

**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL  
DATE: 17th FEBRUARY 2006**

**SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON CHAPTER 15 (EAST LEEDS)**

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

**Chapel Allerton, Gipton & Harehills, Killingbeck & Seacroft, Cross Gates & Whinmoor, Temple Newsam, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill, Garforth & Swillington**

**Specific Implications for:**

Ethnic Minorities   
Women   
Disabled People

Key Decision  Major Decision  Eligible for call in  Not Eligible for call in   
Significant Operational Decision  Administrative Decision  (details contained in the report)

**1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1 The purpose of the report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendations for the East Leeds Extension contained in Chapter 15 – East Leeds, and to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations in the light of legal advice.

**2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 At its meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> February 2006 the Panel considered a Report on the proposed response to the Inspectors Recommendations contained at Chapter 15 (East Leeds). A copy of that report is attached as Appendix 1.
- 2.2 Members accepted the officers recommendations in the report except in respect of Section 6 dealing with the East Leeds Extension and requested that legal advice be sought on issues raised in debate before considering the matter further.

**3.0 LEGAL ADVICE**

3.1 Legal advice has been sought from Counsel and will be reported to Panel. Members may wish to treat such advice as an exempt item under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4.12

**4.0 RECOMMENDATION**

4.1 Subject to the advice received Members are asked to agree the recommendations contained in the report dated 7<sup>th</sup> February 2006 regarding the East Leeds Extension as the City Council’s response to the Inspector’s recommendation and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.



## CHAPTER 15 – EAST LEEDS

<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/004</b></p>	<p><b><u>PA 15/004</u></b> AREA STATEMENT – New para.</p> <p><b><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u></b> Para 15.3 I recommend that that Alteration 15/004 be modified to read: “The area covered by East Leeds contains several special policy areas identified for comprehensive neighbourhood renewal under Policy R1 and for which Area Action Plans are to be prepared. These are Aire Valley Leeds, Gipton and Harehills. In addition, East Leeds contains several Action Areas which have been identified for regeneration under Policy R2 and for which Area Statements have been or are to be prepared. These include neighbourhood regeneration at Seacroft, ....</p>	<p><b><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></b> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 15.2 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s recommendation to amend the wording of Alteration 15/004.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Modification</u></b> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>inserting the following paragraph in the Area Statement:</li> </ul> <p><b>“The area covered by East Leeds contains several special policy areas identified for comprehensive neighbourhood renewal under Policy R1 and for which Area Action Plans are to be prepared. These are Aire Valley Leeds, Gipton and Harehills. In addition, East Leeds contains several Action Areas which have been identified for regeneration under Policy R2 and for which Area Statements have been or are to be prepared. These include neighbourhood regeneration at Seacroft, ....</b></p>
<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/011</b></p> <p><b>15/011/ RD</b></p>	<p><b><u>PA 15/011</u></b> “AIRE VALLEY LEEDS” NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL AREA</p> <p><b><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u></b> Para 15.25 I recommend that the UDP be modified by RD Alteration 15/011subject to:</p> <p>1. amending the paragraphs preceding the upper case Policy as follows:</p> <p>AIRE VALLEY LEEDS” NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL AREA</p> <p>The Aire Valley area is a major focus for employment growth in the region. It represents a very significant but underused part of the urban area which could be regenerated to realise its full potential and benefit nearby residents and the City as a whole. The area has considerable strengths and potential in terms of the existing diverse employment base, improving access to a large local workforce in adjacent residential areas, and improved access to the motorway network, the Leeds Inner Ring Road and Leeds City Centre. There are considerable constraints which need to be addressed including</p>	<p><b><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></b> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 15.5-15.24 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s recommendation to modify the text of Alteration 15/011.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Modification</u></b> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>amending the paragraphs preceding the policy as follows:</li> </ul> <p><b>AIRE VALLEY LEEDS” NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL AREA</b></p> <p><b>The Aire Valley area is a major focus for employment growth in the region. It represents a very significant but underused part of the urban area which could be regenerated to realise its full potential and benefit nearby residents and the City as a whole. The area has considerable strengths and potential in terms of the existing diverse employment base, improving access to a large local workforce in adjacent residential areas, and improved access to the motorway network, the Leeds Inner Ring Road and Leeds City Centre. There are considerable constraints which need to be addressed including contamination, inadequate infrastructure and poor environmental quality. A key feature of the area is the Knostrop Waste Water Treatment Works which treats waste for the whole of Leeds. This key strategic asset has a wide environmental impact which will influence acceptable land uses throughout the Neighbourhood Renewal Area.</b></p>

contamination, inadequate infrastructure and poor environmental quality. A key feature of the area is the Knostrop Waste Water Treatment Works which treats waste for the whole of Leeds. This key strategic asset has a wide environmental impact which will influence acceptable land uses throughout the Neighbourhood Renewal Area.

[Continue with SRB6 funding paragraph which identifies the ongoing initiative].

Continue “The identification of “Aire Valley Leeds” as a special policy area under Policy R1 will provide a context for regeneration of the area and support comprehensive, sustainable and innovative new development.”

2. adding the following paragraph:

“Regeneration proposals for the Aire Valley will need to address traffic and transportation issues and must deal with the relationship to the adjoining Motorway network. Through the preparation of an Area Action Plan the City Council, Highways Agency and other transport providers seek to develop a package of sustainable transport infrastructure improvements and services to support the Council’s regeneration proposals. These measures will in turn be developed through consultation with a range of stakeholders and procured through private sector developer contributions and funding agencies.”

3. amending the Policy to refer to an AREA ACTION PLAN rather than ACTION PLAN;

4. adding “and their location” after “Determining the range of land uses” in bullet point 11;

5. adding two further bullet points/key issues “Recognising the impact of, and on, existing businesses/land uses” and “Sustainable transport measures which are of particular importance in the Aire Valley.”; and

6. adding at the end of the penultimate paragraph of 15/011 “This will take the form of an Area Action Plan prepared as part of the new planning system introduced by the Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (see paras. 11.3.2 – 6.)”

[Continue with SRB6 funding paragraph which identifies the ongoing initiative].

**Continue “The identification of “Aire Valley Leeds” as a special policy area under Policy R1 will provide a context for regeneration of the area and support comprehensive, sustainable and innovative new development.”**

- adding the following paragraph:

**“Regeneration proposals for the Aire Valley will need to address traffic and transportation issues and must deal with the relationship to the adjoining Motorway network. Through the preparation of an Area Action Plan the City Council, Highways Agency and other transport providers seek to develop a package of sustainable transport infrastructure improvements and services to support the Council’s regeneration proposals. These measures will in turn be developed through consultation with a range of stakeholders and procured through private sector developer contributions and funding agencies.”;**

- amending the Policy to refer to an AREA ACTION PLAN rather than ACTION PLAN;
- adding “and their location” after “Determining the range of land uses” in bullet point 11;
- adding two further bullet points/key issues “Recognising the impact of, and on, existing businesses/land uses” and “Sustainable transport measures which are of particular importance in the Aire Valley.”; and
- adding at the end of the penultimate paragraph of 15/011 “This will take the form of an Area Action Plan prepared as part of the new planning system introduced by the Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (see paras. 11.3.2 – 6.)”

<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/014</b></p> <p><b>15/014/ RD</b></p>	<p><b>PA 15/014</b> HUNSLET RIVERSIDE STRATEGIC HOUSING SITE</p> <p><b>Inspector's recommendation</b> Para 15.39 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with RD Alteration 15/014 subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. changing the Policy title to "Hunslet Riverside Strategic Housing and Mixed-use Site", and amending the supporting text to clearly set out the intended balance between housing and other uses;</li> <li>2. amending the boundary of the site in accordance with Doc. S/20387/A; and</li> <li>3. adding the following as an additional paragraph at the end of the supporting text:</li> </ol> <p>"East of the river there is a rail link which is expected to have a long-term future and this part of the site has considerable potential for further rail-related uses, which will be explored through preparation of the development framework. It will be important to ensure that such potential is safeguarded for the future, in line with national advice on transport planning, and that any layout provides an adequate buffer between rail facilities and sensitive uses such as housing and open space."</p>	<p><b>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</b> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 15.27-15.38 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to modify the text of Alteration 15/014.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modification</b> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• amending the policy title, site boundary and supporting text.</li> <li>• changing the Policy title to "Hunslet Riverside Strategic Housing and Mixed-use Site", and amending the supporting text to clearly set out the intended balance between housing and other uses by adding the following as an additional paragraph at the end of the supporting text:</li> </ul> <p><b>"East of the river there is a rail link which is expected to have a long-term future and this part of the site has considerable potential for further rail-related uses, which will be explored through preparation of the development framework. It will be important to ensure that such potential is safeguarded for the future, in line with national advice on transport planning, and that any layout provides an adequate buffer between rail facilities and sensitive uses such as housing and open space."</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• amending the boundary of the site in accordance with Doc. S/20387/A by deleting land at the south east of the site from the allocation as shown on the attached plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/015</b></p> <p><b>15/015/ RD</b></p>	<p><b>PA 15/015</b> EAST LEEDS EXTENSION AND PROPOSED ALTERATIONS 15/023, 15/024, 15/025, 15/026, 15/027 AND 16/016</p> <p><b>Inspector's recommendation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Para 15.100 I recommend that prior to adoption of the RUDP the proposed allocation be re-assessed with a view to confining the bulk of built development to the north of the A64, and south of the Leeds - Barwick Road; and including outline phasing proposals in the Plan;</li> <li>2. the UDP be modified in accordance with Alteration RD 15/015, subject to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. deleting the first two sentences and substituting:</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p><b>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</b> The Council rejects the Inspector's recommendations in part. The city council accepts the Inspector's recommendations with the exception of recommendation 1 which relates to a re-assessment of the site to confine the bulk of built development to the north of the A64, and south of Leeds- Barwick Road; and the inclusion of outline phasing proposals in the Plan. The council agree that the area between the A64 and Leeds – Barwick Road is a sensitive area in terms of the need to minimise impact on the Green belt and maintain a significant separation between communities, however, it is premature to define the specific location and nature of development at this time. The Council considers that these matters should be considered within a development framework for the site. The process of identifying which areas may be developed the purpose for which they should be developed and their potential phasing is likely to take some time, will hold up adoption of the Plan and would be better achieved through detailed consideration as part of the Local Development Framework.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modification</b></p>

	<p>“Land around the eastern edge of Leeds is identified as a long-term reserve of land to be used in the event that brownfield sites do not come forward at the rate and in the quantity necessary to meet the annual average housing requirement set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. It will only be released if monitoring shows that this is the case, if any orbital road produces clear public benefits, and if development there is demonstrably the most sustainable option.”</p> <p>b. in the bold text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>deleting “Policy H3-2” and “Phase 2” and substituting “Policy H3” and “Phase 3”;</li> <li>deleting sub-paragraph iv;</li> <li>adding the following at the end:</li> </ul> <p>THE ALLOCATION WILL BE BROUGHT FORWARD FOR DEVELOPMENT ONLY IF:</p> <p>i. MONITORING INDICATES THE NEED FOR FURTHER LAND TO BE RELEASED TO MEET THE RSS ANNUAL AVERAGE HOUSING REQUIREMENT;</p> <p>ii. THE ASSESSMENT OF THE NEED FOR AN ORBITAL ROAD DEMONSTRATES THAT SUCH A ROAD WOULD BOTH SERVE THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SATISFACTORILY AND PRODUCE CLEAR PUBLIC BENEFITS TO USERS OF THE HIGHWAY SYSTEM; AND</p> <p>iii. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL DEMONSTRATES THAT THERE ARE NO PREFERABLE, MORE SUSTAINABLE SITES; AND THAT THE DETAILED PROPOSALS FOR THE EXTENSION ARE INTRINSICALLY SUSTAINABLE.</p> <p>c. adding the following at the end of the first paragraph of supporting text after the bold text:</p> <p>“The impact of such a road upon the highway system will be fully assessed and, so far as the trunk road</p>	<p>Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deleting the first two sentences and substituting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>“Land around the eastern edge of Leeds is identified as a long-term reserve of land to be used in the event that brownfield sites do not come forward at the rate and in the quantity necessary to meet the annual average housing requirement set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. It will only be released if monitoring shows that this is the case, if any orbital road produces clear public benefits, and if development there is demonstrably the most sustainable option.”</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>Revising the policy wording by: in the bold text: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>deleting “Policy H3-2” and “Phase 2” and substituting “Policy H3” and “Phase 3”;</li> <li>deleting sub-paragraph iv;</li> <li>adding the following criteria: <p><b>THE ALLOCATION WILL BE BROUGHT FORWARD FOR DEVELOPMENT ONLY IF:</b></p> <p><b>i. MONITORING INDICATES THE NEED FOR FURTHER LAND TO BE RELEASED TO MEET THE RSS ANNUAL AVERAGE HOUSING REQUIREMENT;</b></p> <p><b>ii. THE ASSESSMENT OF THE NEED FOR AN ORBITAL ROAD DEMONSTRATES THAT SUCH A ROAD WOULD BOTH SERVE THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SATISFACTORILY AND PRODUCE CLEAR PUBLIC BENEFITS TO USERS OF THE HIGHWAY SYSTEM; AND</b></p> <p><b>iii. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL DEMONSTRATES THAT THERE ARE NO PREFERABLE, MORE SUSTAINABLE SITES; AND THAT THE DETAILED PROPOSALS FOR THE EXTENSION ARE INTRINSICALLY SUSTAINABLE.</b></p> </li> <li>adding the following at the end of the first paragraph of supporting text after the bold text: <p><b>“The impact of such a road upon the highway system will be fully assessed and, so far as the trunk road network is concerned, this will be done in consultation with the</b></p> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--	--

	<p>network is concerned, this will be done in consultation with the Highways Agency.”</p> <p>d. incorporating IC/015 into the supporting text;</p> <p>e. adding the Alteration text, as amended, to follow Policy H3 in Chapter 7.</p> <p>3. FD Alterations 15/018 and 15/020 be abandoned.</p>	<p><b>Highways Agency.”</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>incorporating IC/015 into the supporting text. The final sentence of the supporting text will now read as follows:</li> </ul> <p>“The timing of any employment proposals is not constrained by the housing land release mechanism and will be considered through the development framework and in relation to any necessary infrastructure provision”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adding the Alteration text, as amended, to follow Policy H3 in Chapter 7.</li> <li>Deleting First Deposit Alterations 15/018 and 15/020.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/018</b></p>	<p><b>PA 15/018</b> POLICY H4.6 – RED HALL LANE, RED HALL</p> <p><b><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u></b> Para 15.100 and 7.122 I recommend that the Red Hall Lane site is abandoned as part of the ELE and included as a Phase 2 housing allocation site.</p>	<p><b><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></b> The Council <i>accepts</i> the conclusions in para 15.96 and in Chapter 7 para 7.87 to delete Red Hall Lane from the ELE and include it as a housing allocation within Phase 2.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Modification</u></b> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>deleting of reference to Red Hall Lane, Red Hall as forming part of the ELE.</li> <li>retaining it as a UDP housing allocation site including the deletion of Alteration 15/018.</li> <li>amending the text of the adopted UDP to include the site within Phase 2 of the Review.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/019</b></p>	<p><b>PA 15/019</b> POLICY H4.7 – REAR OF SEACROFT HOSPITAL</p> <p><b><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u></b> Para 15.108 I recommend that the UDP be modified by transferring Site H3-3.24, Rear of Seacroft Hospital, Seacroft, from Phase 3 to Phase 2.</p>	<p><b><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></b> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 15.101-15.107 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s recommendation to transfer the site to the rear of Seacroft Hospital, Seacroft from Policy H3-3 to Phase 2.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Modification</u></b> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>reclassifying the Rear of Seacroft Hospital, Seacroft, housing allocation site from Phase 3 to Phase 2.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/020</b></p>	<p><b>PA 15/020</b> POLICY H4.8 - GRIMES DYKE, WHINMOOR</p>	<p><b><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></b> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 15.74-15.79 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s recommendation to delete the site from the ELE and include it within Phase 2.</p>

	<p><b><u>Inspector's recommendation</u></b> Para 15.109 I recommend that the Grimes Dyke site is abandoned as part of the ELE and included as a Phase 2 housing allocation site.</p>	<p><b><u>Proposed Modification</u></b> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• deleting of reference to Grimes Dyke, Whinmoor as forming part of the ELE.</li><li>• retaining it as a UDP housing allocation site including the deletion of Alteration 15/020.</li><li>• amending the text of the adopted UDP to include the site within Phase 2 of the Review.</li></ul>
--	--	---







**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL  
DATE: 7th FEBRUARY 2006**

**SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON CHAPTER 15 (EAST LEEDS)**

**Electoral Wards Affected:**

**Chapel Allerton, Gipton & Harehills, Killingbeck & Seacroft, Cross Gates & Whinmoor, Temple Newsam, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill, Garforth & Swillington**

**Specific Implications for:**

Ethnic Minorities   
Women   
Disabled People

Key Decision  Major Decision  Eligible for call in  Not Eligible for call in   
Significant Operational Decision  Administrative Decision  (details contained in the report)

**1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1.1 The purpose of the report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 15 – East Leeds, and to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations.

**2.0 BACKGROUND**

2.1 There were 36 Proposed Alterations in the East Leeds Chapter, but only 11 Alterations were the subject of an objection to the Plan and these were considered at the Inquiry by the Inspector. These related to the Area Statement and the East Leeds Extension (ELE) and its inclusion of UDP housing allocations at Red Hall Lane (H4:6) and Grimes Dyke (H4:8). In addition, objections related to four PAS sites at Manston Lane, Manston; West of Wetherby Road, Red Hall; Red Hall Lane/Skelton Lane, South of A64; and Scholes Park Farm (falls within Chapter 16).

2.2 Other objections related to the Aire Valley Leeds Neighbourhood Renewal Area; the Hunslet Riverside Strategic Housing site (H3-1A); and the inclusion of the Seacroft Hospital housing allocation site (H3-3.24) within Phase 3 of the UDP Review.

**3.0 AREA STATEMENT**

3.1 The East Leeds Area Statement was expanded to include reference to several action areas identified for regeneration activity under policy R1.

3.2 The Inspector recommends that the Area Statement should be amended to reflect the introduction of Special Policy Areas and the preparation of Area Action Plans in accordance with his recommendations relating to Policy R1 in Chapter 11. In addition the Area Statement should be amended to reflect his recommendations in Chapter 7

renaming the Hunslet Riverside Strategic housing site and phasing of the East Leeds Extension.

3.3 The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions and his recommendation to modify the Area Statement.

#### **4.0 AIRE VALLEY LEEDS**

4.1 The Inspector considers the key issues concerning Aire Valley Leeds (AVL) are:

- should the results of the AVL Transportation Study be included in the UDP Review;
- should reference be made to safeguarding the setting of Temple Newsam Historic Park and Garden and the Colton Conservation Area to the north? Should "and scheduled Ancient Monuments" be added to Alteration 15/011?
- should the Proposed Alteration be amended to reflect Yorkshire Water Services' [YWS] concerns with regard to the presence and environmental effects of the Knostrop Waste Water Treatment Works [KWWTW]?
- should the Proposed Alteration be amended to express more fully the opportunities and constraints as identified by the Grimley reports "Strategic Vision for the Aire Valley" and "AVL – Market Demand and Development Impact Study Final Report"]?
- should there be reference to the north-west parts of the area being suitable for leisure, residential, retail and tourist orientated developments to support the City Centre? Should there be a more detailed policy to provide certainty?

4.2 On the above key issues the Inspector concludes the following:

#### **Transportation Study**

4.3 The Highways Agency consider that the results of the AVL Transportation Study should be included in the UDP to address the transportation issues. The Council and the Highways Agency agreed an addition to the Alteration, which was included in the Council's evidence at the Inquiry (ref: LCC/062). This stated that:

*"Regeneration proposals for the Aire Valley will need to address traffic and transportation issues and must deal with the relationship to the adjoining Motorway network. Through the preparation of an Area Action Plan the City Council, Highways Agency and other transport providers seek to develop a package of sustainable transport infrastructure improvements and services to support the Council's regeneration proposals. These measures will in turn be developed through consultation with a range of stakeholders and procured through private sector developer contributions and funding agencies".*

4.4 The Council agreed that sustainable transport measures will need to be addressed in the preparation of the intended AAP. In response to the Highway Agency's views the Council also proposed an Inquiry Change (re: IC/018) to add to the policy criteria in Alteration 15/011 as follows:

*"Sustainable transport measures which are of particular importance in the Aire Valley."*

- 4.5 Enhanced public transport and accessibility to jobs is already included in the policy criteria. The Inspector commented that all the necessary issues will need to be addressed in the AAP and concluded that it is premature to go into further detail in the UDP at this stage.

### **Historic Sites and Areas**

- 4.6 English Heritage's concern relating to Temple Newsam has been addressed by RD Alteration 15/011 in that a policy criterion is proposed to be added referring to safeguarding the setting of Temple Newsam Historic Park and Garden and the Colton Conservation Area.

### **Knostrop Waste Water Treatment Works**

- 4.7 YWS are concerned that the UDP Review (Revised Deposit) as drafted fails to recognise the presence and impact of KWWTW in the Aire Valley. Relocation of the works is not practicable; the cost is estimated to be about £500m. Significant improvement could only be afforded through profit from development of the surrounding area. The Inspector concludes that KWWTW is likely to be a permanent presence which should be acknowledged and taken into account in future planning of the AVL and that such reference should be made in the RUDP.
- 4.8 It is an accepted planning principle, (seen with regard to pollution in para. 1.32 of PPG23) that the juxtaposition of conflicting uses should be avoided. YWS's usual guidance is that a separation distance of 100-500m should be allowed around sewage treatment works but in this case they are not seeking a specific "cordon sanitaire". However there is no basis for any such distance in national, regional or Council policies or guidance.
- 4.9 The Council consider that existing AUDP Policies GP3 and GP5, which require a judgement to be reached, are sufficient to protect residential amenity if necessary through affording sufficient separation. YWS suggest the inclusion of a paragraph relating to odour and its measurement by odour units based on the Environment Agency's Draft Technical Guidance Note on Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control H4. The Inspector notes that this guidance is currently draft and considers that this is sufficient reason for the suggested limits not being included in the UDP. The odour units contours are also questionable based on average emissions data rather than KWWTW site-specific measurements.
- 4.10 The Inspector considers that it would be appropriate to include the wording suggested by YWS following the introductory paragraph in Alteration 15/011 to reflect the presence and importance of KWWTW. Similarly it would be appropriate to amend the 11<sup>th</sup> bullet point in the Alteration to read "*Determining the range of land uses and their locations.*" YWS suggest an additional bullet point, "*accommodating existing strategically important land uses*". The Council prefer "*recognising the impact of, and on, existing businesses/land uses*". The Inspector considered that the Council's proposed wording is preferable.

### **Opportunities and Constraints**

- 4.11 Keyland Developments Ltd [KDL] consider that the introduction to 15/011 does not adequately express opportunities and constraints particularly as identified in the Grimley reports. The Inspector considers that it is necessary to refer to both the current employment initiative as well as the future consideration of the area's wider

potential without necessarily referring to such aspects as “engine for growth” as suggested. A combination of text advanced in the UDP Review (Revised Deposit) and by objectors is considered appropriate by the Inspector. The Inspector saw no need to introduce the word “flexible” to describe the context as other recommended modifications cover the points made about the inflexibility of E7, as proposed to be changed by Proposed Alteration 8/001 and the approach to the preparation of AAPs. As regeneration will be planned in a holistic fashion, in accordance with national guidance, he saw no reason to add “including consideration of those [land uses] which would be required to support a sustainable community” to bullet point 11 as suggested by KDL.

### **Suitability of North West Parts of the Area for Different Uses to Support the City Centre**

- 4.12 The Inspector considered that to include reference to the north-west parts of the area being suitable for leisure, residential, retail and tourist orientated developments to support the City Centre would be to predetermine proposals in the AAP. However, he commented that it would be useful to add a cross-reference to paras. 11.3.2 - 7, and recommends they should be amended, as part of Alteration 15/011.

### **Other Matters**

- 4.13 The inspector also considered the KDL suggestion that a further bullet point, “*appropriate treatment to alleviate flood risk*”, should be added to the list in the Alteration. He points out that this aspect of infrastructure improvement is already covered by bullet point 3 and that Policy N38B would require flood risk assessment as part of a planning application in the area. No need for a separate bullet point is therefore required.
- 4.14 In all these respects the Council accept the conclusions of the Inspector and his recommendations on Aire Valley Leeds.

## **5.0 HUNSLET RIVERSIDE STRATEGIC HOUSING SITE (H3-1B:7)**

- 5.1 The Inspector considers the key issues relating to Hunslet Riverside Strategic Housing Site are:
- does the proximity of the Knostrop Waste Water Treatment Works [KWWTW] prejudice the Strategic Housing Site (SHS)?
  - do the boundaries of the proposed SHS reasonably and realistically reflect what could be achieved during the Plan period? Should reference be made to rail-related uses as a component of the proposed development framework?
  - is flood risk assessment necessary and how should it be undertaken?
- 5.2 On the above key issues the Inspector concludes the following.

### **Knostrop Waste Water Treatment Works**

- 5.3 YWS consider that the SHS would be adversely affected to an unacceptable degree by odour from the KWWTW and should not be included in the UDP.
- 5.4 The Inspector comments that it is common sense not to site housing development adjacent to a major sewage treatment works as would be the case at the eastern end

of the SHS. He considers that the UDP Review's approach is somewhat confusing and potentially contradictory in that the Policy addresses "a strategic housing site incorporating mixed use development", and the supporting text refers to both "a significant concentration of new housing in the form of a second urban village" and "housing within a mixed-use development". The title and allocation of "Strategic Housing Site", and the emphasis on housing, suggest that residential development could be proposed anywhere within the area identified, though it is apparent from discussion at the Inquiry that this is not the intention. In particular, he argued that there is no indication in the UDP Review that housing would be concentrated in the north-western part of the SHS, that the anticipated number of dwellings would be about 1,000, or that employment uses might remain over a good part of the SHS. He therefore recommends that the name be changed to "Strategic Housing and Mixed Use Site" to more accurately reflect the intended balance of uses.

- 5.5 The inspector notes that the further away from KWWTW the less the odour impact would be and it was confirmed during the Inquiry that YWS had not objected to the proposed development of Hunslet Mills for the 700 apartments for which planning permission was granted in 2003. This potential development, which is about 1km from KWWTW, together with the Copperfield College site, (about 800m distant), should be far enough way from the odour sources to avoid a problem.
- 5.6 The Council see scope for some housing on the east bank of the river but this would not extend to the south-east corner of the site, close to KWWTW. The aggregate plant there will remain for the Plan period and the Inspector recommends that the SHS be modified to exclude that site.
- 5.7 The Inspector concludes that there is no inconsistency in progressing housing development in advance of the preparation of the AAP, provided that the area within which it is progressed is identified in a practicable way in relation to other uses and the approach is fully explained. Part of the reason for inclusion of both sides of the River Aire is to facilitate the area's comprehensive environmental improvement.
- 5.8 The Inspector advises that detailed consideration of uses that can be satisfactorily sited in relation to KWWTW will need to be undertaken as part of the development framework for the SHS and the AAP for the Aire Valley. YWS do not rule out the possibility of further works to mitigate odour if they are necessary to meet wider development aspirations for the area. YWS will be fully involved in the preparation both of the development framework for the SHS and the AAP.

### **Boundaries of the Proposed Strategic Housing Site**

- 5.10 Network Rail [now the Strategic Rail Authority] originally sought removal from the SHS of the whole area bounded by the rail spur, Knowsthorpe Lane and KWWTW but later reduced this to cover only the aggregate plant towards the south-east end of the site, together with land adjoining the KWWTW.
- 5.11 Whilst recognising the role of the proposed development framework the Inspector considers that the objector's land qualifies in principle for protection for freight handling in the terms set out in PPG13 [para. 45], and that it would be helpful to users of the Plan if this was acknowledged in the supporting text.

### **Flood Risk**

- 5.12 British Waterways and ISIS Regeneration both raise concerns at the requirement for a comprehensive flood risk assessment [introduced in RD Alteration 15/014 in response

to the Environment Agency objections under Alterations 7/002 and 7/003]. It is suggested that the site should be broken down into 3 distinct areas. Airebank Developments Ltd raise a similar objection and suggest that a comprehensive flood risk assessment would lead to delays and frustration.

- 5.13 The Inspector commented that Flood Risk Assessment prior to commencement of development is a necessary requirement which is not outweighed by considerations of frustration and delay. He recognises that Policy N38B requires an overall flood risk assessment as part of a planning application where consultations with the Council or the Environment Agency have identified a need for it, or where there is other clear evidence that a proposal is likely to be affected by flooding, or could increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. He concludes that the criterion should be retained.
- 5.14 In all these respects the Council accept the conclusions of the Inspector and his recommendations on Hunslet Strategic Housing Site.

## **6.0 EAST LEEDS EXTENSION (INCLUDING RED HALL AND GRIMES DYKE HOUSING ALLOCATIONS, PAS SITES AT RED HALL/SKELTONS LANE, SOUTH OF A64, WHINMOOR, NORTH OF A64, WHINMOOR AND SCHOLLES FARM PARK (CHAPTER 16))**

- 6.1 Under Policy H3-2 the Council identified some 215 ha of land around the eastern edge of Leeds for housing, employment uses, greenspace and other ancillary facilities as part of Phase 2 of the Review. The release of the East Leeds Extension (ELE) was to be determined by housing supply monitoring, and caveated to ensure that no residential development would be occupied prior to Phase 2 which was anticipated to start on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011.
- 6.2 The Inspector considers the issues to be as follows:
- Is there a need for development on the scale proposed in order to meet the RPG housing requirement during the Plan period?
  - If there is such a need, is the ELE demonstrably the best location for development, and the most sustainable form?
  - Is the timing of the proposal appropriate?
  - Should land at Grimes Dyke, Whinmoor be separately allocated for development, or regarded as the first phase of ELE?
  - Would the impact of development on the Green Belt and the landscape be acceptable?
  - Could access be provided in an effective, safe and sustainable way, and without detriment to the existing highway system and the adjoining urban area?

### **Need**

- 6.3 The Council proposed ELE to ensure that a “reservoir” of additional land would be available to draw on in the event of under-supply and to provide a range of housing across the district. The Inspector accepts that it is important to have land in reserve to cope with unforeseen circumstances. He considers, however, that the Council has not given detailed consideration to the size of the reserve of land required or how it should be provided, and has identified ELE on the basis that it would be an urban extension without comparing it in any detail with other options.
- 6.4 The Inspector accepts in principle that the proposed managed release guidelines provide a robust defence against premature release of ELE, or release in response to



only a marginal housing shortfall, but is concerned about the inflexibility of a very substantial quantum of development in one location.

- 6.5 On this first issue the Inspector concludes that ELE requires more detailed and rigorous justification in the plan and this should include a reassessment of the overall capacity and annual yield of the site based upon additional information submitted to the Inquiry which suggested that the site may be capable of accommodating a further 800 – 1,400 dwellings.

### **Location and Sustainability**

- 6.6 The Inspector accepts that an earlier Inspector (to the original UDP) had acknowledged the potential of East Leeds for significant growth after an exhaustive analysis of potential housing locations and sites, but considers that the justification for the ELE within Phase 2 of the Review is lacking. The Inspector points out that the Council has not undertaken a comparison between the ELE and sites proposed in Phase 3 of the Plan.
- 6.7 Whilst the ELE would produce a substantial amount of housing accessible to existing employment by non-car modes, given its relationship to the existing urban area the Inspector is not convinced of the ELE's ability to function as a community with a coherent identity and character of its own or its ability to utilise existing physical and social infrastructure. The Inspector therefore recommends an alternative strategy based on smaller, urban edge sites in sustainable locations to be brought forward if and when necessary within a revised Phase 2.
- 6.8 The Inspector indicates that if it becomes apparent that the supply of brownfield land is reducing to an unacceptable level and additional land is required over and above the smaller greenfield allocations, ELE could be brought forward within Phase 3. The Inspector concludes this issue by recommending adding to the Policy a series of tests that would have to be satisfied for the allocation to be released, relating to monitoring, the benefits of an orbital road and sustainability.

### **Timing**

- 6.9 Developers promoted earlier phasing of ELE to enable occupation of dwellings before 2011 and commencement from April 2009, related to criteria on housing land supply and housing choice, regeneration, employment growth and infrastructure provision. The Inspector indicates that he has seen no convincing evidence that it would be needed as early in the Plan period as this and suggests that to start planning for ELE in little more than a year's time would present a major distraction from the necessary emphasis on brownfield land and could seriously undermine the central housing strategy.
- 6.10 Other objectors either wished to return to the First Deposit wording of Alteration 15/015 which omitted reference to release of the site being connected to housing supply monitoring or wanted no date to be included for release of the site. The Inspector disagrees with these objections and considers that relating implementation to the monitoring process introduces reasonable flexibility while retaining a sense of direction which would be lost if the process was completely open ended.

### **Grimes Dyke, Whinmoor**

- 6.11 Persimmon Homes promoted release of land at Grimes Dyke, Whinmoor [allocated as housing site H4.8 in the AUDP but proposed in the Review for inclusion in ELE] in

Phase 1 of the housing strategy. Alternatively, they asked that it be regarded as the first phase of ELE in Phase 2. The Inspector considers that sufficient land can be found for Phase 1 and there is therefore no justification for releasing greenfield sites such as this in Phase 1, which would risk undermining the housing strategy.

- 6.12 The Inspector points out that the UDP Inspector considered Grimes Dyke suitable for development and capable of being developed independently of the then Seacroft/Cross Gates Bypass. The Council were prepared to grant planning permission in 1999/2000 on the basis of proposals that would have dovetailed access with adjoining ELE land, but subsequently changed their stance in response to publication of PPG3. The Inspector also notes that in the early stages of the Review the Council proposed the site as the first phase of ELE (UDP Review Scope and Content, December 2002)
- 6.13 The Inspector considers the site generally sustainable, and significantly more sustainable than the bulk of ELE. He notes that it is the only substantive part of ELE that lies within 15 minutes walking distance of an existing town centre [Seacroft], there are primary schools and some local services and employment close at hand. Bus services would also be within easy walking distance of the whole site. He acknowledges that, at the time of writing, the prospects for Supertram were not clear but indicates that is not a good reason to discount the site or assume that in its absence alternative public transport enhancements would not be forthcoming. In addition, in strategic terms development would constitute an urban extension bounded on two sides by the existing urban area with only a limited effect on the landscape to the east.
- 6.14 The Inspector sees no compelling reasons why development of the site must await a decision to proceed with the whole of ELE, as the site is capable of independent access. He notes that the Council are concerned that the developer of this site should contribute towards a comprehensive access strategy for ELE but sees no good reason why an appropriate developer contribution should not be sought towards possible long-term access improvements given that the likely timing of development would allow ample time for the details of both housing and the orbital road to be resolved so as to avoid any conflict between the two. The Inspector recommends that if required in Phase 2, the site could be developed without the major infrastructure implications associated with ELE as a whole, and could form part of a more phased and flexible approach to land release in general and to ELE in particular.

### **Impact on the Green Belt and Landscape**

- 6.15 Thorne Parish Council, Barwick and Scholes Parish Council and other objectors wanted the ELE to be returned to the Green Belt. Since much of the land north of the A64 and south of the Leeds-Barwick Road, has never been approved GB, and only had "interim" status in the Development Plan Review 1972, the Inspector agrees with the Council that the question of a "return" to the Green Belt does not arise and no exceptional circumstances have been put forward to support changing Green Belt boundaries to include it.
- 6.16 The Inspector considers that the area between York Road and Leeds-Barwick Road should be kept undeveloped, or at least developed last, given the relative narrowness of the gap separating Scholes from the edge of the City. This would minimise the possible impact on the Green Belt, and maintain a significant separation between communities. The Inspector recommends that prior to adopting the Plan the Council examine the possibility of confining development principally to areas north of the A64, and south of the Leeds-Barwick Road. The latter would also have the merits of being

close to the Thorpe Park Business Park and capable of being accessed by an extension of Manston Lane Link Road. The form of access beyond this, whether by East Leeds Orbital Route (ELOR), or an alternative development road, would be a matter for further examination. The inspector goes on to suggest that development within the central section of ELE need not be precluded completely but might well be an area where greenspace provision could be concentrated. The Inspector estimates that in broad terms development on this reduced scale could yield between 2,900 and 3,900 dwellings, depending on density.

- 6.17 In addition the Inspector recommends that further consideration be given now to how the overall development might be phased with a view to incorporating proposals into the Plan. Whilst he understands that phasing is closely associated with provision of infrastructure, he suggests that even a broad indication of phasing would be a helpful guide and provide valuable flexibility for bringing land forward under the plan monitor and manage approach, should this be necessary in response to any falling off in the supply of brownfield land.

### **Access**

- 6.18 The Council estimated that an initial 700 or so dwellings could be developed within ELE before it would be necessary to construct ELOR. The Inspector considers this to be a reasonable prediction subject to two caveats: firstly, that more investigation is carried out on the impact of development within ELE on the Outer Ring Road (ORR) and the extent to which it could be mitigated and secondly, that consideration is taken of any anticipated change in traffic volumes at the possible start date for ELE to inform a phased approach to development.
- 6.19 In respect of the remainder of ELE the Inspector is of the view that all the evidence suggests that some alternative highway capacity will be needed if existing traffic levels on the ORR are to be reduced, and problems of pollution, noise, accident risk and severance ameliorated. He notes that these problems are particularly severe at Seacroft and Cross Gates where the scope for improvements to the road, is most constrained. He considers that ELOR has the potential to provide some such relief, and that it is unlikely that improving the ORR alone, as some objectors advocate, would provide a feasible alternative. He considers that transport-related measures in ELE, and associated with it, have the potential to bring real benefits. He notes, however, that most of the benefits are speculative at the present time and there is an insufficient basis on which to judge whether the transport aspects are sound. In view of the central importance of ELOR the Inspector recommends inclusion of a test of demonstrable public benefit from the road.
- 6.20 The Inspector concludes that ELE should be moved from Phase 2 to Phase 3 of the plan to reflect the housing land supply situation and the need for considerable planning and design work to be done. Grimes Dyke, Whinmoor (UDP Policy H4.8] and Red Hall [H4.6] are recommended for inclusion in Phase 2.

### **COUNCIL'S RESPONSE**

- 6.21 The main response to the Inspector's recommendations on the housing strategy have already been considered in the report to Panel on 3 January 2006 under Chapter 7: Housing where it was accepted that East Leeds Extension should be deleted from Phase 2 and moved to Phase 3 (2012 – 2016) as site H3-3A.33, and Grimes Dyke and Red Hall Lane should be incorporated in Phase 2 under policies H3-2A.2 and H3-2A.3 respectively.

- 6.22 In respect of the detailed development of the ELE, however, the Council is not in total accord with the Inspector's first recommendation that **prior to adoption** of the UDP review, the proposed allocation be re-assessed with a view to confining the bulk of built development to the north of the A64, and south of the Leeds- Barwick Road and (ii) including outline phasing proposals in the Plan.
- 6.23 Whilst the Council agree that maintaining separation between communities and minimising impact on the Green Belt are key planning principles, the detailed planning of the area should properly be undertaken as part of an overall development framework for the site. In addition it is premature to consider phasing of the site when there is no certainty that the site will be developed since following the Inspector's recommendation additional wording is proposed to be included indicating that the site will only be released..... "if any orbital road produces clear public transport benefits, and if developed there is demonstrably the most sustainable option".
- 6.24 The Council therefore accepts the conclusions of the Inspector relating to deletion of ELE from Phase 2 of the Plan and its incorporation in Phase 3 as site H3-3A.33, but proposes to reject the Inspector's recommendations relating to the identification of development areas and phasing of development.

## **7.0 REAR OF SEACROFT HOSPITAL, SEACROFT**

- 7.1 The site was included as a Phase 3 greenfield allocation in the Review on the basis that it accorded with the sequential approach to housing land release set out in paragraph 30 of PPG3.
- 7.2 The Inspector concluded that the site would not qualify as a Strategic Site within Phase 1, and that as it is greenfield it should not be ranked on a par with the brownfield sites that comprise that Phase. However, its location within the urban area and sustainability qualify it for inclusion in the revised Phase 2.
- 7.3 The Council accept the Inspector's conclusions and his recommendation to include the site within Phase 2.

## **8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

- 8.1 Members are asked to agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.

## CHAPTER 15 – EAST LEEDS

<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/004</b></p>	<p><b><u>PA 15/004</u></b> AREA STATEMENT – New para.</p> <p><b><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u></b> Para 15.3 I recommend that that Alteration 15/004 be modified to read: “The area covered by East Leeds contains several special policy areas identified for comprehensive neighbourhood renewal under Policy R1 and for which Area Action Plans are to be prepared. These are Aire Valley Leeds, Gipton and Harehills. In addition, East Leeds contains several Action Areas which have been identified for regeneration under Policy R2 and for which Area Statements have been or are to be prepared. These include neighbourhood regeneration at Seacroft, ....</p>	<p><b><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></b> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 15.2 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s recommendation to amend the wording of Alteration 15/004.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Modification</u></b> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>inserting the following paragraph in the Area Statement:</li> </ul> <p><b>“The area covered by East Leeds contains several special policy areas identified for comprehensive neighbourhood renewal under Policy R1 and for which Area Action Plans are to be prepared. These are Aire Valley Leeds, Gipton and Harehills. In addition, East Leeds contains several Action Areas which have been identified for regeneration under Policy R2 and for which Area Statements have been or are to be prepared. These include neighbourhood regeneration at Seacroft, ....</b></p>
<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/011</b></p> <p><b>15/011/ RD</b></p>	<p><b><u>PA 15/011</u></b> “AIRE VALLEY LEEDS” NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL AREA</p> <p><b><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u></b> Para 15.25 I recommend that the UDP be modified by RD Alteration 15/011subject to:</p> <p>1. amending the paragraphs preceding the upper case Policy as follows:</p> <p>AIRE VALLEY LEEDS” NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL AREA</p> <p>The Aire Valley area is a major focus for employment growth in the region. It represents a very significant but underused part of the urban area which could be regenerated to realise its full potential and benefit nearby residents and the City as a whole. The area has considerable strengths and potential in terms of the existing diverse employment base, improving access to a large local workforce in adjacent residential areas, and improved access to the motorway network, the Leeds Inner Ring Road and Leeds City Centre. There are considerable constraints which need to be addressed including</p>	<p><b><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></b> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 15.5-15.24 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s recommendation to modify the text of Alteration 15/011.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Modification</u></b> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>amending the paragraphs preceding the policy as follows:</li> </ul> <p><b>AIRE VALLEY LEEDS” NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL AREA</b></p> <p><b>The Aire Valley area is a major focus for employment growth in the region. It represents a very significant but underused part of the urban area which could be regenerated to realise its full potential and benefit nearby residents and the City as a whole. The area has considerable strengths and potential in terms of the existing diverse employment base, improving access to a large local workforce in adjacent residential areas, and improved access to the motorway network, the Leeds Inner Ring Road and Leeds City Centre. There are considerable constraints which need to be addressed including contamination, inadequate infrastructure and poor environmental quality. A key feature of the area is the Knostrop Waste Water Treatment Works which treats waste for the whole of Leeds. This key strategic asset has a wide environmental impact which will influence acceptable land uses throughout the Neighbourhood Renewal Area.</b></p>

contamination, inadequate infrastructure and poor environmental quality. A key feature of the area is the Knostrop Waste Water Treatment Works which treats waste for the whole of Leeds. This key strategic asset has a wide environmental impact which will influence acceptable land uses throughout the Neighbourhood Renewal Area.

[Continue with SRB6 funding paragraph which identifies the ongoing initiative].

Continue “The identification of “Aire Valley Leeds” as a special policy area under Policy R1 will provide a context for regeneration of the area and support comprehensive, sustainable and innovative new development.”

2. adding the following paragraph:

“Regeneration proposals for the Aire Valley will need to address traffic and transportation issues and must deal with the relationship to the adjoining Motorway network. Through the preparation of an Area Action Plan the City Council, Highways Agency and other transport providers seek to develop a package of sustainable transport infrastructure improvements and services to support the Council’s regeneration proposals. These measures will in turn be developed through consultation with a range of stakeholders and procured through private sector developer contributions and funding agencies.”

3. amending the Policy to refer to an AREA ACTION PLAN rather than ACTION PLAN;

4. adding “and their location” after “Determining the range of land uses” in bullet point 11;

5. adding two further bullet points/key issues “Recognising the impact of, and on, existing businesses/land uses” and “Sustainable transport measures which are of particular importance in the Aire Valley.”; and

6. adding at the end of the penultimate paragraph of 15/011 “This will take the form of an Area Action Plan prepared as part of the new planning system introduced by the Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (see paras. 11.3.2 – 6.)”

[Continue with SRB6 funding paragraph which identifies the ongoing initiative].

**Continue “The identification of “Aire Valley Leeds” as a special policy area under Policy R1 will provide a context for regeneration of the area and support comprehensive, sustainable and innovative new development.”**

- adding the following paragraph:

**“Regeneration proposals for the Aire Valley will need to address traffic and transportation issues and must deal with the relationship to the adjoining Motorway network. Through the preparation of an Area Action Plan the City Council, Highways Agency and other transport providers seek to develop a package of sustainable transport infrastructure improvements and services to support the Council’s regeneration proposals. These measures will in turn be developed through consultation with a range of stakeholders and procured through private sector developer contributions and funding agencies.”;**

- amending the Policy to refer to an AREA ACTION PLAN rather than ACTION PLAN;
- adding “and their location” after “Determining the range of land uses” in bullet point 11;
- adding two further bullet points/key issues “Recognising the impact of, and on, existing businesses/land uses” and “Sustainable transport measures which are of particular importance in the Aire Valley.”; and
- adding at the end of the penultimate paragraph of 15/011 “This will take the form of an Area Action Plan prepared as part of the new planning system introduced by the Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (see paras. 11.3.2 – 6.)”

<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/014</b></p> <p><b>15/014/ RD</b></p>	<p><b>PA 15/014</b> HUNSLET RIVERSIDE STRATEGIC HOUSING SITE</p> <p><b>Inspector's recommendation</b> Para 15.39 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with RD Alteration 15/014 subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. changing the Policy title to "Hunslet Riverside Strategic Housing and Mixed-use Site", and amending the supporting text to clearly set out the intended balance between housing and other uses;</li> <li>2. amending the boundary of the site in accordance with Doc. S/20387/A; and</li> <li>3. adding the following as an additional paragraph at the end of the supporting text:</li> </ol> <p>"East of the river there is a rail link which is expected to have a long-term future and this part of the site has considerable potential for further rail-related uses, which will be explored through preparation of the development framework. It will be important to ensure that such potential is safeguarded for the future, in line with national advice on transport planning, and that any layout provides an adequate buffer between rail facilities and sensitive uses such as housing and open space."</p>	<p><b>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</b> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 15.27-15.38 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to modify the text of Alteration 15/014.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modification</b> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• amending the policy title, site boundary and supporting text.</li> <li>• changing the Policy title to "Hunslet Riverside Strategic Housing and Mixed-use Site", and amending the supporting text to clearly set out the intended balance between housing and other uses by adding the following as an additional paragraph at the end of the supporting text:</li> </ul> <p><b>"East of the river there is a rail link which is expected to have a long-term future and this part of the site has considerable potential for further rail-related uses, which will be explored through preparation of the development framework. It will be important to ensure that such potential is safeguarded for the future, in line with national advice on transport planning, and that any layout provides an adequate buffer between rail facilities and sensitive uses such as housing and open space."</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• amending the boundary of the site in accordance with Doc. S/20387/A by deleting land at the south east of the site from the allocation as shown on the attached plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/015</b></p> <p><b>15/015/ RD</b></p>	<p><b>PA 15/015</b> EAST LEEDS EXTENSION AND PROPOSED ALTERATIONS 15/023, 15/024, 15/025, 15/026, 15/027 AND 16/016</p> <p><b>Inspector's recommendation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Para 15.100 I recommend that prior to adoption of the RUDP the proposed allocation be re-assessed with a view to confining the bulk of built development to the north of the A64, and south of the Leeds - Barwick Road; and including outline phasing proposals in the Plan;</li> <li>2. the UDP be modified in accordance with Alteration RD 15/015, subject to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. deleting the first two sentences and substituting:</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p><b>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</b> The Council rejects the Inspector's recommendations in part. The city council accepts the Inspector's recommendations with the exception of recommendation 1 which relates to a re-assessment of the site to confine the bulk of built development to the north of the A64, and south of Leeds- Barwick Road; and the inclusion of outline phasing proposals in the Plan. The council agree that the area between the A64 and Leeds – Barwick Road is a sensitive area in terms of the need to minimise impact on the Green belt and maintain a significant separation between communities, however, it is premature to define the specific location and nature of development at this time. The Council considers that these matters should be considered within a development framework for the site. The process of identifying which areas may be developed the purpose for which they should be developed and their potential phasing is likely to take some time, will hold up adoption of the Plan and would be better achieved through detailed consideration as part of the Local Development Framework.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modification</b></p>

	<p>“Land around the eastern edge of Leeds is identified as a long-term reserve of land to be used in the event that brownfield sites do not come forward at the rate and in the quantity necessary to meet the annual average housing requirement set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. It will only be released if monitoring shows that this is the case, if any orbital road produces clear public benefits, and if development there is demonstrably the most sustainable option.”</p> <p>b. in the bold text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• deleting “Policy H3-2” and “Phase 2” and substituting “Policy H3” and “Phase 3”;</li> <li>• deleting sub-paragraph iv;</li> <li>• adding the following at the end:</li> </ul> <p>THE ALLOCATION WILL BE BROUGHT FORWARD FOR DEVELOPMENT ONLY IF:</p> <p>i. MONITORING INDICATES THE NEED FOR FURTHER LAND TO BE RELEASED TO MEET THE RSS ANNUAL AVERAGE HOUSING REQUIREMENT;</p> <p>ii. THE ASSESSMENT OF THE NEED FOR AN ORBITAL ROAD DEMONSTRATES THAT SUCH A ROAD WOULD BOTH SERVE THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SATISFACTORILY AND PRODUCE CLEAR PUBLIC BENEFITS TO USERS OF THE HIGHWAY SYSTEM; AND</p> <p>iii. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL DEMONSTRATES THAT THERE ARE NO PREFERABLE, MORE SUSTAINABLE SITES; AND THAT THE DETAILED PROPOSALS FOR THE EXTENSION ARE INTRINSICALLY SUSTAINABLE.</p> <p>c. adding the following at the end of the first paragraph of supporting text after the bold text:</p> <p>“The impact of such a road upon the highway system will be fully assessed and, so far as the trunk road</p>	<p>Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deleting the first two sentences and substituting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Land around the eastern edge of Leeds is identified as a long-term reserve of land to be used in the event that brownfield sites do not come forward at the rate and in the quantity necessary to meet the annual average housing requirement set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. It will only be released if monitoring shows that this is the case, if any orbital road produces clear public benefits, and if development there is demonstrably the most sustainable option.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Revising the policy wording by: in the bold text: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• deleting “Policy H3-2” and “Phase 2” and substituting “Policy H3” and “Phase 3”;</li> <li>• deleting sub-paragraph iv;</li> <li>• adding the following criteria: <p><b>THE ALLOCATION WILL BE BROUGHT FORWARD FOR DEVELOPMENT ONLY IF:</b></p> <p><b>i. MONITORING INDICATES THE NEED FOR FURTHER LAND TO BE RELEASED TO MEET THE RSS ANNUAL AVERAGE HOUSING REQUIREMENT;</b></p> <p><b>ii. THE ASSESSMENT OF THE NEED FOR AN ORBITAL ROAD DEMONSTRATES THAT SUCH A ROAD WOULD BOTH SERVE THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SATISFACTORILY AND PRODUCE CLEAR PUBLIC BENEFITS TO USERS OF THE HIGHWAY SYSTEM; AND</b></p> <p><b>iii. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL DEMONSTRATES THAT THERE ARE NO PREFERABLE, MORE SUSTAINABLE SITES; AND THAT THE DETAILED PROPOSALS FOR THE EXTENSION ARE INTRINSICALLY SUSTAINABLE.</b></p> </li> <li>• adding the following at the end of the first paragraph of supporting text after the bold text: <p><b>“The impact of such a road upon the highway system will be fully assessed and, so far as the trunk road network is concerned, this will be done in consultation with the</b></p> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--	---



	<p>network is concerned, this will be done in consultation with the Highways Agency.”</p> <p>d. incorporating IC/015 into the supporting text;</p> <p>e. adding the Alteration text, as amended, to follow Policy H3 in Chapter 7.</p> <p>3. FD Alterations 15/018 and 15/020 be abandoned.</p>	<p><b>Highways Agency.”</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>incorporating IC/015 into the supporting text. The final sentence of the supporting text will now read as follows:</li> </ul> <p>“The timing of any employment proposals is not constrained by the housing land release mechanism and will be considered through the development framework and in relation to any necessary infrastructure provision”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adding the Alteration text, as amended, to follow Policy H3 in Chapter 7.</li> <li>Deleting First Deposit Alterations 15/018 and 15/020.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/018</b></p>	<p><b>PA 15/018</b> POLICY H4.6 – RED HALL LANE, RED HALL</p> <p><b><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u></b> Para 15.100 and 7.122 I recommend that the Red Hall Lane site is abandoned as part of the ELE and included as a Phase 2 housing allocation site.</p>	<p><b><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></b> The Council <i>accepts</i> the conclusions in para 15.96 and in Chapter 7 para 7.87 to delete Red Hall Lane from the ELE and include it as a housing allocation within Phase 2.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Modification</u></b> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>deleting of reference to Red Hall Lane, Red Hall as forming part of the ELE.</li> <li>retaining it as a UDP housing allocation site including the deletion of Alteration 15/018.</li> <li>amending the text of the adopted UDP to include the site within Phase 2 of the Review.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/019</b></p>	<p><b>PA 15/019</b> POLICY H4.7 – REAR OF SEACROFT HOSPITAL</p> <p><b><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u></b> Para 15.108 I recommend that the UDP be modified by transferring Site H3-3.24, Rear of Seacroft Hospital, Seacroft, from Phase 3 to Phase 2.</p>	<p><b><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></b> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 15.101-15.107 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s recommendation to transfer the site to the rear of Seacroft Hospital, Seacroft from Policy H3-3 to Phase 2.</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Modification</u></b> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>reclassifying the Rear of Seacroft Hospital, Seacroft, housing allocation site from Phase 3 to Phase 2.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Prop. Alt. 15/020</b></p>	<p><b>PA 15/020</b> POLICY H4.8 - GRIMES DYKE, WHINMOOR</p>	<p><b><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></b> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 15.74-15.79 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s recommendation to delete the site from the ELE and include it within Phase 2.</p>

	<p><b><u>Inspector's recommendation</u></b> Para 15.109 I recommend that the Grimes Dyke site is abandoned as part of the ELE and included as a Phase 2 housing allocation site.</p>	<p><b><u>Proposed Modification</u></b> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First &amp; Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• deleting of reference to Grimes Dyke, Whinmoor as forming part of the ELE.</li><li>• retaining it as a UDP housing allocation site including the deletion of Alteration 15/020.</li><li>• amending the text of the adopted UDP to include the site within Phase 2 of the Review.</li></ul>
--	--	---



