

DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL

7TH FEBRUARY 2006

PRESENT Councillor A Carter in the Chair
Councillors Blake, D Blackburn, Cleasby
Congreve, Harker, Leadley, J Procter, and Taggart

IN ATTENDANCE Councillor Fox

60 Late item

The Chair agreed to admit one late item to the agenda, (minute 62 refers). The item was not available when the agenda was despatched, although it had been circulated to the Panel prior to the meeting, and required urgent consideration to enable the minutes to be approved and the resolutions passed on to the next Executive Board meeting

61 Declarations of Interest

The following Members declared personal/prejudicial interests for the purposes of Section 81 (3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 13 of the Members Code of Conduct

Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector’s report on Chapter 13 (City Centre) – Councillor Leadley declared a personal interest as the Chair of the Scrutiny Commission (Flooding in Leeds) as the report contained details of sites within Holbeck Urban Village which might require a flood risk assessment (minute 63 refers)

Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector’s report on Chapter 13 (City Centre) – Councillor Carter declared a personal interest as a member of the Holbeck Urban Village Steering Group as the report contained proposals for Holbeck Urban Village (minute 63 refers)

62 Minutes

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Development Plan Panel meeting held on 24th January 2006 be agreed as a correct record

63 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector’s report on Chapter 6 (Transport) – Clarification of Policy T2D and T24A

Further to minute 58 of the meeting held on 24th January 2006, Members received a report providing further information of the context of the proposed new policies. Appended to the report was a copy of the proposed amendments for Members’ information

Members were informed that in respect of Policy T2D – (Public Transport Contributions) Plans Panels would still be able to refuse applications where important issues relating to public transport cannot be resolved to an acceptable standard, by citing a range of other policies

Regarding Policy T24A (Free Standing Longstay Car Parking), the Inspector

noted that the Council's approach was broad-brush, but considered this was pragmatic. Following Members' concerns at the last meeting, further discussions amongst officers took place resulting in the view that the proposed amendments by the Inspector provided scope for flexibility, where necessary and would not affect the regeneration of Leeds' outer townships

RESOLVED –

- (i) To agree the conclusions set out in the submitted report
- (ii) To agree the report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter 6 – Policy T2D as outlined in paragraph 4.5 of the submitted report, and the clarification of Policy T24A, and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

64 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector's report on Chapter 13 (City Centre)

The Director of Development submitted a report setting out the Inspector's recommendations for Chapter 13 (City Centre) including Alteration 7/003 (land at Kidacre Street) and the suggested modifications, a copy of which was appended to the submitted report

The main points of the proposed alterations in respect of Leeds Waterfront, Holbeck Urban Village Strategic Housing Site and land at Kidacre Street together with the Inspector's comments to issues raised were highlighted by officers

Members discussed the following matters

- who would fund and carry out the flood risk assessment referred to in the report
- whether the amendment at para 13.7.73h to read 'Developers will be encouraged to create and enhance pedestrian routes through the area' was strong enough

Officers stated that in respect of the flood risk assessment, this had not been resolved and that it was part of a broader issue

Members' wish to do more than 'encourage' developers to create pedestrian routes through HUV was noted. The Chief Strategy and Policy Officer stated that the amendment would provide a strong pointer to Developers of the position the Council would take in negotiations. However, it should be noted that problems could occur where the owners of the Canal Basin will not be able to give access beyond their ownership

RESOLVED –

- (i) To agree the report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendations in respect of Chapter 13 (Alteration 13/017, 13/019 and 7/003)
- (ii) To accept the Inspector's recommendations in respect of Alteration 13/017, 13/019 and 7/003
- (iii) To recommend approval of these recommendations to Executive Board in due course

65 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector’s report on Chapter 15 (East Leeds)

The Panel received a report on the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 15 (East Leeds) and the proposed amendments which were appended to the report for Members’ consideration

As the report referred to Protected Area of Search (PAS) sites which were considered at the meeting held on 24th January 2006, those elements of the report were not discussed at this meeting

Officers presented the report and highlighted the key issues in relation to:

- the Area Statement
- Aire Valley Leeds – including the Transportation Study, Historic Sites and Areas and Knostrop Waste Water Treatment Works (KWWTW)
- Hunslet Riverside Strategic Housing Site
- East Leeds Extension (ELE)

Officers reported receipt of a letter from Mr Cunnane on behalf of Thorner Parish Council setting out their views on the ELE section of the Chapter Members of the Panel had also received a copy of this letter

Members discussed the report and commented on the following matters:

- KWWTW and the need to take seriously the concerns raised by Yorkshire Water set out in paragraphs 4.7-4.10 of the submitted report
- whether any additional investment was planned to reduce the odour problem from the treatment plant, particularly in light of the technological advancements which enabled filter beds to be sited under cover
- the comments of the Inspector and officers in relation to the ELE including:
 - Density of development
 - concerns about the figure of 2900 and 3900 dwellings on the site, as estimated by the Inspector
 - the extent of the site given over to the possible creation of the East Leeds Orbital Route (ELOR), and the relatively low percentage (60%) of the site remaining for development
- ELOR
 - the Inspector’s comments on the possibility of building in the region of 700 units without the need for the East Leeds Orbital Route (ELOR) and the highways implications of this
 - the need to establish whether the ELOR was necessary and if it was, whether it should be a single or dual carriageway
 - the current lack of funding for the ELOR
 - the earliest that any sites in the ELE could be considered for development
 - the impact of the increased level of housing that the Authority may be required to provide under the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy – ie 2600 dwellings per annum from a previous figure of 1930

Officers responded and provided the following information:

- in respect of improvements to KWWTW, Members were informed that Yorkshire Water was investing to improve the environmental impact of their operation

- regarding the estimated number of dwellings on site, the Inspector had taken into account the need for the site to also provide other facilities, ie, POS, employment land etc, so reducing the amount of land for housing. Furthermore the estimates provided by the Inspector should not be viewed as a target, but rather as a broad indication of the levels of housing which could be achieved on site that

- regarding timescales for development, if Grimes Dyke and Redhall were included this could be 2008, and without them it would probably be 2012. However, the actual timing will depend on the housing land supply position determined through monitoring, particularly the scale of continuing brownfield windfall sites

Members discussed the timescales and enquired whether it might be possible to return the land to PAS, thereby making it 2016 before it was reviewed, or earlier if consideration was given to returning the land to Green Belt

Officers responded and stated that the ELE had been included in the Inspector's package of proposals, and if the site was returned to PAS status as a modification then this would be expected to generate objections, including raising the issue of alternative sites. Such objections would be likely to result in the need for a second Public Inquiry

Members considered this information and it was the majority view of the Panel to request Counsel's advice on this, and to defer a decision in respect of the ELE sites to a further meeting

RESOLVED –

(i) To agree the report with the exception of those modifications relating to The East Leeds Extension – (ie 15/023/15/024/15/025/15/026/15/027 and 16/016) as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

(ii) To request the Chief Legal Services Officer to seek Counsel's advice on the issues raised by the Panel relating to the ELE, and to convene a further meeting of the Development Plan Panel to consider the response to the Inspector's recommendations in light of the advice received from Counsel, with a view to making a recommendation on this matter to Executive Board in due course

66 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector's report on Chapter 19 (Otley and Mid-Wharfedale)

The Director of Development submitted a report setting out the proposed modifications to Chapter 19, in light of the Inspector's recommendations. A copy of the proposed amendments was appended to the submitted report

As the report referred to Protected Area of Search (PAS) sites which were considered at the meeting held on 24th January 2006, those elements of the report were not discussed at this meeting

Officers presented the report and highlighted the main issues, for Members' consideration

RESOLVED To agree the report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendations in respect of Chapter 19 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

67 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector's Report on Chapter 24 (Wetherby)

The Panel considered a report on the Inspector's recommendations for Chapter 24 (Wetherby) and the proposed modifications in response to the Inspector's comments. A copy of the proposed amendments was appended to the submitted report

As the report referred to Protected Area of Search (PAS) sites which were considered at the meeting held on 24th January 2006, those elements of the report were not discussed at this meeting

The Panel discussed the report and commented on the need for Affordable Housing in the Rural North, the future of the Thorp Arch Trading Estate (TATE) and the implications in terms of highways issues on TATE through the planned extension to the British Library

Members questioned the comments regarding there being no contamination on the TATE site, in view of its use as a former munitions site

RESOLVED - To agree the report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's comments in respect of Chapter 24 (Wetherby) and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

68 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector's Report on Chapter A7 (Waste Management)

The Director of Development submitted a report setting out the proposed modifications to Chapter A7 (Waste Management) following the Inspector's recommendations

The Head of Planning of Economic Policy provided further information following a meeting with Government Office and indicated that there might be scope to pick up waste management matters as part of the Core Strategy

RESOLVED – To agree the report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter A7 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course