

DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL

5TH JULY 2005

PRESENT Councillor D Blackburn in the Chair
Councillors Blake, Cleasby, Harker, Leadley
and Taggart

IN ATTENDANCE Councillor Fox and Councillor Schofield

11 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Carter and Congreve

12 Declarations of interest

Councillor Harker declared a personal interest in item 15, as a Trustee of the Thackray Medical Museum

13 Minutes

That the minutes from the Development Plan Panel meeting held on 25th May 2005 be approved as a correct record

14 Matters arising from the minutes

Further to minute 6 of the meeting on 25th May 2005, - Revised Statement of Community Involvement - Councillor Taggart reported that facilities existed within the Authority to translate documents into many more languages than had been specified within this document, and requested officers to indicate this on the information to be distributed as part of the SCI

15 East and South East Leeds (EASEL) Area Action Plan – Initial issues and consultation and sustainability scoping report

The Director of Development submitted a report setting out the strategic planning and regeneration context for the EASEL AAP, and provided background information, initial issues, progress on current initiatives, details of the consultation arrangements and a production timetable

Appended to the report was a plan showing the area of the EASEL AAP and officers tabled a copy of the recent publication 'Leeds Local Development Scheme' for Members' information

Officers spoke to the report and stressed the importance of the connectivity of the EASEL AAP with the City Centre and Aire Valley AAPs and the need to ensure that emerging proposals were in line with corporate ambitions for the area

Members were informed that the submitted timetable had been based on the milestones of the LDF, but were advised there could be some slippage and on-going negotiations would result in revisions to the timetable, which would be resubmitted for the Panel's information

Members considered the report and commented on the following issues:

- the specified boundaries, and that a small part of City and Hunslet ward falls within the EASEL AAP area which could skew economic

statistics, and that part of Chapel Allerton ward was also included within the specified AAP area

- that in the broad role of the AAP, some reference should be made to the artistic and cultural life within the City
- that for future reference, where regeneration projects have not been successful in the City, greater feedback should be provided
- that reference should be made to the cultural diversity of the area and the specific housing needs of minority ethnic groups in Harehills should be recognised
- the importance of public transport in this area and the need for an additional station between the City Centre and Cross Gates
- footpaths within the area and that consideration be given to defining footpaths, particularly before areas are developed
- the need to ensure new developments are well designed, and that existing good quality buildings within the area should be retained
- that the statements contained within the submitted report regarding educational developments in the area were not yet definitive
- the methods to keep Ward Members informed beyond the consultation process and the need for strong links between the Development Plan Panel and the Executive Board
- the need to ensure that the 'preferred bidder' will be fully engaged in the process in order to deliver the proposals within the AAP
- that the Leeds Learning Partnership be included in the list of proposed consultees
- that all information being provided is done so with reference to the new ward boundaries which came into effect in 2004, and that references to the Aire Valley should be in terms of the Upper and Lower Aire Valley, to avoid confusion

RESOLVED –

- (i) To receive and note the report
- (ii) To note the issues raised by Members and the responses of officers

16 West Leeds Gateway Area Action Plan – Stage 1 issues report, proposed consultation and sustainability scoping report

The Director of Development submitted a report setting out the strategic planning and regeneration context for the West Leeds Gateway (WLG) AAP, and provided background information, initial issues, progress on current initiatives, details of the consultation arrangements and a production timetable

Appended to the report was a plan showing the area of the proposed AAP

Officers presented the report and provided details of the events which had already taken place to raise awareness of the AAP, and which had enabled local people to give their views ahead of the formal consultation process

Members were informed that the regeneration would be privately led and that local people would be at the heart of the proposals, with key drivers being transport, job creation, development and training

RESOLVED –

- (i) To receive and note the report and the comments now made



AGENDA
ITEM NO.:

Originator: David Feeney
Tel: 247 4539

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT

MEETING: DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL

DATE: 6 September 2005

SUBJECT: LEEDS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK : PROGRESS REPORT

Electoral Wards Affected:	Specific Implications For:
All	Ethnic Minorities <input type="checkbox"/> Women <input type="checkbox"/> Disabled People <input type="checkbox"/>

1. PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform members of progress, regarding the on going preparation of Local Development Framework (LDF), Development Plan Documents and the Statement of Community Involvement. The preparation of this progress report also provides an opportunity to update members on the Sustainability Appraisal methodology and its use in relation to the preparation of Development Plan Documents, following comments received from a number of statutory consultees.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 From previous Panel reports, members will recall that the Local Development Scheme, in reflecting City Council priorities, sets out a challenging work programme. At the 25 May Development Plan Panel, members approved a Timetable and Forward Plan for the detailed preparation and reporting of Local Development Framework Documents. The following progress report sets out progress for Development Plan Documents and the Statement of Community Involvement, in relation to this Timetable and Forward Plan, together with summaries of consultation and public engagement comments received to date as part of early and on going engagement activity.

2.2 It is important to report also that in reflecting the corporate and city wide significance of the LDF, the Development Plan pages on the City Council's internet site have been reviewed and updated (and new pages created) to include the Local Development Framework. Consequently, all the consultation material referred to in this report and information concerning the Local Development Framework more generally (including the Local Development Scheme, consultation timetables, on line consultation forms etc) are all available via the City Council's web site at www.leeds.gov.uk/ldf. It should be noted also, that in order to ease access to this information, a "Speed Link" has been created from the City Council's internet "Home Page", to the LDF pages described above.

2.3 In terms of disseminating and communicating information concerning the LDF to communities across Leeds more widely, an article and contact details regarding the

preparation of the various LDF documents has been included within the first edition of the new Council publication "About Leeds". This publication is being circulated in early September (5th – 16th September) and will be distributed to individual Leeds households, Libraries, One Stop Shops and Council buildings (such as the Civic Hall and Merrion House).

- 2.4 The Development Plan Documents covered as part of this report are the City Centre Area Action Plan, the Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan and East and South East Leeds Area Action Plan, together with the Statement of Community Involvement. It should be noted that progress and timetable issues in relation to the West Leeds Gateway Area Action Plan are covered in a separate Panel report on this agenda. In reviewing progress, each of the above documents are covered in turn, with details summarising, the Current Position, Consultation Progress, a Summary of Consultation Comments Received and Next Steps.

3. DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENTS PROGRESS

3.1 CITY CENTRE AREA ACTION PLAN

3.1.1 Current Position

Members approved a Stage 1 report on the City Centre Area Action Plan at the 25 May Panel meeting. This report set out the initial issues identified for consultation, a programme of consultation activity and consultation material.

3.1.2 Consultation Progress

Following the presentation of the Stage 1 Report and consultation material to Panel, the following consultation and engagement activity has been undertaken:

- The consultation pack has been available for download from the Council's web site since mid June.
- All named groups and organisations identified in Appendix 4 of the Statement of Community Involvement have been sent a copy of the consultation pack in June.
- All Town and Parish Councils in Leeds have been sent a copy of the consultation pack.
- Presentation to Leeds Cycling Forum on 13 July.
- All Leeds Initiative partnership groups were offered a presentation on the Area Action Plan and so far, officers have made presentations to the following partnership groups: Environment City Partnership, Arts Partnership and Cultural Partnership. Where partnership groups chose not to have a presentation, the consultation material was circulated to members.
- Officers presented to the Executive Groups of Leeds Initiative, Narrowing the Gap and Going up a League as well as Leeds City Centre Management Initiative.
- All groups and organisations on the City Council's equality database have been targeted for involvement. Approximately 450 organisations and groups have been offered presentations and assistance to encourage involvement.
- The voluntary groups' database (managed by Library Services, Learning and Leisure) has been used to identify those organisations and groups working in the areas identified as hard to reach in the Statement of Community Involvement. These groups were offered presentations and assistance to encourage involvement.
- A presentation to the inner North West Area Committee took place on 30 June.
- Officers attended the two Local Development Framework events in the Town Hall promoting the Statement of Community Involvement and other LDF documents under preparation.
- Officers are working closely with the Yorkshire Branch of Planning Aid to engage school students and young people around the city centre. Due to the summer

vacation period, this will not take place until September. Ultimately, engagement will be at the discretion of the educational establishments concerned, which includes high schools and colleges. Planning Aid is also assisting with consultation of more established communities around the fringe of the city centre. Outreach workers funded through the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister are actively going out to the community offering impartial professional advice to communities to generate interest and engagement in the preparation of the City Centre Area Action Plan.

- To engage city centre residents, the University and KW Linfoot have kindly directed correspondence on behalf of the City Council to those residents who attended an evening session at the University to discuss living in the city centre.
- Leeds Property Forum are dedicating their September meeting to discussing the Area Action Plan issues and deciding who of their members will attend the scheduled workshops (see table below).
- The closing date for responses to the consultation pack will be the end of September (combined with the planned workshops), although it is envisaged that consultation with identified hard to reach groups in the SCI will be an ongoing process.

Following on from the above, a series of other engagement activities are programmed for September, including 4 themed workshops on the 27 and 28 September.

Date	Forum	Venue
6 September	Leeds Voice Environment Forum	Civic Hall
12 September	Access Advisory Group	Civic Hall
16 September	Housing Forum	Civic Hall
27 September	Stakeholder workshops	Round Foundry, Holbeck Urban Village.
28 September	Stakeholder workshops	Round Foundry, Holbeck Urban Village.
September Cycle	Inner Area Committees	Various
tbc	Leeds Civic Trust	tbc

3.1.3 Summary of Comments Received (at the time of preparing this Report)

3.1.4 As the consultation period has not yet expired, the level of written response has been low. Five comments have been submitted through the web site. Two written comments have been received. The Leeds Civic Trust have expressed concern regarding the daytime programming of the workshops. In response, an evening meeting is to be scheduled for officers to meet with the Civic Trust.

3.1.5 The feedback and comments received from the meetings that have occurred at the time of preparing this report are summarised below

Date	Forum	Comments
25 May	Leeds Arts Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions regarding what the Partnership were specifically being asked to do/comment on at this stage. • Need for greater clarity to distinguish between the LDF City Centre Area Action Plan and the Leeds City Centre Management Strategy.
14 June	Leeds Environment City Partnership (LECP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions regarding the scope of the public consultation at this stage. • Suggestion that existing data

		<p>– responses from the Vision II consultation – over 30,000 responses, should be used to inform the preparation of the City Centre AAP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The priorities of the LECIP should be reflected in the questions and documentation • Questioned whether targeted consultation was sufficient for Stage 1 although one member did support the Council's approach. • The timing of the workshops during the day was queried. • Use should be made of the Civic Newspaper. • Was the documentation going to appear on the web – could the link be sent to the Leeds Initiative to also encourage access to the information.
17 June	The Urban Design Forum (City Council, Development Dept)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion for the Chamber of Commerce & the Property Forum to be formally invited to the workshops in September.
12 July	The Leeds Initiative Narrowing the Gap Executive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leeds Initiative to distribute the Reg 25 "Pack" to Board members.
13 July	The Leeds Initiative Going Up a League Executive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some exploration of how the City Centre AAP will sit with the City Centre Management Strategy (2006-10), the Leeds Renaissance Partnership Business Plan (April 2005) and the Narrowing the Gap Action Plan (2005-8)

3.1.6 Next Steps

Following the conclusion of the above early consultation stage, representations and comments in relation to issues raised will be analysed, with a view to preparation of "Options", to be presented to members at the November Development Plan Panel meeting.

3.2 AIRE VALLEY LEEDS AREA ACTION PLAN

3.2.1 Current position

Members approved a Stage 1 report on the Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan at the 25 May Panel meeting. This report set out the initial issues identified for consultation, a programme of consultation activity and consultation material.

3.2.2 Consultation Progress

The initial consultation on key issues commenced in July and consultation documents were sent to:

- All those in the initial list of the Panel Report; plus major utilities
- all members
- stakeholders/landowners
- members of the Aire Valley Board and their sub groups
- other invitees to Aire Valley Leeds events and launches
- all companies who receive the Aire Valley Newsletter
- South and East Area Managers (Neighbourhoods & Housing)
- Libraries

The consultation document that was sent to formal consultees was also edited into an “abridged” less technical version, that was considered more ‘reader friendly’ to a wider audience to encourage broader engagement and initiate a response.

The Hunslet Gala (25th June) provided the first opportunity to make the community aware of the Aire Valley Leeds AAP and their chance to be involved in shaping its future. Officers therefore attended this event where consultation material and questionnaires were circulated.

In addition to the above, a series of other engagement activities are programmed for September. These include:

Date	Forum	Venue
2 September	City Council officer workshop	Thoresby House
5 September	South District Partnership	tbc
6 September	East Inner Area Committee	tbc
12 September	East Outer Area Committee	tbc
20 September	South Inner Area Committee	tbc
20 September	East Outer Area Committee	tbc
23 September	East District Partnership	tbc
30 September	City Council officer workshop	Thoresby House

3.2.3 Summary of Comments Received (at the time of preparing this Report)

The deadline for consultation comments was 12th August. At the time of preparing this report, comments from 14 external respondents making a range of substantive points had been received. A detailed schedule of these comments has been included within Appendix 1 of this report. There are a divergent range of views (both general and technical) regarding how best and via which uses the area should be regenerated. Such uses include employment, residential, retail and leisure. A number of the responses also comment on the need for major improvements to the infrastructure within the area and for significant environmental improvements to be made. Points are also raised in relation to the regional and employment role of the area and the relationship of this part of the Aire Valley to the City Centre and to local communities.

3.2.4 Next Steps

Following the conclusion of the above early consultation stage, representations and comments in relation to issues raised will be analysed, with a view to preparation of “Options”, to be presented to members at the November Development Plan Panel meeting.

3.3 EAST & SOUTH EAST LEEDS (EASEL) AREA ACTION PLAN

3.3.1 Current Position

Members received a report on the background to the identification of the area as an AAP at the Development Plan Panel of 5th July 2005. The report detailed the initial issues identified, progress on current initiatives, and set out initial consultation arrangements and the timetable for the production of the AAP. Subsequent to Panel, the material within the report has been adapted for informal consultation with the community, stakeholders and statutory consultees.

3.3.2 Consultation Progress

In order to meet the current AAP timetable it was considered appropriate to begin consultations with statutory and key consultees as soon as possible. Consultations on the AAP (which included a list of key questions to consider and comments forms) and the Sustainability Scoping Report were sent to statutory consultees on 27th July 2005. Key stakeholders (including Ward Members) and general stakeholders were circulated on 1st August 2005. Senior officers within the City Council have also been circulated with details of the consultation, which is available for general comment on the Council website. The consultation period extends until 2nd September 2005. However, in practice at this informal stage in the AAP process, this date is flexible and any comments received prior to Options being identified, will be considered.

Copies of the consultation material has been left in libraries within and adjoining the area, together with a poster, which advertises the consultation and gives details of where further information may be obtained.

Ward Forum members have all been circulated with a copy of the consultation material and officers will attend all Forum meetings within the area during the September cycle of meetings with the exception of Richmond Hill Forum which received details at their meeting on 8th August and for which a separate consultation is being undertaken through the Renew website. Officers have arranged to attend the following meetings to raise awareness of the AAP process, obtain comments on the initial issues identified and answer questions, which may be raised:

Date	Forum	Venue
8 th August	Richmond Hill Forum	
6 th September	Inner South Area Committee	
7 th September	Harehills Forum	7pm Harehills Primary School
8 th September	St James Partnership	10am Archway, Harehills
8 th September	East Leeds and Environment Partnership	Deacon House Seacroft
8 th September	Halton Forum	6pm Woodkirk Primary
9 th September	Leeds Initiative	tbc
13 th September	Gipton Forum	7pm Henry Barran
13 th September	Burmantofts Forum	7pm St Cyprians
13 th September	Halton Moor Forum	6pm Halton Moor One Stop Shop
16 th September	City Centre Housing Forum	tbc
20 th September	Outer South Area Committee	tbc
20 th September	Seacroft Forum	7pm ELFLC
22 nd September	Economy Partnership	tbc
23 rd September	District Partnership	10am Killingbeck office or Job Centre Plus at Southern House

Comments are to be requested within 2 weeks of each of the above meetings taking place to allow further opportunity for comment subsequent to discussion. In addition to these events we hope to arrange meetings with East Leeds Voluntary and Community Forum and Leeds Voice.

3.3.3 Summary of Comments Received (at the time of preparing this Report)

Consultees	Date Received	Key comments
Leeds City Credit Union	4 th August 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of tackling financial inclusion should be an integral part of any local area development plan and LCCU hopes to work with Leeds City Council in addressing this serious issue.
West Yorkshire Police	10 th August 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EASEL AAP seems the perfect opportunity to make significant improvements to reduce the levels of crime in the EASEL area and improve the quality of life for residents. The Council documents 'Neighbourhoods for Living' and Designing for Community Safety will need to form an integral part.
The Countryside Agency	11 th August 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linkages between openspace, greenspace and green corridors for access and recreation appears to be missing – this needs to be linked with enhancing opportunities for wildlife. The provision for facilities for walking and cycling is not fully recognised.
Leeds Construction and Training Agency	12 th August 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AAP need to maximise employment opportunities for local people who need support to access training and jobs. Synergy between all partners needs to be achieved. Employment/development issues need to recognise the Construction Leeds Partnership. In employment terms the need to stress the inclusion of hard to engage people for who provision by statutory services (job centres etc) is not appropriate. Travel to work often requires multiple journeys – development needs to link with childcare provisions. Need to encourage global view – linking with other areas to avoid displacement of crime from one area to another.
Mr G Goddard (local resident)	15 th August 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wants the AAP to achieve a safer, cleaner environment for all the residents – maintaining the well established community that exists. Key changes need to be an improvement of anti-social behaviour and neglect. If council homes are to be reduced – where are the tenants to live How can demolition be sustainable ? The area is well served by public transport Improved policing is a must Better environmental linkages and signposting

3.3.4 Next Steps

We intend to use the above comments and those received via the programmed meetings, to assist us in drawing up Options for the future development of the area. A workshop involving key stakeholders is to be scheduled for late September to facilitate this process. It is anticipated that a Draft Preferred Options Report and Sustainability Appraisal Report for EASEL will be reported to the October or November Development Plan Panel. Whilst work in relation to the EASEL AAP is progressing, it is important to

emphasise that this is in parallel to the on going procurement exercise for the City Council to agree a strategic partner for the longer term regeneration of the EASEL area. As a consequence, the timing of the 'options' stage EASEL Report to Development Plan Panel is likely to be influenced by the procurement process and may therefore be subject to change.

3.4 STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRESS

3.4.1 Current position

Members approved a report on the revised draft SCI at the 25th May Panel meeting and agreed to informal consultation during June/July 2005. This report sets out how Leeds City Council will involve local people in plan making and planning applications and the programme of consultation and consultation material.

3.4.2 Consultation Progress

Early consultation took place during June/July on the draft SCI. This has included the following activity:

- The SCI consultation material and posters were sent to all the libraries in Leeds district.
- Two SCI 'events' took place at Leeds Town Hall on 7th July and 21st July. These were informal events and were attended by a variety of community groups and stakeholders, including officers from other departments as well as Councillors. They were based on round table discussions and one-to-one sessions.
- A draft summary leaflet was produced, primarily for the two SCI events. The summary leaflet was used as an example of a method in which to advertise the consultation material as well as simplifying what the SCI was about.
- The draft SCI was available on the website with the opportunity to fill in the comments form online. In addition to the statutory consultees, we have consulted with those bodies/groups who we felt would have a particular interest in the SCI. We have also consulted widely within the Council to increase the level of awareness of the SCI and the LDF. Letters and emails were sent to a wide variety of community groups and stakeholders as listed in the 25th May Panel Report (para 4.4).

3.4.3 Summary of Comments Received (at the time of preparing this report)

The following comments outline the main issues raised, through written comments and at the Town Hall events. At the time of preparing this report, 26 responses have been received relating to SCI issues and a total of 55 participants attended the Town Hall events. A detailed schedule of the comments received at the time of writing this report has been included in Appendix 2 of this report. The following comments can be summarised:

- The draft SCI has been generally well received and the spirit of consultation and engagement put forward in the document was applauded by many, but there was a significant degree of scepticism on how this may work in practice.
- The draft SCI was generally felt to be clear and accessible. A number of participants complimented the "Plain English" used in the draft SCI.
- The SCI summary leaflet was popular – it was suggested that more copies need to be printed for the formal consultation and disseminated by some community groups themselves.
- Concerns raised about the length of the consultation process, which may stretch the resources of community groups in terms of endurance.

- A great deal of interest in how the SCI will affect planning applications in the future – many comments reflected a general unhappiness with most aspects of community involvement in planning applications.
- Concerns about how the SCI will be enforced.
- The SCI needs to have “local” ownership - it should have photographs to illustrate different communities and towns (a number of comments were made by groups from outlying villages who tend to feel missed off the agenda when they see documents centred on the urban part of the city).
- Many comments referred to the cost of consultation and concerns that the Council would not be able to afford to undertake proper consultation indefinitely.
- The steps to include those who are often excluded from the planning process were applauded but numerous respondents asked for more detail (and a guarantee) on how the Council will do this.
- Clear concern was expressed by some respondents that there should be sanctions for not conforming with the SCI – whether developers or the Council itself.

3.4.4 Next Steps

Following the above initial consultation stage and consideration of comments received, the Formal Participation (Pre-Submission) Stage (November 2005) will be completed. This is the formal pre-submission participation stage as identified under regulation 26 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. At this stage we will consult with all the community groups and stakeholders identified in Appendix 4 of the revised draft SCI. Leeds City Council will arrange consultation events and make presentations to ward forums etc at this stage. We have already arranged a presentation to the Access Advisory Group on the 12th September. Special efforts will be made to consult with those who are often excluded from the planning system. This formal consultation period lasts for 6 weeks. Following this the document will be submitted to the Secretary of State (March 2006), followed by the commencement of 6 week representation period.

4. **SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**

- 4.1 At the 22 March meeting, Members received a report and presentation regarding the requirement of the new Development Planning system, to undertake Sustainability Appraisals in the preparation of Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents. Members were subsequently minded to agree the use of the Sustainability Appraisal methodology (developed by CAG Consultants) in the preparation of documents identified as part of the Local Development Scheme.
- 4.2 Following this decision, officers have developed their understanding of the Sustainability Appraisal process in the preparation of a number of Sustainability Scoping Reports (subsequently agreed by Panel members) and through consultation activity. Following this work and as a consequence of consultation comments received, it will be necessary to amend the methodology to improve the scope and clarity of the process. For example, comments received from the Environment Agency (one of the statutory consultees for Sustainability Appraisals under the LDF), have suggested that the methodology should give more explicit emphasis to flood risk issues to reflect the significance of the issues and on going work of the Agency within the Leeds area.
- 4.3 Linked to the above revisions will be a need also to continue to develop the ‘evidence base’, to underpin work in relation to the preparation of Sustainability Appraisals. This will need to be an on going process as Local Development Documents progress through their various stages and are subject to monitoring.
- 4.4 In relation to the above issues, it should be noted also that the ODPM are due to finalise the guidance in relation to the preparation of LDF Sustainability Appraisals (anticipated

August/September). At the time of preparing this report this guidance was still awaited. Consequently, upon receipt, it is therefore proposed to amend the methodology (to reflect the guidance where necessary) and also incorporate the amendments noted above. These will then be reported to a future meeting of the Development Plan Panel for consideration.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

5.1 The purpose of this report is to inform members of progress, regarding the on going preparation of Local Development Framework (LDF) Development Plan Documents and the Statement of Community Involvement. As highlighted in the report, a wide range of activity is underway to take the LDF process forward to the next phases of production and that early engagement activity to date has yielded some useful material for consideration.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Development Plan Panel Members are requested to note progress in relation to the preparation of LDF documents as identified in this report.

APPENDIX 1

AIRE VALLEY LEEDS AREA ACTION PLAN – INITIAL COMMENTS RECEIVED

AIRE VALLEY LEEDS AREA ACTION PLAN

Representor Number	Representation Number	Name of Organisation	Theme	Comments	Consultation Stage
0001	00001	Commercial Development Projects Ltd	What do you want AAP to achieve	New jobs through B1, B2, B8 industrial development. Priority given to construction of ELLR.	REG 25
0001	00002	Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Good things about area	Existing employment uses	REG 25
0001	00003	Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Like to change about area	Improve the canal and river corridor.	REG 25
0001	00004	Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Barriers to improving area	Poor roads, contaminated land, odours from filter beds.	REG 25
0001	00005	Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Objectives	Right ones identified. Employment opportunities, access and movement are most important.	REG 25
0001	00006	Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Missing issues	Right issues identified.	REG 25
0001	00007	Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Economic issues	Mix of B1, B2, B8 employment uses supported. Not necessary to target specific types of employment. New housing should be near city centre not M1 and should include affordable housing. Retailing should be kept to minimum.	REG 25
0001	00008	Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Social issues	New industrial units should provide jobs for local residents in deprived communities but they must have access to work experience, training and skills.	REG 25

0001	00009	Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Infrastructure issues	ELLR is the key. New river crossing is desirable but not essential for a number of years.	REG 25
0001	00010	Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Image	Supports ideas.	REG 25
0001	00011	Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Environmental issues	Improving landscaping in new development a priority. More work on viability of removing filter beds.	REG 25
0001	00012	Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Implementation issues	Put ELLR in first then look at feasibility of the other issues	REG 25
0001	00013	Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Consultation	Written notification.	REG 25
0002	00014	Vickers Oils	Consultation	E-mail updates, Exhibition/road show, discussion group	REG 25
0002	00015	Vickers Oils	Economic issues - Employment	Will area (Clarence Road) still be accepted for industrial use. Where in area would company be able to move if relocated ?	REG 25
0002	00016	Vickers Oils	Economic issues - Housing	Support development of affordable housing so that employees do not get priced out of area. Need for larger 3-4 bedroom apartments in which families can live.	REG 25
0002	00017	Vickers Oils	Economic issues - Retail	Small scale retail development would be useful for employees of local companies as well as residents	REG 25
0002	00018	Vickers Oils	Infrastructure issues	Aware of Metro Connect but not used it. Reliable public transport with good connection to the station useful. Supertram supported.	REG 25
0003	00019	Alyn Nicholls & Associates	What do you want AAP to achieve	To provide framework to enable redevelopment on land to north west of South Accommodation Road to support role of City Centre and contribute towards its vitality and viability by increasing and enhancing the range of city centre uses in the area.	REG 25
0003	00020	Alyn Nicholls & Associates	Like to change about area	Planning policies should positively encourage a range of developments such as leisure, residential, retail and tourism uses	REG 25

0003	00021	Alyn Nicholls & Associates	Barriers to improving area	Existing planning policies north west of South Accommodation Road. Should be a proactive approach to encourage a range of uses to contribute towards the vitality and viability of the City Centre.	REG 25
0003	00022	Alyn Nicholls & Associates	Objectives	First objective to enhance Leeds as a regional capital and a regional economic centre should be amended to make it clear that opportunities to enhance the role of the City Centre should be maximised.	REG 25
0003	00023	Alyn Nicholls & Associates	Economic issues	Identified issues do not refer to the interface between the AV and the City Centre. Part of area falls within the defined City Centre. This area offers opportunities to enhance the role and function of the City Centre.	REG 25
0003	00024	Alyn Nicholls & Associates	Consultation	E-mail updates.	REG 25
0004	00025	Keyland Developments Ltd	General	Objective of securing regeneration must have primacy over other planning policies in the UDP. The Vision for the Aire Valley set out in the first Grimley report must be paramount. Concerned that this approach has not been carried through in the AAP e.g. the Housing Market Assessment does not consider housing within the context of the overall vision but simply as an appraisal of individual sites, some of which are considered only because of their potential to contribute to infrastructure costs. Essential that regeneration creates a sense of place, rather than creating a modern version of estates that surround the Valley.	REG 25
0004	00026	Keyland Developments Ltd	General	Report already prepared or being undertaken should be approached on the understanding that the timescales then considered are not the timescales for the realisation of a Vision. Development of the Valley is expected to take 15-20 years. In considering potential for retail development, the Council's consultants looked at capacity only until 2011. Short-term considerations should not preclude the realisation of the long-term Vision even if other factors indicate that certain aspects should be phased for later in the process.	REG 25

0004	00027	Keyland Developments Ltd	Infrastructure issues	Clear that cost of infrastructure is very large. Much of the infrastructure is a pre-requisite to carrying out any development other than large-scale employment uses. Delivery of that infrastructure, including both its financing and physical implementation, is clearly going to be the largest problem for regeneration. Landowners whose holdings are particularly critical to the delivery of the eventual Vision should be closely involved in the debates on the methodology and viability of delivery.	REG 25
0005	00028	AWS Ltd	What do you want AAP to achieve	Bring forward significant acreage primarily for industrial but also residential development.	REG 25
0005	00029	AWS Ltd	Good things about area	Motorway links, ease of accessibility, diverse industrial base and flexibility provided by private sector.	REG 25
0005	00030	AWS Ltd	Barriers to improving area	Pontefract Lane must be connected to the M1 and development sites opened up. Emphasis must be on B2/B8 uses - already too much B1. Residential also a possibility. Residential a possibility. Retail must be excluded as will be detrimental to other towns in the Leeds region.	REG 25
0005	00031	AWS Ltd	Objectives	Leeds is the engine that drives the West Yorkshire area and transport and residential issues must be looked at in this context.	REG 25
0005	00032	AWS Ltd	Missing issues	More emphasis should be on economic issues and infrastructure.	REG 25
0005	00033	AWS Ltd	Economic issues	Development will fund the infrastructure but have to be careful with type of development. Retail will attract highest land values but will detract from the City Centre and other centres. Bulky goods maybe ok.	REG 25
0005	00034	AWS Ltd	Infrastructure issues	ELLR is vital and urgently needed. New river crossing is not necessary and could sterilise urgently needed development land. Supertram is more relevant to South Leeds and to Leeds residents rather than commuters from outside Leeds.	REG 25
0005	00035	AWS Ltd	Image	Does not support. Most occupiers need high bay industrial space, which isn't pretty - issues proposed bring in too much design and render development	REG 25

				difficult.	
0005	00036	AWS Ltd	Infrastructure issues	Design guides are negative influences. Developers will resolve most issues within a predominantly industrial area.	REG 25
0005	00037	AWS Ltd	Implementation issues	Land remediation will be dealt with by developers. Infrastructure is urgent. Land values will account for infrastructure costs. Grants should be used to remove the filter beds. Only high value uses should be residential and limited retail and a motorway service station.	REG 25
0005	00038	AWS Ltd	Consultation	Written notification; e-mail updates; focus and discussion group; workshop or planning for real	REG 25
0006	00039	Yorkshire Water	Need for an AAP	Recommend that the following words are included: "One of the factors to be considered would be the impact of odours from Knostrop Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW). This is sufficiently important to merit specific consideration and land use decisions with the Action Plan should be based on odour modelling for the WWTW over the period for implementation of the plan. This modelling should take into account changes in configuration of the WWTW, odour mitigation undertaken by YW under its investment programme and additional works, which are secured under development agreement.	REG 25
0006	00040	Yorkshire Water		Would not rule out the possibility of further works to mitigate odour subject to a number of conditions: measures were necessary to meet wider development aspirations for regeneration in terms of type, mix and sustainability of development; further mitigation measures would offer real benefit in terms of impact on predicted levels of odour; works are fully funded by the development in question.	REG 25

0006	00041	Yorkshire Water	Objectives	Objective should be to achieve regeneration and development in the Aire Valley from Leeds to the M1 motorway in a co-ordinated and planned way that: recognises and resolves potential conflicts between land uses; ensures that the costs of development are funded from development values; secures co-ordination of development and the infrastructure it needs; produces a viable and sustainable pattern of development.	REG 25
0006	00042	Yorkshire Water	Key issues	Hunslet Strategic Housing Site is subject to an objection from YW	REG 25
0006	00043	Yorkshire Water	Economic issues	Filter beds represent only one stage in the existing treatment processes at the WWTW and their removal would do little to address the problem of odours from sewage and effluents. Undertaking works to meet requirements of the Freshwater Fisheries Directive (FFD) and a separate scheme to deal with the worst sources of odour and complaints from existing uses. Possibility of housing development in or near the area of the existing filter beds should be regarded as very unlikely even with measures to mitigate odours. Incorporating a plant, the size of Knostrop to eliminate odour would be a huge task with costs in the hundreds of millions. Examples quoted in the report area dealing with much smaller plants in areas where land values are considerably higher. If residential development values are required to fund the necessary infrastructure works for regeneration of the area, greater consideration needs to be given to the most appropriate locations. Will still be areas close to the WWTW where residential uses would be	REG 25
0006	00044	Yorkshire Water	Infrastructure issues	Public highways should not run through the operational site of the WWTW. Infrastructure improvements do not include any reference to the need for odour control or reconfiguration of the WWTW.	REG 25

0006	00045	Yorkshire Water	Environmental issues	Filter beds likely to be removed before 2010 but reconfigured works will still have a significant impact and the overall footprint will not be greatly reduced without further significant investment. Environmental pressures on water companies to invest in measures to reduce the environmental impact does not extend to odours. PPG23 should be applied in relation to considerations of appropriate land uses.	REG 25
0007	00046	National Grid Transco	Infrastructure issues	National Grid has voltage electricity apparatus in the area (plan provided). No objections but need to take into account the location and nature of the high voltage equipment when planning development in the vicinity of overhead lines, cables and substations	REG 25
0008	00047	Joseph Priestly College	What do you want AAP to achieve	Co-ordinate developments in the area and ensure effective linkages with all other plans	REG 25
0008	00048	Joseph Priestly College	Good things about area	Location of the area is its main strength. Attracted a diverse community, which should continue to be supported.	REG 25
0008	00049	Joseph Priestly College	Like to change about area	Improve transport and create new economic opportunities for local communities	REG 25
0008	00050	Joseph Priestly College	Objectives	Creating a sustainable mixed use area and bringing maximum economic benefit to local people should be a priority.	REG 25
0008	00051	Joseph Priestly College	Economic issues	Appropriate mix of uses is essential. An injection of new technology and knowledge-based industries will enhance the success of the area.	REG 25
0008	00052	Joseph Priestly College	Social issues	Important that local people benefit from developments. Linking employment opportunities to appropriate training is essential. Job guarantee schemes may be appropriate.	REG 25
0008	00053	Joseph Priestly College	Consultation	E-mail updates; Focus or discussion group. Will be particularly keen to explore and support the training need of local people in relation to employment opportunities generated in the area.	REG 25
0009	00054	Re'new	What do you want AAP to achieve	Key objective should be to ensure a link between local people and Aire Valley jobs.	REG 25

0009	00055	Re'new	Good things about area	Openness in the landscape - doesn't seem crowded. Waterside is attractive but could be stunning.	REG 25
0009	00056	Re'new	Like to change about area	Poor image of dereliction, run-down industrial sites, abandoned waterways.	REG 25
0009	00057	Re'new	Barriers to improving area	Has no residents, so difficult to engage communities who don't have a direct and immediate interest to pursue.	REG 25
0009	00058	Re'new	Objectives	Probably the right ones but may help to raise the profile of those that can be delivered more readily, so as to establish a track record of delivery and credibility.	REG 25
0009	00059	Re'new	Economic issues	Residential agenda probably good in principle but not sure it stacks up yet. Will the proposals yield the values required to fund the infrastructure. Target market for East Aire Village questioned because purchasers buying property will be looking for transport links along the M62 rather than Leeds City Centre	REG 25
0009	00060	Re'new	Social issues	Suggests redrawing Aire Valley boundaries to include some residential areas.	REG 25
0009	00061	Re'new	Infrastructure issues	The river can be used for freight but what about leisure use or for commuting to the City Centre. All the infrastructure improvements listed will be needed. What happened to the proposals in the Water vision report from 2003.	REG 25
0009	00062	Re'new	Image	Profiling and marketing is fundamental but the AAP is unclear who the target audiences are: Leeds, East/South Leeds, regional, national? And what is to be sold. Are the efforts aimed at inward investors, housebuilders/purchasers, developers, existing communities?	REG 25
0009	00063	Re'new	Environmental issues	Report is unclear on whether removal of the filter beds is feasible.	REG 25
0009	00064	Re'new	Implementation issues	Land values may be depressed by lack of infrastructure so will struggle to generate sufficient value to fund massive infrastructural improvements without support from elsewhere at least initially. A creative, innovative and effective delivery vehicle will be essential and needs	REG 25

				to be capable of harnessing the support of the private sector.	
0009	00065	Re'new	Consultation	Receive e-mail updates. Re'new and the to'gether partnership could help in community engagement and consultation as have links to local networks.	REG 25
0010	00066	Yorkshire Forward	General	Feel that the renewal and regeneration of the area will play a significant role in securing its position as the regional and economic centre and renowned European city, in line with the emerging RSS, which identified Leeds' role as a competitive and leading city region. RES makes specific reference to the economic opportunities presented by Aire Valley. The emerging RSS acknowledges that the area provides an economic development and housing opportunity, but one, which requires major infrastructure investment.	REG 25
0010	00067	Yorkshire Forward	Objectives	High level objectives are appropriate. However, number of the objectives are generic and could be further enhanced with more detail and clarification in terms of context, perhaps providing a focus on how the image of the area will be enhanced and the quality of the environment improved. Also important to recognise the inter-relationships between, and co-dependency of, a number of the objectives. Particularly welcome the desire to improve access to and movement through the area, including the specific objective to improve public transport. These objectives will assist in ensuring maximum benefit for local people and enhance the image of the area and quality of the environment by providing and encouraging more sustainable forms of transport. Perhaps the objective to improve public transport should be broadened further to also increase the use of public transport and other more sustainable forms of transport and to reduce reliance on the private car.	REG 25

0010	00068	Yorkshire Forward	Economic issues - Employment	<p>For Leeds to maintain and further build on its status as a successful and competitive city, the economy needs to be sufficiently responsive to growth sectors of the economy. A move towards new and expanding growth industries, including research and development and technology-based industries may support the achievement of an internationally renowned city. Employment in the Aire Valley should not be solely reliant on traditional industries and the AAP should make provision for a range of uses, including office and business uses and ensure provision of units of different sizes from business incubator/start up units to larger industrial/warehousing units. Also important to ensure that location of warehousing and industrial uses is balanced with the requirements of neighbouring residential development.</p>	REG 25
0010	00069	Yorkshire Forward	Economic issues - Housing	<p>Priority should be to create mixed, balanced sustainable communities. Scale of housing provision needs to be balanced to ensure it maximises opportunities for local people to access housing in the area but not negatively impact on areas of the city suffering from low demand. Should provide a mix of housing types, catering for families, young and elderly people and disabled people. A mix of size, tenure and price is also important. Welcome housing close to the City Centre and in vicinity of the waterfront but would not consider a location close to the M1 as a suitable location for residential. Accessibility by a range of transport modes must be a key factor in locating residential development. Housing close to the City Centre will provide new residents with good access to city centre services and facilities. The provision of housing in locations that exploit natural resources such as the waterfront is promoted in best practice guidance (By Design). To maximise the opportunities of the waterfront a genuine mix of</p>	REG 25

0010	00070	Yorkshire Forward	Social issues	Vital that benefits of regeneration for local people are maximised. Welcome targeting of particular communities to ensure they share benefits. Some flexibility will be required to ensure that AVL can become a key economic driver for Leeds and the wider region. Important to ensure that appropriately skilled and qualified personnel can be recruited to meet the likely requirements for the range of jobs created. In order for local people to take advantage there are a number of barriers that will need to be overcome. Barriers to employment such as poor accessibility, skill levels or local capacity should be addressed by actions and strategies promoted in the AAP.	REG 25
0010	00071	Yorkshire Forward	Infrastructure issues	Support provision of the ELLR. However, national and regional policy places a strong emphasis on sustainable travel. Therefore imperative that development is not only accessible to everybody, but is accessible by sustainable forms of transport. Consider that a package of infrastructure improvements that seeks to balance the need for improved highway access with provision of sustainable transport modes, including pedestrian and cycle routes and facilities to encourage use of alternatives, is required.	REG 25
0010	00072	Yorkshire Forward	Image	An attractive, appealing, safe and welcoming built environment is an important aspect of creating a better quality of life. AAP should include policies to improve the public realm and image of the area. Can be provided by opening up the waterfront and developing a mix of uses there. Enhancing the identity and sense of place in the area will support and complement the area's economic development. Emphasis should be placed on focusing uses, which promote activity along the waterways corridor, enhancing access to the waterfront and creating areas of diverse character.	REG 25

0010	00073	Yorkshire Forward	Environmental issues	AAP needs to include policies to promote better design of spaces and buildings within them, improved landscaping (hard and soft) and the provision and improvement of open spaces (including public realm) and recreational facilities. Policies will be required to outline how flood risk and contaminated land issues are to be mitigated in implementation. AAP should also include policies to promote sustainable construction techniques and materials to increase energy efficiency, incorporation of on-site renewable energy and heat generators and sustainable waste management solutions.	REG 25
0010	00074	Yorkshire Forward	Implementation issues	To better inform policies in the AAP, research should be carried out to look at current site conditions and the cost of various infrastructure, environmental and social improvements being considered for the area to assess their feasibility. Guidance should be provided regarding the contributions and requirement the Council will be seeking from developers to deal with affordable housing, transport and other issues. Whilst establishing a strategic vision is vital, detailed plans and effective implementation methods are also needed to ensure desired objectives and improvements are actually delivered.	REG 25
0011	00075	RWE Npower	General		REG 25
0011	00076	RWE Npower	Need for an AAP	UDP should be seen as the starting point. AAP should build on this planning framework by showing how comprehensive development can be realised and co-ordinated across the Aire Valley. AAP should set ambitious targets but be realistic and pragmatic. Blanket redevelopment will not occur in a short time frame. The AAP should facilitate incremental change wherever possible. New development at the Power Station site can be realised in the earliest phase without comprising the objective of comprehensive regeneration. Employment development will: (1) Strengthen local	REG 25

				infrastructure (2) Bring derelict and contaminated land into beneficial use (3) Help to attract a critical mass of new development which can begin to support wider initiatives such as improved public transport	
0011	00077	RWE Npower	Economic issues	Employment development can be secured on the former Power Station site at an early stage in the regeneration cycle. This can be delivered despite the presence of constraints, which might take a considerable time to resolve. Can take place whilst Knostrop Sewage Works is operational and can be adequately serviced in advance of major changes to infrastructure such as ELLR. If opportunities for new employment are created at the Power Station site then this will herald a renewed confidence in the area for business investors. Modern, high quality employment can co-exist with other uses and activities. Employment development would not preclude a more broadly based mix of uses in the vicinity although mixed use development will always be constrained by the presence of the filter beds.	REG 25
0011	00078	RWE Npower	Infrastructure issues	Efficient infrastructure is critical to the successful delivery of comprehensive regeneration. Four key development sites rely on the construction of the ELLR. There are limitations to the ELLR it will not unlock all development opportunities. To create an effective infrastructure grid it is prudent to access development opportunities by strengthening south to north links. Skelton Grange Road is one link which together with Skelton Road Bridge is capable of providing access to new development on the Power Station site	REG 25

0011	00079	RWE Npower	Environmental issues	Viable and realistic new development will provide the primary vehicle for environmental gain. New development will underpin investment in the remediation and reclamation of contaminated land. Filter bed are a significant impediment to new uses such as offices, residential or retail but it would be wrong to build a strategy which relies on their removal as a first step because the process is complex and costly.	REG 25
0011	00080	RWE Npower	Implementation issues	Regeneration must be seen as a long-term process. Significant new infrastructure and land reclamation on an exceptional scale will take place over a considerable time and will be phased. Important that short term development is encouraged. Power Station site is one location where short-term benefits can be realised-benefits to economic activity and diversity, to the infrastructure grid of the area and to the quality of the environment.	REG 25
0012	00081	Leeds Construction and Training Agency	What do you want AAP to achieve	Significant economic and social impact for Leeds. Maximise employment opportunities for those local people who need support to access training and jobs - who are not job ready and may have been unemployed for a long period. Tie job opportunities into tendering with contractors.	REG 25
0012	00082	Leeds Construction and Training Agency	Like to change about area	Improved access and more attractive for people to live and work.	REG 25
0012	00083	Leeds Construction and Training Agency	Barriers to improving area	Access by local residents from surrounding area.	REG 25
0012	00085	Leeds Construction and Training Agency	Economic issues	Needs to offer jobs for local people. Needs clear workforce planning so long-term unemployed are trained and job ready before jobs are available. Need to benefit from opportunities in the regeneration activity and in the businesses who will locate there.	REG 25
0012	00086	Leeds Construction and Training Agency	Social issues	Need to ensure that hard to reach groups who do not access job centre services are supported so that they benefit from these opportunities.	REG 25

0012	00087	Leeds Construction and Training Agency	Infrastructure issues	Need to consider local labour contracts at tender stage and then enforce the contracts.	REG 25
0013	00088	Leeds City Credit Union	Missing issues	No mention is made of the issues of financial exclusion on the residents and businesses in the area. The LCC study "Exclusion to Inclusion" (Dec 2004) highlights the effects of financial exclusion on the most deprived area some recommendations.	REG 25
0013	00089	Leeds City Credit Union	Consultation	E-mail updates; focus groups, public exhibition (as exhibitor if possible); Attend workshop of planning for real session.	REG 25
0014	00090	Freightliner Ltd	Infrastructure issues	Supports freight by rail and the encouragement of taking freight off the road	REG 25
0014	00091	Freightliner Ltd	Consultation	E-mail updates	REG 25

APPENDIX 2

STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT – INITIAL COMMENTS RECEIVED

			LEEDS STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT		
Represent or Number	Representation Number	Name of Organisation	Comments	Change proposed	Consultation Stage
0001	00001	Leeds Youth Council	There is concern over the volume of consultation the LYC are receiving. They need to be assured of the value of any contribution they may make.		REG25
0002	00002	Farnley & Wortley Ward	Not impressed by the effort at community engagement and capacity building within the LDF process to date.		REG25
0003	00003	Cllr John Illingworth	Consultation involves a dialogue between equals. The Freedom of Information Act needs to be embraced. Current notification is not effective, copies of plans are not made available, the process is abbreviated so that community groups don't have the time to respond, "it is a game only rich white men can play". Consultation needs to be a two way street - the LDF has already fixed the areas for consultation and the topics to be considered.	Advertise better - send more letters to neighbours, publish master plans showing location of current planning applications. Getting more details out to more places and by publishing on the internet. Reduce the cost of public participation. Give the public more time to respond - avoid consulting in the holidays. reject more "unsatisfactory" planning applications rather than defer & delegate. accept more public input.	REG25
0004	00004	WM. Morrison Supermarkets PLC	Reproduce the "Leeds guide to community involvement" as an appendix to the SCI to guide developers on best practice in community consultation.	Would like to be involved with the Eastgate redevelopment and any retail study/survey.	REG25

0005	00005	The Laurels Action Group	Needs to be more concise - "too long for a statement"! The structure of the SCI is easy to understand. It is essential to involve more people in the planning process and developers should be made to consult the community before submitting plans. All officers should know the area of the city for which they are responsible so that there can be effective consultation. Find out what groups operate in the area eg church groups etc and publise the information.	There are some excellent ideas but how many of these are viable - it should be mandatory for developers to pay for consultation events. Liaison should take place with the MP and ward councillors as well as the community.	REG25
0006	00006	Ramblers Association	The document is easy to understand. The Ramblers Association welcomes the Council's proposals to involve more people. It is unfortunate that the Draft SCI is out for consultation at the same time as other SPDs. The SCI will define the list of stakeholder groups and as such it is suggested that the SPDs are subject to early review.	The SCI makes no reference to how LDD will be made available once adopted. We would wish to see paper copies made widely available in libraries and similar places and that these are free of charge to voluntary organisations. It is suggested that SPDs are subject to longer periods of public consultation as they are not subject to independent examination.	REG25
0007	00007	Leeds Local Access Forum	The document is easy to understand. The Leeds Local Access Forum is a statutory body established under Section 94 of the C'side and Rights of Way Act 2000. It provides advice to Leeds City Council and Countryside Agency (Natural England) on the improvement of public access to land for open-air recreation and the enjoyment of the area in ways which respect local circumstances and the needs of integrated land management, environmental, social economic and educational interests. the forum consists of 10 members. the forum would welcome the opportunity to be consulted on large planning applications, which have a strategic impact. Of key interest to the Forum is the Core Strategy, Public Transport Improvements, Greenspace and Sport and	On behalf of the Leeds Local Access Forum it is requested that the Forum is added to the Existing Consultation and Improvement Structure in Leeds as set out in Appendix 3.	REG25

			Recreation.		
0008	00008	English Nature	English Nature supports the engagement and consultation with groups, which represent the environmental lobby and ramblers, walkers and cyclists. We would expect some of the other groups to also have concerns about the environment for example easy access to greenspace for healthy walking by the health care groups.		REG25
0009	00009	English Heritage	In view of English Heritage's remit they suggest that the following general principles are reflected in the SCI: Environmental quality in spatial planning - incorporating the natural, built and historic environment and rural issues in plans and strategies. It is recommended that EH, EN, EA and CA are all contacted at as early as possible in the making of plans. Guidance produced by EH "Planning and development in the historic environment - a charter for EH Advisory services, April 2005 details the circumstances where EH must be consulted i.e. planning applications etc. it also underlines the importance of pre-application discussions.	English Heritage recommends consulting the following non-governmental organisations: CABI, Ancient Monuments, Council for British Archaeology, society for the protection of ancient buildings, the Georgian group the Victorian society the twentieth century society, garden history society the national trust, local civic/amenity society, local building preservation trust local archaeological and Antiquarian societies and local history societies. (they have provided an address list).	REG25

0010	00010	The Ridings Housing Association	<p>More transparency with regard to the decision process is required. A lot of residents can put forward views at forums that have no decision making powers. Consultation forums do not provide sufficient transparency for participants in terms of what happened with their views. similarly there needs to be a clearer process for challenging the authority - there are not enough measurable service standards in the SCI that could be challenged for eg through a complaints process. in terms of planning applications there should be protection for residents against repeat applications. the SCI is very good on information and consultation structures however there should be more public participation in decision making and policy implementation. Eg. better VOICE representation rights on all decision making panels. Community participation is very good in some district partnerships but poor in others - the SCI should set the minimum requirement.</p>	REG25	
0011	00011	Yorkshire Forward	<p>YF welcomes the general approach to the SCI document but suggest a few minor amendments to improve it: The identification of different sectors, groups and individuals that make up the Leeds community is welcomed as is the acknowledgement of their differing needs in terms of consultation and involvement. it is vital that a range of methods are utilised during the LDF process and planning applications. Different consultation mechanisms are needed to be targeted at different audiences to maximise community involvement. Appendix 2 clearly outlines the proposed consultation and participation methods however there seems to be limited opportunity in this table for community and stakeholder involvement in the consideration of 'Issues and options'. YF welcome the recognition of the broad groups who are often excluded from the planning process and the intention to pay particular attention to addressing this issue.</p>	<p>It may be helpful for the SCI to indicate which consultation methods may be used for which sectors/ groups of the community. Whilst comprehensive details of timescales for the production of different LDF documents are contained in the LDS it may be helpful to highlight key dates for involvement in and consultation on the DPDs identified in the SCI. YF feel that the consultation and engagement process could be significantly enhanced through improved engagement in the earlier stages of DPD preparation and as such would suggest greater consideration to the methods used to engage the community and stakeholders prior to preferred options consultation. Further detail could usefully be included in the SCI on how Leeds plan to address the issue of</p>	REG25

				<p>'excluded groups' - and more specifically how these groups might be engaged in the process. YF would like to see LCC consider options available to provide capacity building and skills training for communities to allow them to participate more effectively in the planning process.</p>	
0012	00012	Leeds Community Foundation	<p>If 'community significance' is to be a determinant of which planning applications are to be subject to community consultation then this term requires definition to avoid either too few or too many applications being deemed by candidates. It is recognised that resources are limited and efficient and effective use of them is to be encouraged but the wording in chapter 6 is worrying that it could lead to tokenistic consultations. Planning for real exercises are a good way of getting positive input from the community but these aren't mentioned in the SCI.</p>	<p>better define "community significance" (in Chapter 5) Add in reference to 'planning for real exercises.</p>	REG25

0013	00013	Community Work Training Company	<p>Comments on the draft summary leaflet: Concern that those involved in groups or partnerships may respond to this but those that are not - how could they respond. The SCI needs to relate to what will be contained in DPDs eg "what the land next to your street is going to be used as" will be clearer as to why people should bother. The SCI needs to provide the simple message "we will come and meet you group".</p>	<p>Two key messages missing from the summary leaflet are: "what is a plan for your community" and "we will come and meet your group".</p>	REG25
0014	00014	The Trustees for Hanover Property Unit Trust	<p>It is essential that the council recognises the importance of adequate "developer interest" within the SCI as the Inspectors report will become binding and the SCI will be referred to for "soundness". As the LDF is progressed the council will be under no obligation to consult anyone who is not identified within the SCI. it is therefore paramount that developer interests are specifically identified so that developer interests and technical knowledge (particularly in regard to market conditions, viability and deliverability) are fully represented from the formative stages of the LDF and throughout. the reference to local developers and builders in Appendix 4 is too restrictive. It is recognised that the LDF will relate only to the Leeds district but the SCI should take into consideration that there are groups and stakeholders with an interest in the LDF process that are not based in the Leeds area.</p>	<p>Reword Appendix 4 to refer to: "groups, which represent landowners, developers and housebuilders with local interests". In addition the reference to "engaging and consulting with any groups or stakeholders in the Leeds areas" at page 30 is restrictive and reference to the "Leeds" area should be deleted. At the very least the council should include as stakeholders all organisations that previously made representations in respect of the UDP.</p>	REG25

0015	00015	Peter Hirschmann	<p>A major flaw in the SCI is resource (pg. 17). Unless it is properly resources LDFs will be a paper exercise. I would prefer to see planners with a manageable caseload as the first priority. The definition of "Community Significance" (pg. 14) is too narrow. Whilst I support the concept of developers submitting details of their community involvement this needs to be a cyclic process as the latest plans that go to committee may not be the version that the community were consulted upon. It is therefore vital that the process of pre-application discussions is rigorous and thorough. Although a member of local community organisations I was unaware of Area Cttee meetings, ward forums and citizens panels - this suggests they are less than effective. Leeds Voice sees its function as networking and education and has no remit to comment on planning matters. Is SPD the new name for SPG? the list appears to be incomplete - there is no reference to VDS/NDS or to CA appraisals - an area where Leeds is woefully failing communities.</p>	<p>Whilst notification is provided to objectors of the outcome of planning applications it would be helpful if the letter could include details of any planning conditions.</p>	REG25
0016	00016	W. Yorkshire Group of Victorian Society	<p>We note the references to Statutory consultees on pg. 7 and amenity societies on page 30 and are surprised that we were not approached directly. At present we receive paper copies of planning applications over and above those required as statutory consultees. we have been concerned for some time that there are inconsistencies in what we receive and would be grateful for a meeting to resolve this as part of the LDF consultation process. this is also inconsistent in regard to pre-application discussions - we would expect to be invited to all major developments involving listed buildings. We note the absence from the list of SPDs of Conservation Area appraisals and Village Design Statements. We note on Page 17 the issue of resources and share the concern that this exercise should not detract from the fundamental activities of the Development Department. We are pleased that the ODPM has allocated earmarked funds for developing LDFs and trust that this will be used in Leeds.</p>		REG25

0017	00017	Groundwork Leeds	<p>The online comments form should be made a word document. The SCI is easy to understand. Wider consultation is applauded and further consultation through Leeds Voice Environmental forum would be welcomed (the forum has over 400 member organisations in Leeds). Local consultation is key to successful planning. where appropriate specialist groups with a wider perspective should be brought in to comment. the community and stakeholder groups look comprehensive.</p>	<p>If not already on the list of consultees can Leeds Voice Environment Forum be added? Please contact Groundwork Leeds on the issues relating to urban landscape design, community consultation and greenspace.</p>	REG25
0018	00018	Government Office of Yorkshire and the Humber	<p>Pg. 3 - Future consultations should be clear and unambiguous about acceptable methods of making comments. Pg. 4 - further info on how the SCI will be linked to the Vision of Leeds and other strategies is recommended. Pg. 10 - it would be more accurate to say an LDF includes two ' principal' types of documents. Also it could usefully be explained here (not withstanding Appendix 5) that a DPD (with RSS) forms part of the statutory development plan for Leeds and is subject to independent examination by an Inspector whose report is binding. Pg. 11 - explain here that SPDs are not part of the plan and not subject to independent examination. More positive drafting should be considered for the sentence "...but only seeks out your contribution... in the subject matter". Pg. 13 - consideration should be given to referring explicitly to 'local advertisement' in a local newspaper (Regs 2, 17, 26 & 28). Pg. 17 & 18 - more needs to be included on resource implications of the consultation methods and availability (finance).</p>	<p>The SCI should include a short section on "how to get involved". This might be included in Appendix 2 (by reference of the stages in Appendix 5 and 6) stating what the community can do at each stage - this could also be inserted into the consultation stage column of appendices 5 and 6. It would be helpful to include an example of an LDD at this stage. Appendix 4 should make sure that groups or stakeholders listed under 'other consultees' (PPS12 App E3) are included. The glossary should provide the full title of the regulations. There needs to be a statement that says that the Council will comply with the SCI.</p>	REG25

0019	00019	Leeds Civic Trust	The trust is very keen on consultation and welcomes any commitment by the council to improving contacts with the community. The SCI will be valuable but only if its ethos is embraced fully by all officers in all dealings with projects that impact on the public who might be affected. A much more open attitude to the way development proposals are processed in Leeds is required. the Trusts current involvement in schemes is inconsistent. Reasonable timescales for responses must be allowed.	REG25	
0020	00020	Far Headingley Village Society	The word "sustainability" is used in several places but not defined in the planning context. Proof reading comments noted. All developments are of "community significance". Developers should be issued with SPG in the form of Neighbourhood Design Statements where published. The Far Headingley Society have taken a lead role on the NDS, involving wide consultations - this pattern could be adopted in the preparation of other documents. Door to door publicity, more use of site notices (clearer and more informative) should be considered - initial awareness is key. Leeds civic newspaper is very useful but its delivery must be monitored.	Define Sustainability in the glossary. Appendix 2 should list "notices" as a means of community engagement. Pdf documents online are not always easy to access - perhaps word versions can be provided as well. Neither of the universities (as institutions or students as individuals) appear as stakeholders - at a minimum student unions should be consulted.	REG25
0021	00021	Leeds Church Institute	The SCI does not appear to have been drafted with any awareness of the guidance in the Local Interfaith Guide ODPM and IFN. As drafted the SCI will not engage faith and BME communities very well.	REG25	
0022	00022	NPFA	The NPFA has adopted a paper entitled "Development Plans and Statements of Community Involvement" which provides guidance to LPA in response to Draft SCI.	REG25	

0023	00023	Leeds HMO Lobby	Appendix 4 comprises a list of Interest Groups but makes no mention of local community associations (groups that represent concerns of a community in a specific geographical locality. The SCI aims to be inclusive - in this respect interest groups are exclusive (they are only concerned with the interests of a specific group. Concern is voiced about the timescales involved in the preparation process of DPDs and SPD and attenuated stages of consultation can be a deterrent to public consultation. Lack of expertise puts community groups at a disadvantage. the community needs expert advocates - the inner NW area has addressed this through appointing a Community Planning Officer. There is no reference in the SCI that SPDs might be initiated by the community.	Recommends that Local Community Associations should feature prominently on any list of candidates for community involvement. Recommends that the procedures for community involvement are as focused as possible. Recommends that community involvement should be facilitated by support from expert advocates (like community planning officers). Recommends that the SCI draws attention to the possibility of community involvement in the very initiation of planning documents.	REG25
0024	00024	Richard Tyler	Appendix 4 comprises a long list of interest groups - area based groups are just as important because they are inclusive to all faiths ethnicity etc. The consultation period will stretch the resources of community groups - can the process be shortened. Could the use of advocates to represent community groups be rolled out across the district (eg the Community Planning officer for NW)? Can Communities initiate SPDs - if so this needs to be highlighted in the SCI	See above.	REG25
0025	00025	Otley In Bloom	The SCI could be improved by providing a simple introduction in lay-mans terms to explain the differences between the existing system and the new system - what are the reasons for the change. The SCI is difficult to get into at the begging but generally is easy to understand. More ownership of plans should be given to local people to reduce objections - and therefore hopefully a reduction in delays. Is there a risk that the finite pot of funding for planning may result in a switch of resources from business and private applications to consultations?		REG25



AGENDA ITEM NO.:
Originator: Gill Smith
Tel: 0113 - 2478070

**REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT
REPORT TO DEVELOPMENT PLANS PANEL**

DATE : 6 September 2005

**SUBJECT : WEST LEEDS GATEWAY AREA ACTION PLAN:
REPORT OF WORK IN PROGRESS.**

Electoral Wards Affected :	Specific Implications For :
Armley	Ethnic Minorities <input type="checkbox"/>
Farnley and Wortley	Women <input type="checkbox"/>
	Disabled People <input type="checkbox"/>

1. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is two fold, namely
 - (i) to set out progress and next steps in the preparation of the West Leeds Gateway Area Action Plan (WLGAAAP); and
 - (ii) to report the responses to the consultation on the Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal for the WLGAAAP.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Members will recall the previous Panel Report considered on 5 July, which set out the approach to and issues for the preparation of the WLGAAAP. Its main purpose is to stimulate co-ordinated sustainable regeneration in the Armley and New Wortley parts of the area, to address the known difficulties and issues previously identified and set these within the context of strategic District-wide aims and objectives, e.g. the Community Strategy for Leeds (Vision II).
- 2.2 The WLG Regeneration proposals are being led by the West Leeds Area Management Team (Dept of Neighbourhoods and Housing). They engaged Atkins as their consultants, to work up Options and a Preferred Option, in order to address the six identified objectives for the area.
- 2.3 These six objectives, explained in detail in the July Panel Report are:-
 - (i) revitalisation of Armley Town Centre;
 - (ii) physical investment in the Clydes housing area;
 - (iii) encouraging provision of a heavy rail halt for Armley;
 - (iv) encouraging businesses and developing jobs for local people;
 - (v) provision of training and skills for local people in an "education cluster";
 - (vi) encouraging private housing investment in the area.

3. CURRENT ISSUES

- 3.1 Atkins made a presentation of the five emerging Options and their Preferred Strategy for the area at the meeting of the West Leeds Area Regeneration Board on 9 August. These options are presently being refined in consultation with Officers from the Development Department.
- 3.2 The Atkins work sought to combine the two normally separate stages of public participation for an AAP under LDF Planning Regulation 25 (informal public engagement on Issues and Alternative Options) and Regulation 26 (formal 6 week public participation on Preferred Options). In merging the stages, there was some concern that this might lead to difficulties later in the plan preparation and approval process regarding the 'test of soundness'. This is because, whilst useful, the only consultation on the emerging Issues and Options to date has been limited to an afternoon workshop for local stakeholders, which in practice mainly comprised Officers of the City Council. It is clearly important that the local community should have an opportunity to comment on all the emerging issues and options and to help 'shape' the plan before decisions are made on Preferred Options (prior to formal public consultation).
- 3.3 Advice was sought by Planning Officers on these concerns regarding the process from the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber and City Council's Legal and Democratic Services section. The Government Office advised that combining the 'Issues and alternative Options' and the 'Preferred Options' stages is technically possible but advised caution in doing this, as it will be the Planning Inspectorate, not them, who will test the 'soundness' of the Plan. The City Council's Legal and Democratic Services section of the Chief Executive's Office also agreed that combining the two stages is technically possible, but they too have also advised against it.
- 3.4 The main reason relates to the "test of soundness" of the Plan. Combining the stages could fall foul of this test at the Public Examination if an Inspector were to consider that insufficient time had been given to public engagement at the appropriate stage. Whilst the need for urgency in tackling the regeneration of the area is a fundamental issue, it is clearly not in the best interests of the City Council, local people or stakeholders, for regeneration strategy for the area to fail at a later stage, due to taking short cuts in an earlier part of plan preparation.
- 3.5 The normal process advocated for AAP preparation is for early engagement and public comment at the Regulation 25 stage to be taken into account in developing the Preferred Options, when the latter are brought back for formal six week consultation under Regulation 26.
- 3.6 The prevailing circumstances relating to the West Leeds Gateway Regeneration Area, with the involvement of consultants by the West Area Management Team, has resulted in a slightly different process for preparation of the Reg. 25 stage of the AAP, compared with those AAPs for the City Centre, the Aire Valley and EASEL. In these other cases, emphasis has been given to public engagement on issues, rather than developing alternative options at such an early stage of preparation. The process issues in relation to the West Leeds Gateway, have arisen as a consequence of seeking to combine programmes of activity being developed through differing regeneration processes and regulatory frameworks.
- 3.7 In taking the West Leeds Gateway AAP process forward positively, it is considered therefore that the Reg. 25 stage (Issues and Alternative Options) is undertaken more

directly to reflect the LDF regulations, in order to be able to demonstrate that the process of plan preparation has been 'sound'. This is because it needs to be clearly demonstrated that the comments and representations on the Issues and Alternative Options have been considered and used to inform the Preferred Options stage under Reg. 26.

- 3.8 If the two stages were combined, as had been proposed (as noted above), then there is concern that the public and stakeholders could be confused by this process, when being asked to comment on issues and proposals for Alternative Options and Preferred Options at the same time. In addition, there would also be a need for clarity in managing any representations received and their status, in the light of combining informal and formal stages of public participation.
- 3.9 The concerns and potential pitfalls of combining the stages for public participation under Regulation 25 and 26 were explained by Officers to the WLG Regeneration Board immediately following the recent Atkins Powerpoint presentation of Alternative Options and Preferred Option.
- 3.10 The Board Members shared the concerns of Officers based on advice from Government and legal sources. The Board therefore agreed that it was prudent to separate out the two stages of consultation under Regulations 25 and 26 into two distinct stages, thereby allowing the choice of Preferred Options to be informed by the views of the public and stakeholders at the Issues and Alternative Options stage.
- 3.11 This change in approach has implications for the timetable for preparing the AAP. Consequently, some amendments will need to be made to the programming of the AAP Timetable which was included in the July Panel Report. A revised timetable will therefore need to be developed within the context of the 'next steps' set out below.

4 NEXT STEPS FOR THE WLGAAP

- 4.1 Atkins, the West Leeds Gateway Area Board's planning consultants, were due to submit their final report at the end of August to the Board. The report and proposals will need to be subject of careful internal consideration and co-ordination across various working areas of the City Council. This is to assess the practical and financial viability of the consultants' various proposals and also how they relate to existing strategic policies, programmes and proposals of the City Council. Although the Strategy for the West Leeds Regeneration Area is intended to be aspirational, it is considered unwise to raise undue false expectations for the area, which cannot be delivered within the timescale of the AAP.
- 4.2 The Atkins final report to the WLG Board (within the context of the West Leeds Gateway Issues previously presented to DPP members) is intended to form the basis of the planning documentation required for public participation on the Issues and Alternative Options stage of the WLGAAP under Regulation 25.
- 4.3 It is now proposed to go out for public engagement on Issues and Alternative Options under Regulation 25. Whilst the regulations do not specify a timescale for public consultation at this stage, it is considered that a six week period would be an appropriate period to engage with the local community and other stakeholders, within the overall timetable for plan production.
- 4.4 A report will be brought back to the Panel (in November), setting out proposals for the main Issues and Alternative Options based on the Atkins Report, for approval as the basis for the public consultation under Reg. 25.

- 4.5 A revised timetable to accommodate the necessary changes will also be brought back at the same time for consideration. It should be noted that, subject to Members' comments, the revised timetable will need to be incorporated into the year end update of the Local Development Scheme, as part of the Annual Monitoring Report.

5 SCOPING REPORT ON SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

- 5.1 Members will recall that the Panel Report on 5 July included the Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal for the WLGAAP, at Appendix B. The Scoping Report was sent to four main stakeholders for comment, as recommended in government guidance on the preparation of Sustainability Appraisals. These comprise the Environment Agency, English Nature, English Heritage and the Countryside Agency. In order to cover economic and social issues, it was also sent to the Leeds Initiative. In addition, at the request of the West Leeds Area Management Team, it was also sent to a range of local groups and organisations.
- 5.2 This consultation is intended to help ensure that the approach to the Sustainability Appraisal covers an appropriate range of issues with which to assess the Preferred Option, at a later stage of plan preparation.
- 5.3 The cut off date for responses to the Scoping Report was 19 August and four responses have been received, namely those from the Countryside Agency, English Heritage, English Nature, together with one from Re'new, a local organisation. The latter's comments, although helpful, did not relate directly to the Scoping Report. It concerned a city wide initiative *Construction Leeds*, linking the unemployed, particularly in deprived area, with jobs in the construction sector. The main comments of the consultees are as follows.
- 5.4 Countryside Agency
- Include impacts on Rights of Way
 - Inadequate and missing information on linking open space, greenspace and green corridors for access and recreation.
- Comment:
These issues will be taken into account in the working up of proposals for the Options and preferred Option, in line with normal good planning practice.
- 5.5 English Heritage
- Local distinctiveness should be more explicitly included and separated out from 'local cleanliness' in the 23 objectives set out in the "Guide to Sustainability Appraisal of the Leeds Local Development Framework".
 - Reference to the term 'preserve' and not 'conserve' is preferred, relating to the historic environment, in line with terminology in government guidance and legislation.
 - Some baseline data is considered inadequate and not sufficiently robust for monitoring the effects of implementing the AAP.
 - Some possible indicators are suggested for the historic environment.
 - Concern is expressed regarding whether the European Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive can be met without additional indicators.
 - English Heritage considers that the SA will need to comply with European Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive, because the strategic role envisaged for the AAP by the City Council for the whole west Leeds is more than a "small area at a local level" – hence triggering the requirement in the SEA.

- The inclusion of reference to 2 additional national policies in Appendix 1, namely PPG 16 on “Archaeology and Planning” and “The Historic Environment: Force for Our Future” (DCMS 2001).

Comment:

- The first two issues are being addressed in the wider context of the document “A Guide to Sustainability Appraisal of the Leeds Local Development Framework” (or the Leeds SA Guide)
- The issues of baseline data and indicators are being re-considered. There is a general acknowledgement of lack of some baseline data in several of the Scoping Reports for Development Plan Documents. This was due to the early difficulty in establishing a broad spectrum of data from a range of potential sources, within a short timescale and working up a satisfactory method for monitoring of performance against the Baseline data.
- The way the Leeds SA Guide is written is considered adequate to meet the SEA Directive, hence the WLGAAP Scoping Report should adequately meet it too, since it is based on the Guide.
- PPG 16 is already included in the national policy documentation at page 30 of the Scoping Report. The Statement of the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) can be added.

5.6 English Nature

- Extend the baseline data for sub-objectives of Objective 14, on Biodiversity (see Appendix 2 of the July Panel report), to include up to date information on the environmental characteristics of the area regarding:
 - (i) the presence/population size of species/habitats in the Leeds Biodiversity Action Plan.
 - (ii) condition of any Sites of Ecological or Geological Importance (SEGI) and Local Nature Reserves (LNR) within the AAP area.

Comment

- This biodiversity issue needs to be considered in the wider context of the Leeds SA Guide and resourcing issues across the City Council. Consequently the potential for monitoring the 10 Leeds Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAP) for habitats, rather than species counts, is currently being considered as a way forward and more deliverable measure. Issues will have to be addressed, however, in monitoring the condition of SEGIs and LNRs.

6. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1 That this report be accepted by Panel as “work in progress” on the West Leeds Gateway Area Action Plan.
- 6.2 That the Panel supports the West Leeds Gateway Regeneration Board regarding the need to have two separate stages of public participation and consultation under the Issues and Alternative Options stage (Reg. 25) and the Preferred Options stage (Reg. 26) of the WLGAAP.

(WLGAAP DPPanel Rpt 6-9-05.doc)