

## **DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL**

**6<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2005**

**PRESENT** Councillor A Carter in the Chair  
Councillors D Blackburn, Blake, Cleasby  
Harker, Leadley, Minkin (substitute for Councillor  
Congreve) J Procter and Taggart

**IN ATTENDANCE** Councillors Campbell and Fox

**28 Apologies for absence**  
Apologies were received from Councillor Congreve

**29 Declarations of interest**  
Councillor Leadley declared a prejudicial interest for the purpose of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 13 of the Members Code of Conduct: - Local Development Framework – Annual Monitoring Report, as the Chair of the Scrutiny Commission (Flooding in Leeds) (minute 35 refers)

**30 Minutes**  
**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2005 be agreed as a correct record

**31 Leeds UDP Review – Overview report, response to the Inspector’s report and proposed modifications**

Members received a report by the Director of Development setting out an overview of the Inspector’s report on the UDP Review and a Powerpoint presentation setting out the main recommendations. It was noted that a copy of the full report had been sent to all Elected Members, that it was available on the Council’s website and that the issues raised in the Inspector’s report would be debated over a series of meetings

Officers explained the ways in which the Council could respond to the Inspector’s report and the implications for the Authority in respect of these options

The main issues were highlighted relating to:

- Housing Strategy
- Affordable Housing
- Student Housing
- Protected Areas of Search (PAS)
- Policy E7 (Protection of Employment Land)
- Transport

following which the Panel discussed the report and sought further information from Officers

Members raised concerns about:

- the seeming focus of the Inspector on Government/National Guidance

Final minutes approved at  
The meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2006

rather than local expression

- the lack of support from the Inspector for the Council's attempt to tighten Policy E7, and that whilst some redundant brownfield sites could be accepted for residential use, it was important that the Authority's three planning panels had sufficient strength to resist residential use on brownfield sites in areas where employment land was needed

- the changes to the phasing of housing development within the plan period, and particularly the changes to the first phase from 2003-2011 to 2003-2008, and concerns that there would not be a chance to review the first phase before the commencement of the second phase

- PAS and the Inspector's rejection of the Council's rationale for putting PAS sites back into the Greenbelt, the need to retain the largest amount of greenspace possible and the damaging implications on communities where areas of land have been designated as PAS

- Student Housing and the Ashore Policy, its rejection by the Inspector and his view that problems created by a concentration of students could not be resolved through the planning process. Members discussed the effect on Headingley of a large student population in terms of loss of family housing, school closures etc and noted the impact that the large-scale purpose-built student accommodation which was emerging in other parts of the city could have for the Headingley area

**RESOLVED** – To note the recommendations contained in the Inspector's report, the Modification Process, the next steps to be taken in the process and the comments now made

### **32 Leeds UDP Review – Response to Inspector's report on Chapter 2 (Strategic Context) and Chapter 3 (Strategy)**

Members considered a report from the Director of Development setting out the Inspector's recommendations for Chapter 2 (Strategic Concept) and Chapter 3 (Strategy) of the Leeds UDP Review

The Panel noted that at the Inquiry the Council had argued against the objection raised regarding the provision of bus passes at a fixed price and the Inspector had agreed with the Council

**RESOLVED** – To agree the report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter 2 & 3 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

### **33 Leeds UDP Review – Response to Inspector's report on Chapter 4, General Policies**

Members considered a report from the Director of Development setting out the Inspector's recommendations for Chapter 4 General Policies of the Leeds UDP Review

The Panel noted the Inspector had suggested a slight amendment to the wording of the Chapter following an objection concerning the degree of community

involvement in the planning system and that officers were satisfied with the proposed amendments which were appended to the submitted report

**RESOLVED** – To agree the report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter 4 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

### **34 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector's report on Chapter 23 (West Leeds)**

Members considered a report from the Director of Development setting out the Inspector's recommendations for Chapter 23 (West Leeds) of the Leeds UDP Review

The Panel noted there were 16 Proposed Alterations in this chapter, however only one site, this being at Viaduct Road, had been the subject of an objection on the grounds that it should be included as a brownfield housing allocation, which was considered at the Inquiry

The Panel noted the Council's view at the Inquiry that the site was not in a location which was considered suitable for a residential use and that the Inspector had supported the Council's position

**RESOLVED** – To agree the report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter 23 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

### **35 Local Development Framework (LDF) – Annual Monitoring report (AMR)**

Further to minute 27 of the meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2005, the Panel received a copy of the Authority's first LDF Annual Monitoring Report for consideration and recommendation to Executive Board and the submission to the Secretary of State by 31<sup>st</sup> December 2005

The Head of Planning and Economic Policy spoke to the report and advised the Panel of the two key elements of the report, these being policy monitoring issues and the progress made against the Local Development Scheme

Members discussed the report and commented on the following matters:

- the vacancy rates contained within the report and details of the rates for the Kirkstall Ward
- the size of households and the possible future use of population surveys to determine the size of properties needed
- the decrease in the stock of affordable or social housing
- flooding issues and climate change, the use of historic data regarding flooding now being used by the Environment Agency to inform debate and the Agency's willingness to engage with the planning process at an early stage

**RESOLVED** –

i) To recommend to Executive Board approval of the Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report, for submission to the Secretary of State pursuant to Regulation 48 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

ii) That officers provide Councillor Minkin with the information requested

### **36 Leeds Local Development Framework – Draft Supplementary Planning Document – City Centre Public Realm Contributions**

The Panel considered a report setting out a draft SPD in respect of City Centre Public Realm Contributions concentrating on the way forward and specific methodology for assessing developer contributions to public realm improvements within the city centre. Appended to the report was a copy of the draft consultation document

Members were informed that as an indication of the levels of contributions which might be achieved, based on previous development rates in the city centre, the sum of £5m per year could be available for public realm use in the city centre

Members were informed of the definition of public realm as all parts of the built and natural environment where the public has free access and which would normally be owned and maintained by the City Council

Members discussed the report and officers were reminded that there were some areas of the city with the potential for public realm impact but that did not have public access, eg along train routes coming into the city

Whilst the Panel recognised the major issues within the city centre, for example the need to replace areas of Landmark Leeds, the possibility of extending public realm contributions to other parts of Leeds, eg Morley, Otley, Wetherby etc was also discussed and Members stated the importance of demonstrating the value of public realm to those developers being asked to make contributions

#### **RESOLVED –**

(i) To note the contents of the Draft City Centre Public Realm Contributions SDP for formal consultation commencing in January 2006

(ii) That the consultation document be sent to all Elected Members for their input into the process