ha <u>Total needed= 27.16 hectares plus 2 children’s play spaces</u>
Policy G4 new greenspace provision  See policy G3	No mention of actual requirements above stated in either the site assessment or site requirements. Garforth present greenspace does not meet LCC standards Appendix 2
Policy G8 Protection of important species and habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site 1232B although used for growing crops contains mature woodland, trees and hedges along the boundary.</li> <li>• There are many bird , small mammal , insect species and flora that are not found elsewhere because it is situated on a ridge of magnesium limestone that runs both sides of the A1, much of which is intensively managed arable land.</li> <li>• The woodland and hedgerows provide the habitats for the many species many of whom are threatened See our appendix 3</li> <li>• The plan should have demonstrated a need to develop this particular site and the requirements for developers should have included the need to preserve woodland, trees, hedges and native species.</li> </ul>
Policy EN5 managing flood risk Site 1232B is not considered to be in a flood zone. Site requirements state that development proposals should consider restoration of culvert /canalised watercourse. In recognition of drainage capacity issues in the Garforth area, the development must demonstrate that there will be no negative cumulative impact on the wider drainage system in the Garforth area	What will be the criteria for deciding there will be no negative impact? Based on our experience of recent housing development on the side of Garforth Cliff, when despite warnings about this known problem by local councillors and Garforth Flood Group and promises from developers to prevent such run off problems, surface water flooding worsened, we affirm with confidence that removal of this agricultural land will exacerbate the surface water flooding frequently experienced by residents below the Garforth Cliff.

### **Part 3 is the plan sound?**

#### **Is it positively prepared? NO**

1. The plan does not seek to meet the local needs for housing (CPRE). There has not been a survey of Garforth's housing needs. Site 1232B has been allocated 83% of all the new housing build in the Outer South East HMCA where is the evidence?
2. The site 1232B significantly fails to meet LCC Sustainability Appraisal scoring a double negative on 9, 11 and 22, scoring negative on SA3,4,6,13,16,20 and we disagree with the 0 score given to SA10,14,18, 19 and 21 which we consider to be a negative.
3. The site 1232B does not meet the Core Strategy spatial policies 1,6 see earlier reference
4. SAP & AVAP infrastructure background paper para 2.67 only requires developers to take care that surface water is adequately drained through the appropriate system. There is no mention of effect on existing sewerage systems which is of a major concern to Garforth
5. The plan does not meet Core strategy Spatial policy 10 as a review of the green belt has not been carried out and site 1232B is contrary to the purpose of the green belt policy as it would coalesce Garforth with Micklefield
6. The site boundary includes land which cannot be developed. There is Ancient Woodland and land in different ownership which has not been offered for development. The site includes another footpath from the Selby road running north to the east of the existing housing to Green Lane School which has not been identified but is shown on OS maps. Signposts have been removed.

#### **Is the plan justified? NO**

1. Site 1232B is the only site to be considered
2. It has been allocated 83% of all new housing for the Outer South East HMCA. There is no explanation for this decision.
3. This site fails to meet many of the SAs.
4. Other sites within the Outer South East HMCA with far better SA scoring have failed to be considered. See our appendix 4.
5. There is not enough evidence to release site 1232B.
6. There are many sites within the Outer South East HMCA which have been discounted for reasons which could equally apply to site 1232B Site Allocation Plan- site Allocation Proposals (housing and safeguarded land) No. 9 Outer South East.

#### **Is the plan effective? No**

Not whilst the plan for 1232B is allocated to phase 1 despite major concerns -having been identified by the Highways Authority and there is being no evidence that any public transport authority, Network Rail, Yorkshire Water, clinical commissioning groups, education, fire & rescue services, utilities (gas, electric and telecoms) have been consulted. Without consulting these agencies and the initial issues and problems being identified, site 1232B cannot be regarded as effective in delivering the allocated housing, associated infrastructure and services necessary to this large development.

#### **Is the plan consistent with national planning policy? No**

1. **NPPF 9 protecting green belt land**



Para 80 States that the green belt serves five purposes of which one is to prevent settlements merging, Site 1232B would coalesce Garforth with Micklefield

**Part 4 legally compliant**

**1. 4.1 Do you consider the plan to be legally compliant? NO**

**NPPF and the Localism Act 2011** relating to the Statement of Community Involvement.

LCC Community Involvement Principle	Our comments
Early contact	Residents of Garforth only became aware of the LCC Site Allocation Issue & Options Plan in July 2013 , 2 weeks before the consultation finished. The Forum was not designated until November 2014 therefore unable to comment on the Core Strategy. The Forum was not consulted on the second draft of the Site Allocations Plan (presently under consultation), therefore the Forum was unable to comment on and amend the draft of the Outer South East SAP. This is our first opportunity to comment.
Access to information	Information is not easily available, without monitoring the Development Plans Panel committee minutes we would not have been informed about the contents of the revised SAP in January 2015. There was no information to explain how we could have commented or requested our ward members to comment on our behalf. We were aware of this forthcoming consultation period, however we had to keep requesting the consultation dates .When the information was finally obtained there was little time to organise our publicity prior to the commencement of the consultation period. We have requested information explaining the removal of some of our voting areas which were placed in the Leeds East HMCA then allocated to the AVLAAP, and the subsequent deduction of the housing contribution from the Leeds East Target in June 2015.We are still waiting. There has been no explanation given for the selection of site 1232B when it significantly failed to meet many of the Sustainability Appraisal Criteria. We requested but were not given the main reference documents. Obtaining the relevant information from the many documents ( only one set ) is difficult in a sometimes noisy setting in the local library. Reading through them online is not a satisfactory alternative. In the absence of a Parish council a Neighbourhood Planning Forum should be consulted at all stages. This has not happened. There was no strategy for encouraging Parish Councillors to work with neighbourhood planning Forums to suggest housing allocations for their HMCA
Reducing barriers	The LCC Statement of Community Involvement states that ‘ opportunities will be provided to consult those parts of the community which do not normally get involved in planning issues’ ,yet fail to consult the Garforth Neighbourhood Planning Forum during the preparation of the SAP
Appropriate methods	The GNPf have not been consulted during the preparation of the SAP as it effects the Outer South East HMCA. Making the SAP available and providing maps is not the same as consultation during the preparation of these plans

- 4.2 Statement of Community involvement. For the Statement of Community Involvement ( adopted in 2007 ) to be included in the LDF, without reference to the requirements to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Localism Act ( 2011 ) and how the council will address them, must mean that the plan is **not consistent with national policy** and cannot be **legally compliant** if it does not incorporate the requirements of the Act
- Authority Monitoring report. The LDS document February 2015 states that an 'Authority Monitoring Report' will be prepared each year. It is understood that there has not been an Annual Monitoring report since 2013. If as stated the Localism Act requires such a report and no up to date report exists, then it is questionable that the plan is legally compliant. The Annual Monitoring Report is the vehicle which confirms compliance for both the Statement of community Involvement and the Gantt charts in section 4 of the Local development Scheme.
- It would therefore seem that the plan is unsound in these respects and cannot be considered effective since it cannot be monitored or justified or if it is not in accordance with the Localism Act, it cannot be considered legally compliant.

### Appendix 1

HMCA	Largest Community	Share of Housing Allocation	Actual Houses
Airebrough	Guiseley	61%	773
Outer North	Wetherby	7%	232
Outer North West	Otley	21%	135
Outer South	Rothwell	52%	920
Outer South East	Garforth	83%	2314
Outer South West	Morley	23%	1025
Outer West	Pudsey	26%	535

### Appendix 2

Using the LCC standard for green space topologies per 1,000 people. Garforth has a population of 15,000. Number of Children is estimated at 2,800

	Standard/1000	Garforth needs	We have	deficiency
Parks & Gardens	1 ha	15 ha	8.471ha	6.5
Outdoor sports provision Excluding educational facilities	1.2 ha	18ha	8.44	9.56
Amenity greenspace	0.45 ha	6.75 ha	3.15	3.6
Allotments	0.24 ha	3.6 ha	2.11	1.49
Natural green space	0.7 ha	10.5 ha	9.72	0.78
Children's play facilities	2	6	3	3

### Appendix 3

Two residents whose garden backs onto the site 1232B have listed the wildlife that has visited their garden over the last two years:

Birds: Blue, great, coal and long tailed tits  
Green, bull, gold and chaffinches,  
Siskens, Blackcaps, Great spotted woodpecker

Rare sightings include: yellow Hammers, Bramblings, Goldcrest, Lesser Spotted Woodpecker, Pied Wagtail and partridges. These will certainly disappear with the proposed development

Butterflies : orange tips, Comma, painted lady, peacocks, common blue  
Red Admiral, large tortoiseshell, listed as recently extinct  
Cinnabar moths

Mammals : Foxes and hedgehogs

The habitats of several of the above need protecting including the red kites and buzzards which are becoming a more frequent sight around Garforth.

### Appendix 4

This is a Sustainability Analysis summary for the rejected and the selected sites and sorted them into descending score sequence. Selected sites are in green, ignored sites in red.  
Site 1232b is ranked joint 41st choice out of 49 sites with only 6 sites scoring lower. The 40 sites ranked above 1232b have a capacity to accommodate 9897 houses

Rank	Site No	Description	Capacity	SA Score
1	5013	High St Kippax	16	13
2	5012	Fairview Farm Wakefield Rd Garforth 0.74ha	0	8
3	265	Ash Tree School Kippax	22	7
4	1357	Ninevah Lane Allerton Bywater	57	7
5	2032	Lotherton Way Ashh lane Garforth	23	6
6	1321	Moorleigh Drive Kippax	13	5
7	1366	Sth of Selby Rd Garforth	38	5
8	3100a	St Aidans Rd Gt Preston	70	5
9	1175a	Brigshaw Lane Kipapx	76	5
10	3321	Berry Lane Gt Preston	84	4
11	310	Barnsdale Rd Allerton Bywater	49	4
12	CFSM021	Wakefield Road 1044	575	3
13	3105	Allotment Gardens Sandgate Dr Kippax	55	3
14	3463	Nth of Brigshaw Allerton Bywater	125	3
15	3102	Park Lane Kippax	48	2
16	3109a	sth of Selby Rd Kippax	140	2
17	3112	Fairview Farm Wakefield Rd	243	2
18	2091	Aberford Rd	55	1
19	3104	Sandgate Lane Kippax	147	1
20	4250	Sandgate Terrace	100	1

21	1176	Pit Lane Micklefield	79	1
22	3109c	Selby Rd Leeds Rd Kippax	40	1
23	827	Carlton View Allerton Bywater	25	1
24	3101	Preston Lane/Wood lane	628	0
25	3096	Allerton Bywater	76	-1
26	3450	Nth of Station Rd Kippax	326	-1
27	3100b	Whitehouse Lane Gt Preston	40	-1
28	3109b	sth of Selby Rd Kippax	1721	-2
29	3103	The Hills Sandgate Lane Kippax	56	-3
30	3107	Lines Way Selby Rd Garforth	58	-3
31	3108	Lines Way Selby Rd Garforth	18	-3
32	3113	Barrowby Lodge	18	-3
33	CFSM028	North Garforth 2156	954	-4
34	1270	Pit Lane to Crescent Micklefield	333	-4
35	2156	West of Hawks nest wood Garforth	954	-4
36	1174	Micklefield Station Car park	18	-4
37	4200b	Newtown Farm Micklefield	42	-5
38	3106	Selby Rd Swillington Common	1916	-6
39	2157a	East of Ridge Rd Micklefield	631	-8
40	4200a	Newtown Farm Micklefield	28	-8
41	1232a	Stourton grange North	4000	-9
42	1237	Astley Lane Swillingtom	137	-9
43	1232b	Stourton Grange Sth	2314	-9
44	2157b	East of Ridge Rd Micklefield	2383	-10
45	3115	New Hold	68	-10
46	4258	Barrowby Lodge 14.4ha	0	-10
47	5002	Green lane Kippax	69	-12
48	1269	Pit Lane to Ridge Rd Micklefield	621	-13
49	3117	Sth of Selby Rd Garforth	40	-14