

DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL

3RD JANUARY 2006

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

IN ATTENDANCE Councillor Fox

37 Chair's opening remarks

Councillor Carter wished everyone present a happy new year

38 Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Congreve The Chair informed the meeting of the sad news of the recent death of Mrs Congreve and advised Members that he had written to Councillor Congreve with condolences

39 Declarations of interest

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

Councillor Harker – declared a personal interest in Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector's report on Chapter 14 (Aireborough, Horsforth and Bramhope) as a Governor at Trinity and All Saints College where a greenfield housing allocation is sited (minute 45 refers)

Councillor Leadley – declared personal interests in Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector's report on Chapter 7 (Housing) and Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector's report on Chapter 21 (Rothwell) as Chair of the Scrutiny Commission (Flooding in Leeds) as sites within these areas may be at risk of flooding (minutes 42 and 50 refer)

40 Withdrawn item

The Chair proposed that agenda item 7, 'Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector's report on Policy N34 (Protected Areas of Search (PAS) and long term growth) be deferred for further information and be considered at the meeting of Development Plan Panel scheduled for 24th January 2006

RESOLVED – That the item be deferred and a further report be submitted to the next meeting

41 Minutes

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 6th December 2005 be agreed as a correct record, subject to the following amendments:

Minute 29 – Declarations of interest - to read 'Councillor Leadley declared a personal interest.....'

Minute 36 – Leeds Local Development Framework – Draft Supplementary Planning Document – City Centre Public Realm Contributions – to read

'(i) To note the contents of the Draft City Centre Public Realm Contributions SPD'

42 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector’s report on Chapter 7 (Housing)

The Panel considered a report by the Director of Development setting out the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 7 (Housing) regarding alterations 7/001 – 7/009 and suggestions for responses to these. Details of the proposed responses were appended to the submitted report and a further proposed amendment in respect of PA 7/008 – Student Housing was tabled for Members’ consideration

Officers set out the main points raised by the Inspector, in relation to housing land strategy, affordable housing targets and student housing

Members discussed and commented on the following:

- the rejection of the Inspector’s suggestion for a target figure of 25% for Leeds and the proposed retention of the adopted 15-25% affordable housing target across the city
- the rejection by the Inspector of the Ashore policy in favour of a criteria-based approach
- the positive impact the Ashore policy had begun to have on communities and the need for any amendments to be robust and be clear to developers/landlords and local communities
- the effect any changes to the Ashore policy might have on permissions granted with conditions attached relating to this policy
- the changing market for student accommodation and the ways in which this could be used to secure a greater mix of tenure of properties in the Headingley area
- the phased release of land for housing and the Inspector’s designation of Otley and Wetherby only as freestanding towns over areas such as Horsforth, Morley, Pudsey etc

RESOLVED –

- i) To agree the report as the City Council’s response to the Inspector’s recommendations in respect of Chapter 7 (Housing) (Alterations 7/001 -7/004 and 7/006 – 7/009 only)
- ii) To recommend approval of these recommendations to Executive Board in due course and to note that the response in relation to 7/005 – PAS – will be considered at the next Development Plan Panel meeting to be held on 24th January 2006 with a view to submitting a recommendation on 7/005 – PAS - to Executive Board, in due course

43 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector’s report on Chapter 8 (Local Economy)

The Panel considered a report by the Director of Development proposing a response to the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 8 (Local Economy). A schedule of the proposed amendments was appended to the submitted report

Officers reported that whilst the Inspector’s views were disappointing the suggested modifications were not a great concession, and that the Inspector had provided useful information on the interpretation of ‘need’ in respect of housing or mixed use applications on employment sites, which could include community need, rather than just that of the site owners/applicants

RESOLVED – To agree the report as the City Council’s response to the Inspector’s recommendations with respect to Chapter 8 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

44 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector’s report on Chapter 11 (Area Based Initiatives and Regeneration)

Members received a report by the Director of Development setting out proposed amendments to Chapter 11 in light of the Inspector’s recommendations. A schedule of the proposed alterations was appended to the report for Members’ information

RESOLVED –

- (i) To agree the report as the City Council’s response to the Inspector’s recommendation in respect of Chapter 11 (Area Based Initiatives and Regeneration) and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course
- (ii) To request that references to the Aire Valley be clarified to differentiate between the Upper and Lower Aire Valley

45 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector’s report on Chapter 14 (Aireborough, Horsforth and Bramhope)

Prior to consideration of the area Chapters (minutes 45- 50 refer) it was agreed that comments relating to PAS (Protected Areas of Search) sites referred to within the area reports would be considered at the meeting to be held on 24th January 2006

The Director of Development submitted a report setting out the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 14 (Aireborough, Horsforth and Bramhope). Appended to the report was a schedule setting out the proposed modifications to the UDP Review

RESOLVED –

- (i) To agree the report, with the exception of those modifications relating to PAS, as the City Council’s response to the Inspector’s recommendations in respect of Chapter 14 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course
- (ii) To note that consideration will be given to modifications relating to PAS sites within Chapter 14 at the meeting to be held on 24th January 2006, with a view to submitting a recommendation on these sites to Executive Board in due course

46 Leeds UDP Review –Response to the Inspector’s report on Chapter 16 (Garforth)

The Director of Development submitted a report setting out the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 16 (Garforth). Appended to the report was a schedule setting out the proposed modifications to the UDP Review

RESOLVED -

- (i) To agree the report, with the exception of those modifications relating to PAS, as the City Council’s response to the Inspector’s recommendations in respect of Chapter 16 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

(ii) To note that consideration will be given to modifications relating to PAS sites within Chapter 16 at the meeting to be held on 24th January 2006, with a view to submitting a recommendation on these sites to Executive Board in due course

47 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector’s report on Chapter 17 (Morley)

Members received a copy of a report setting out proposed modifications to the UDP Review, Chapter 17 (Morley), in light of the Inspector’s recommendations. Appended to the report was a schedule setting out the proposed amendments

RESOLVED –

(i) To agree the report, with the exception of those modifications relating to PAS, as the City Council’s response to the Inspector’s recommendations in respect of Chapter 17 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

(ii) To note that consideration will be given to modifications relating to PAS sites within Chapter 17 at the meeting to be held on 24th January 2006, with a view to submitting a recommendation on these sites to Executive Board in due course

48 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector’s report on Chapter 18 (North Leeds)

The Director of Development submitted a report setting out the Inspector’s recommendations in relation to Chapter 18 (North Leeds) A copy of the schedule setting out the proposed modifications was appended to the submitted report

RESOLVED -

(i) To agree the report, with the exception of those modifications relating to PAS, as the City Council’s response to the Inspector’s recommendations in respect of Chapter 18 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

(ii) To note that consideration will be given to modifications relating to PAS sites within Chapter 18 at the meeting to be held on 24th January 2006, with a view to submitting a recommendation on these sites to Executive Board in due course

49 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector’s report on Chapter 20 (Pudsey)

Members received a copy of a report setting out proposed modifications to the UDP Review, Chapter 20 (Pudsey), in light of the Inspector’s recommendations. Appended to the report was a schedule setting out the proposed amendments

RESOLVED –

(i) To agree the report, with the exception of those modifications relating to PAS, as the City Council’s response to the Inspector’s recommendations in respect of Chapter 20 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

(ii) To note that consideration will be given to modifications relating to PAS sites within Chapter 20 at the meeting to be held on 24th January 2006, with a view to submitting a recommendation on these sites to Executive Board in due course

50 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector’s report on Chapter 21 (Rothwell)

The Panel considered a report by the Director of Development setting out proposed modifications to the UDP Review Chapter 21 (Rothwell) following the Inspector’s recommendations. A schedule of proposed alterations was appended to the submitted report

Members raised concerns that some of the area reports did not correctly identify the affected wards and asked that greater care be taken to identify the wards based on the 2004 boundary changes

RESOLVED –

(i) To agree the report, with the exception of those modifications relating to PAS, as the City Council’s response to the Inspector’s recommendations in respect of Chapter 21 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

(ii) To note that consideration will be given to modifications relating to PAS sites within Chapter 21 at the meeting to be held on 24th January 2006, with a view to submitting a recommendation on these sites to Executive Board in due course

51 Leeds UDP Review – Response to Inspector’s report on Chapter A9A (Car parking guidelines)

Members received a copy of a report by the Director of Development setting out the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter A9A and the proposed amendments arising from these which were appended to the submitted report

The Panel noted that the Inspector had supported the Council’s position with the caveat that references to the requirement for commuted spaces in the City Centre core car parking area be deleted

RESOLVED – To agree the report as the City Council’s response to the Inspector’s recommendations in respect of Chapter A9A and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL
DATE: 24 JANUARY 2006**

**SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON
POLICY N34 (PROTECTED AREAS OF SEARCH AND LONG TERM
GROWTH)**

Electoral Wards Affected:

ALL

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 5 – Environment, regarding Alterations 5/001, 5/002 and 7/005 (Policy N34, Protected Areas of Search (PAS) and long term growth) and to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Paragraph 5.4.9 of the Adopted UDP lists 40 sites where, under Policy N34, development is to be restricted to existing and temporary uses so as not to prejudice the possibility of long-term development. Alteration 5/002 of the UDP Review (and consequent changes 5/001 and 7/005 regarding changes to the supporting text explaining the reasons for the proposed changes) proposes to delete the list of sites, the Policy and the supporting text. As part of the UDP Review, site specific changes relating to Policy N34 are also covered in the appropriate area chapters. The response to the Inspectors recommendations on these sites will be covered in separate reports to Development Plan Panel. The focus of this report therefore, is to consider the strategic issues associated with Policy N34 and the Inspectors recommendations. It should be noted also that the City Council’s response to housing land and phasing issues has been covered in a separate Panel report (3 January 2006).
- 2.2 The Proposed Alterations for Policy N34 as part of the Review, were promoted by the City Council on the basis of changes to planning policy following the introduction of Planning Policy Guidance 3 – Housing (PPG 3). The broad thrust of this guidance is to give priority to brownfield (rather than greenfield land) for development. Linked to this, the City Council identified a sufficiency of housing and employment land, well beyond the end of the Plan period, which in the Council’s view meant that it was no longer necessary to safeguard PAS land for long term development. Other than the

PAS sites associated with the East Leeds Extension (Alterations 15/015, 15/018, 15/020, 15/025, 15/026, 15/027 and 16/016), the City Council therefore proposed to reallocate the majority of the PAS sites as Green Belt.

3.0 INSPECTORS REASONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 In considering the representations made in respect of the UDP Review proposed Alterations for Policy N34, the Inspectors recommendations are very clear in emphatically rejecting the City Council's approach to PAS. In making his recommendations, the Inspector has considered national planning policy guidance, housing capacity, employment and in particular the issue of the 'exceptional circumstances' required to justify changing Green Belt boundaries. Following this analysis, he concludes that the City Council's proposed approach is "imprudent and premature" (Para.5.25) and "fatally flawed" (Paras. 5.30 – 5.34), in commenting that neither national advice published since the last UDP Inquiry (PPG 3), nor the identified sufficiency of land available for development within urban areas justify the abandonment of the approach to PAS land under Policy N34.
- 3.2 The inspector also concludes, that PPG 3 does not change the approach to Green Belt in Planning Policy Guidance 2 (PPG 2) and specifically the importance in "permanence" of establishing long term Green Belt boundaries and the inclusion of land within it, which fulfils its purpose. The Inspector therefore recommends that the UDP should not be modified in accordance with First Deposit Alterations 5/001, 5/002 and 7/005 and that paragraph 5.4.8 and section 7.5 are deleted and replaced with substitute paragraphs. These replacement paragraphs reaffirm the Green Belt boundaries defined as part of the Adopted UDP (2001) and specify the role of PAS in safeguarding land to provide "some flexibility for growth and development".
- 3.3 Within the context of the Inspector's recommendations on strategic PAS issues, he notes that six sites were not subject to objection and therefore did not come before him as part of the Inquiry. The six sites are:
- a) N34.2 - Canada Road, Rawdon (1.13 ha.)
 - b) N34.21 – Leeds Road, Collingham (6.7 ha.)
 - c) N34.30 – Mickletown Road, Methley (9.7 ha.)
 - d) N34.31 – Low Moor Side, New Farnley (5.6 ha.)
 - e) N34.35 – West Park, Boston Spa (4.1 ha.)
 - f) N34.36 – Chapel Lane, Clifford (1.4 ha.)

In respect of these sites, the Inspector notes (para. 5.2 of his report) that, whilst it is a matter for the City Council to determine the approach to them, he concludes that the overarching policy considerations are such that they should be treated consistently with his recommendations on PAS (para.5.40 of his report). Within the context of the Area Chapters in which these sites are located, it is therefore recommended that these six sites are also returned to PAS in the UDP Review.

4.0 THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE

- 4.1 As with many of the Inspectors recommendations, his conclusions on Policy N34 are a direct reflection of national planning policy guidance, rather than an interpretation of national guidance in the light of local circumstances and strategic objectives. Consequently, the overall package of policies at the heart of the UDP Review (including housing and PAS) have either been rejected or readjusted by the Inspector, in favour of an approach, which is a close expression of national policy. Within this context, the Inspector has made an emphatic decision in respect of PAS Policy which

is not in accordance with the City Council's own judgement in terms of both overall strategy and conclusions regarding the Green Belt merits of individual sites. However, it is accepted that the Inspector has conducted a thorough appraisal of PAS policy and whilst his conclusions do differ from the Council's own analysis, his recommendations are accepted.

- 4.2 Whilst the Inspectors recommendations on PAS are a very disappointing outcome for the City Council, the decision does at least perhaps give the Council some longer term flexibility in the event of changing and unforeseen circumstances. Within the context of the UDP Review, the Inspector has largely supported a housing phasing strategy, with the emphasis upon the development of brownfield land in advance of the release of greenfield sites. Greenfield release will therefore be subject to the implementation and monitoring of the UDP Review policies. Consequently, the longer term role and necessity for PAS will need to be assessed in the light of the performance and the delivery of the housing requirements against this framework.
- 4.3 New housing strategy proposals and any comprehensive review of PAS (and the implications for development plan allocations), will need to be addressed through the Local Development Framework. This process will enable the role and need for individual PAS sites to be considered in the future. In considering the merits of these sites and in the preparation of LDF documents to address these issues, it will be necessary to undertake sustainability appraisals, develop a detailed evidence base and complete extensive public and stakeholder consultation. Guided by Development Plan Panel, this would be done in advance of developing any further policies and proposals, prior to consideration by an independent Inspector and final adoption.
- 4.4 With regard to the PAS sites listed in para. 3.3 above, such is the logic of the Inspector's approach and the emphatic nature of his recommendations, it would be illogical and difficult to take an alternative view to the Inspectors overarching recommendations. However, for further clarity, officers have sought further legal advice on this matter as a basis to consider the most appropriate way to proceed. Within this context, counsel's opinion is that there are two basic options open to the City Council.

(i) The first would be for the City Council to reject the Inspectors recommendation. Given the Inspector's reasoning, it is felt that this approach may require a further Public Inquiry to be held although there are arguable grounds to maintain such a position. In considering this option Members will need to be aware of the public policy requirement that Plans are adopted as soon as practically possible to ensure reasonable certainty under the provisions of Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

(ii) The second option would be for the City Council to support the Inspector's suggested approach and apply the PAS policy conclusions to the six sites which were not before him at the Inquiry. This is clearly his intention following a strategic assessment of PAS policy. Given the Inspectors emphatic recommendations on PAS however, this would be a more sustainable position to take and to facilitate early adoption of the Plan as recommended in Government Guidance.

- 4.5 On balance, counsel's opinion was to favour the latter option (option ii) as a more robust planning stance given the unilateral and comprehensive nature of the Inspectors recommendation. Should Members wish to revisit the issues in due course it would be preferable to do so under the Local Development Framework when objectors to, and supporters of, any proposals which the Council may subsequently wish to put forward may be considered by an Inspector under the new regime.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 This report has outlined the strategic context to the development of Policy N34, set out the Inspectors Reasons and Recommendations and his reasons, together with the Council's proposed response. As emphasised above, the Inspector has made an emphatic decision in respect of PAS policy which is not in accordance with the City Council's own judgement. However, it is accepted that the Inspector has conducted a thorough appraisal of the Policy and whilst his conclusions differ from the Council's own analysis, his recommendations are accepted.
- 5.2 Within this context, it is recommended that, in the Inspectors overarching recommendation on PAS and specifically his comments in para. 5.2 of his report, that the 6 sites that did not attract objections are also returned to PAS. These sites are listed in Para. 3.3 of this report.
- 5.3 Development Plan Panel members will recall that consideration of this report has been deferred from the 3 January meeting. At that meeting, a series of Area Chapter reports (Chapter 14: Aireborough, Horsforth & Bramhope, Chapter 16: Garforth, Chapter 17: Morley, Chapter 18: North Leeds, Chapter 20: Pudsey and Chapter 21: Rothwell) were tabled and that the area recommendations were agreed, with the exception of the recommendations for the site specific PAS allocations – which are subject to members consideration of the strategic recommendations on PAS covered in this report.
- 5.4 In the light of the conclusions made in this report, it is therefore recommended that the following sites (previously presented to members at the 3 January Development Plan Panel) should be retained as PAS and that Modifications are made to the UDP Review to reflect the Council's acceptance of the Inspector's strategic recommendations on PAS. The sites are:

Chapter 14: Aireborough, Horsforth & Bramhope

N34: 1 Breary Lane East, Bramhope.

N34: 3 Haw Lane, Yeadon.

N34:15 Canada Road, Rawdon (this being one of the 6 PAS sites that did not receive objections).

Chapter 16 : Garforth

N34: 8 East of Scholes.

N34: 9 Land South of Garforth.

N34: 10 Pit Lane, Micklefield.

N34: 12 Moorgate, Kippax.

N34: 39 Wood Lane, Scholes.

N34: 40 Park Lane, Allerton Bywater.

Chapter 17: Morley

N34: 14 Tingley Station, Morley.

Chapter 18: North Leeds

N34: 21 Moseley Bottom, Cookridge.

N34: 22 Church Lane, Adel.

Chapter 20: Pudsey

N34: 24 Hill Foot Farm, Farsley.

N34: 25 Calverley Lane, Farsley.

N34: 26 Kirklees Knowl, Farsley.

Chapter 21 : Rothwell

N34: 27 Greenland Farm, Oulton.

N34: 28 Royds Lane, Rothwell.

N34: 29 Pitfield Road, Carlton.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

6.1 Members are asked to:

- i) agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendations and in respect of Chapter 5 (Alteration 5/001, 5/002 and 7/005),
- ii) to accept the Inspectors recommendations in respect of Alteration 5/001, 5/002 and 7/005),
- iii) within the context of the overall strategic recommendations on Policy N34, agree the retention of the sites listed in para. 3.3 (the six sites without objection) and section 5.4 of this report as PAS,
- iv) to recommend approval of these recommendations to Executive Board in due course.

<p>Prop. Alt. 5/001</p>	<p><u>PA 5/001, 5/002 and 7/005</u></p> <p>POLICY N34 (PROTECTED AREAS OF SEARCH AND LONG TERM GROWTH)</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendations</u></p> <p>Para. 5.40. I recommend that the UDP be not modified in accordance with FD Alterations 5/001, 5/002 and 7/005.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.4.8 be deleted and the following substituted:</p> <p>"The Regional Spatial Strategy does not envisage any change to the general extent of Green Belt for the foreseeable future and stresses that any proposals to replace existing boundaries should be related to a longer – tern time-scale that other aspects of the development plan. The boundaries of the Green Belt around Leeds were defined with the adoption of the UDP in 2001, have not been changes in this limited review and are currently expected to remain broadly unchanged.</p> <p>To ensure the necessary long-term endurance of the Green Belt, definition of its boundaries was accompanied by designation of Protected areas of Search to provide land for longer – term development needs. Given the emphasis in the UDP on providing for new development within urban areas it is not currently envisaged that there will be a need to use any such safeguarded land during the Review period. However, it is retained both to maintain the permanence of Green Belt boundaries and to provide some flexibility for the City's long-term development. The suitability of the protected sites for development will be comprehensively reviewed as part of the preparation of the Local Development Framework, and in the light of the next Regional Spatial Strategy. Meanwhile it is intended that no development should be permitted on this land that would prejudice the possibility of longer term development, and any proposals for such development will be treated as departures from the Plan."</p> <p>Section 7.5 be deleted and the following substituted:</p> <p>"When the UDP was adopted it was envisaged, on the basis of population projections then current, that there would be a net increase of some 50, 000 households in Leeds between 1991 and 2016. The Plan provided land for some 28, 500 dwellings to 2006, leaving about 21, 500 households to be accommodated thereafter. Taking into account the proportion of the need that was expected to be met within existing urban areas, it was estimated that 430 hectares of land was required to meet long term needs through the actual area of land safeguarded under Policy N34 is now about 352 hectares.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></p> <p>The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u></p> <p>Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) and Proposals Map by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substituting deleted paragraph 5.4.8 and reinstate the wording of Policy N34 to read as follows: <p>"The Regional Spatial Strategy does not envisage any change to the general extent of Green Belt for the foreseeable future and stresses that any proposals to replace existing boundaries should be related to a longer – tern time-scale that other aspects of the development plan. The boundaries of the Green Belt around Leeds were defined with the adoption of the UDP in 2001, have not been changes in this limited review and are currently expected to remain broadly unchanged.</p> <p>To ensure the necessary long-term endurance of the Green Belt, definition of its boundaries was accompanied by designation of Protected areas of Search to provide land for longer – term development needs. Given the emphasis in the UDP on providing for new development within urban areas it is not currently envisaged that there will be a need to use any such safeguarded land during the Review period. However, it is retained both to maintain the permanence of Green Belt boundaries and to provide some flexibility for the City's long-term development. The suitability of the protected sites for development will be comprehensively reviewed as part of the preparation of the Local Development Framework, and in the light of the next Regional Spatial Strategy. Meanwhile it is intended that no development should be permitted on this land that would prejudice the possibility of longer term development, and any proposals for such development will be treated as departures from the Plan."</p> <p>N34: WITHIN THOSE AREAS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP UNDER THIS POLICY, DEVELOPMENT WILL BE RESTRICTED TO THAT WHICH IS NECESSARY FOR THE OPERATION OF EXISTING USES TOGETHER WITH SUCH TEMPORARY USES AS WOULD NOT PREJUDICE THE POSSIBILITY OF LONG TERM DEVELOPMENT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within the context of the Inspectors recommendations in paragraph 5.40 and the Inspectors recommendations in relation to Proposed Alterations 15/023, 15/024, 15/025, 15/026 and 15/027 (which delete PAS sites and reallocate them as housing sites in Phase 3 of the Review as part of the East Leeds Extension, 15/015), reinstating Paragraph 5.4.9 from the Adopted UDP to read as follows: <p>"The following sites are protected under Policy N34 as Protected Areas of Search:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Breary Lane East, Bramhope Canada Road, Yeadon Haw Lane Yeadon Selby Road, Garforth
--------------------------------	---	--

This area of land remains undeveloped and, given the greater emphasis now on development on brownfield land within existing urban areas, and the capacity identified there for such development, it is likely to provide a very generous reserve for possible long-term development. However, it is unnecessary to seek to quantify now with any precision the area that might be needed after the Review period as the primary purpose of safeguarded land is to provide some flexibility for growth and development within Green Belt boundaries that will endure for the foreseeable future.”

10. Pit Lane, New Micklefield
11. Scholes Park Farm
12. Moorgate, Kippax
13. Low Moor Farm, Morley
14. Tingely Station
15. Spring Gardens, Drighlington
16. New Lane, East Ardsley
17. Bradford Road East Ardsley
18. Lane Side Farm, Churwell
19. Owlars Farm, Morley
20. Manor House Farm, Churwell
21. Moseley Bottom, Cookridge
22. Church Lane, Adel
23. West of Pool in Wharfedale
24. Hill Foot Farm, Pudsey
25. Calverley Lane, Farsley
26. Kirklees Knowl, Farsley
27. Greenland Farm, Oulton
28. Royds Lane, Rothwell
29. Pitfield Road, Carlton
30. Mickleton Road, Methley
31. Low Moor Side, New Farnley
32. Green Lane/Grove Road, Boston Spa
33. Leeds Road, Collingham
34. Spofforth Hill, Wetherby
35. West Park, Boston Spa
36. Chapel Lane, Clifford
37. The Ridge, Linton
38. Red Hall Lane/Skelton Lane, Whinmoor
39. Wood Lane, Scholes
40. Park Lane, Allerton Bywater”

Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:

- Deleting section 7.5 and substituting with :

LONG TERM GROWTH

“When the UDP was adopted it was envisaged, on the basis of population projections then current, that there would be a net increase of some 50, 000 households in Leeds between 1991 and 2016. The Plan provided land for some 28, 500 dwellings to 2006, leaving about 21, 500 households to be accommodated thereafter. Taking into account the proportion of the need that was expected to be met within existing urban areas, it was estimated that 430 hectares of land was required to meet long term needs through the actual area of land safeguarded under Policy N34 is now about 352 hectares.

This area of land remains undeveloped and, given the greater emphasis now on

		<p>development on brownfield land within existing urban areas, and the capacity identified there for such development, it is likely to provide a very generous reserve for possible long-term development. However, it is unnecessary to seek to quantify now with any precision the area that might be needed after the Review period as the primary purpose of safeguarded land is to provide some flexibility for growth and development within Green Belt boundaries that will endure for the foreseeable future.”</p>
--	--	--

**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLANS PANEL
DATE: 24 January 2006**

**SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON
CHAPTER 5, ENVIRONMENT**

Electoral Wards Affected:

ALL

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 this report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 5 - Environment, to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations. The PAS element of Chapter 5 has been dealt with under a separate report and the remainder of Chapter 5 is dealt with in this report. The Chapter received 18 objections regarding flood risk, 2 objections regarding sustainable drainage, 1 regarding waste management and 1 regarding air quality. There are also two Inquiry Changes regarding the boundary of two Sites of Ecological and Geological Interest (SEGI) which have been included as proposed modifications to the UDP Review.

2.0 BACKGROUND

Flood Risk

2.1 The UDP Review introduced Policy N38A to prevent development in flood risk areas and Policy N38B to require a flood risk assessment where appropriate. Objections under Policy N38A concern whether the Policy is unreasonably restrictive, whether mineral working and nature conservation should be included as an exception and whether the scope of the Policy should be widened to cover areas where water is stored other than washland. One objection is concerned that there may be overlap between development allocations and washland.

2.2 Objections under Policy N39B concern whether the Policy is sufficiently clearly expressed, whether there should be a flood risk assessment submitted for the whole site at the outset (where there is a proposed phased development) and whether the supporting text should state that developers who undertake flood defence or alleviation works should be required to pay a deposit for future maintenance.

Sustainable Drainage

- 2.3 Policy N39A seeks to encourage the introduction of sustainable drainage systems wherever practicable. One objection asks for the Policy to be strengthened and asks for provision for future maintenance.
- 2.4 A further objection challenges whether the supporting text is in accord with national guidance.

Waste Management

- 2.5 One objection asks if a waste disposal site should be allocated in Morley.

Air Quality

- 2.6 An objection was received which questioned whether the Review gave sufficient emphasis to bus travel as the principal alternative means of transport to the car.

SEGI Boundary Changes

- 2.7 The City Council proposed two Inquiry Changes as a result of objections from West Yorkshire Ecology. The first one proposed to amend the boundary of SEGI 07 at Bramham Park, Garforth / Wetherby to accord with the boundary held by West Yorkshire Ecology. The second one proposed to replace Local Nature Area 66 with SEGI 35 at Kippax Meadows, Garforth to accord with the boundary held by West Yorkshire Ecology.

As a result of these Inquiry Changes, West Yorkshire Ecology withdrew their objections. The changes are shown on the two attached site plans.

3.0 THE INSPECTOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Flood Risk

- 3.1 The Inspector states that he does not regard Policy N38A to be too restrictive. With regard to nature conservation, he acknowledges that the Council have agreed that it may be acceptable in washland however he does not consider that the Council's proposal to change the text accordingly goes far enough and he suggests an appropriate amendment to the words of the Policy. With regard to mineral working, the Inspector states that this also may occur in areas of flood risk, however he considers it prudent to handle each case on its merits and therefore recommends an appropriate form of wording in the accompanying text.
- 3.2 The Inspector recommends that the Proposals Map be checked for any instances where allocations and washlands overlap and if necessary site-specific information be included on measures necessary to address any flood risk. The Council requires developers to provide a flood risk assessment where appropriate and in this way site-specific information on flood risk is provided. Washland boundaries have changed since the Proposals Map was first drawn and there are now three locations where there is a slight impingement of the development site on washland. The first of these is at Riverdale Road, Otley (H4:77) which was not defined as including any washland several years ago when it was developed. The second is at East of Otley (H6) where flooding, drainage and washland issues were dealt with in great detail at the UDP Review Inquiry and the Inspector concluded that 'the site could be adequately drained to avoid flooding and increased run-off and to be compliant with the guidance in PPG25'. The third is at Skelton Business Park (E4:45) where flood risk issues have

been adequately resolved to the Environment Agency's satisfaction through the on-going consideration of the planning application.

- 3.3 The Inspector recommends a form of words to help further clarify and strengthen Policy N38B. However he agreed with the Council that it was not necessary for the Policy to seek flood measure maintenance contributions from developers as he considered this to be too detailed a matter for the UDP and may not be appropriate in every case.

Sustainable Drainage

- 3.4 The Inspector agreed with the objector that Policy N39A should be strengthened and has suggested a suitable form of words for the Policy to ensure that there are no loopholes which would allow the developer to avoid implementing Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS). The Inspector has further supplemented this by suggesting wording in the supporting text to strengthen the reference to the Council's Supplementary Guidance Note 22 on Sustainable Drainage and adding text to make clear that the Policy applies to those proposals which are defined as significant developments in the Guidance Note.

Waste Management

- 3.5 The Inspector notes that the objection does not provide sufficient information and has agreed with the Council that a waste disposal site for Morley should not be allocated at this stage.

Air Quality

- 3.6 The Inspector states that he regards the Review to show a substantial commitment to bus travel and to go further might be more appropriately addressed in the Local Transport Plan rather than the UDP.

SEGI Boundary Changes

- 3.7 Inquiry Changes are those proposed after the closure of the Revised Deposit period (17 March 2004) and are submitted as part of the evidence presented to the Inquiry by the City Council. The Inquiry Changes have therefore been before the Inspector, however, because they led to the withdrawal of the objections, the Inspector has not needed to specifically mention them in his Report.

4.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 Members are asked to agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter 5 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.

Chapter 5 – Environment

<p>Prop. Alt. 5/003</p>	<p>PA 5/003 DEVELOPMENT AND FLOOD RISK</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></p>
<p>5/003/RD</p>	<p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 5.52 I recommend that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the UDP be modified in accordance with RD Alteration 5/003, subject to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Inserting the words SPORT, AMENITY AND CONSERVATION between RECREATION and USES in Policy N38A; b) Replacing RD para. 5.5.10e with the following: "Appropriate" uses in terms of the Policy are those that do not interfere with flood plain flows or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, do not involve residential accommodation, and incorporate warning and evacuation measures where necessary to ensure public safety. Minerals extraction is an activity that may of necessity have to locate in the functional flood plain. Whilst mineral working proposals will be treated as exceptions to the policy, and handled on their merits and in consultation with the Environment Agency, the Council will take into account locational constraints, the possibility that needs for minerals cannot be met from other sources, and the potential benefits of mineral working to flood control, such as provision of flood water storage capacity." c) Replacing the first sentence of RD Policy N38B with the following: PLANNING APPLICATIONS MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT WHERE CONSULTATIONS WITH THE COUNCIL OR THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY HAVE IDENTIFIED A NEED FOR SUCH ASSESSMENT, 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. 2. the Proposals Map be checked, in consultation with the Environment Agency if necessary, for any instances where allocations and designated washlands overlap: an assessment made of whether any such cases can be fully justified; and, if necessary, site-specific information be included on measures necessary to address any flood risk. 	<p>The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para 5.43 – 5.51 of the Report and consequently accepts his recommendations to make amendments to Policies N38A and N38B and to the wording of the supporting text. The Proposals Map has been checked according to the Inspector's recommendation and the three cases where there is minor overlap between allocations and washland can be fully justified as the flood risk issue has either been discussed at length during the Inquiry or during the determination of the planning application.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inserting the words SPORT, AMENITY AND CONSERVATION between RECREATION and USES in Policy N38A; so that the Policy now reads: <p>N38A: DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING CHANGES OF USE, WILL NOT BE PERMITTED IN THE FUNCTIONAL FLOODPLAIN INCLUDING ALL WASHLAND AREAS AS IDENTIFIED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP UNLESS IT IS FOR :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. APPROPRIATE OPEN RECREATION, SPORT, AMENITY AND CONSERVATION USES, AND ii. ESSENTIAL TRANSPORT AND UTILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE WHICH CANNOT PRACTICABLY BE LOCATED ELSEWHERE. <p>DEVELOPMENT IN THE INDICATIVE FLOOD PLAIN WILL BE ASSESSED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SEQUENTIAL TEST SET OUT IN PPG25.</p> <p>ALL DEVELOPMENT SHOULD ENSURE THAT IT DOES NOT INCREASE THE RISK OF FLOODING BOTH ON-SITE AND ELSEWHERE, CATCHMENT WIDE.</p> <p>IN ALL CASES EARLY DEVELOPER CONSULTATION WITH THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY IS ENCOURAGED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacing RD para. 5.5.10e with the following: "Appropriate" uses in terms of the Policy are those that do not interfere with flood plain flows or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, do not involve residential accommodation, and incorporate warning and evacuation measures where necessary to ensure public safety. Minerals extraction is an activity that may of necessity have to locate in the functional flood plain. Whilst mineral working proposals will be treated as exceptions to the policy, and handled on their merits and in consultation with the

		<p>Environment Agency, the Council will take into account locational constraints, the possibility that needs for minerals cannot be met from other sources, and the potential benefits of mineral working to flood control, such as provision of flood water storage capacity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> replacing the first sentence of RD Policy N38B so that the Policy now reads: <p>N38B: PLANNING APPLICATIONS MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT WHERE CONSULTATIONS WITH THE COUNCIL OR THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY HAVE IDENTIFIED A NEED FOR SUCH ASSESSMENT, 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. WHERE A DEVELOPMENT IS TO BE DELIVERED IN PHASES PLANNING PERMISSION WILL ONLY BE GRANTED FOR AN INDIVIDUAL PHASE WHERE AN OVERALL FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT HAS BEEN CONDUCTED THAT TAKES ACCOUNT OF THE CUMULATIVE FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE IMPACTS OF BOTH CURRENT AND FUTURE PHASES.</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 5/004 5/004/FD</p>	<p><u>PA 5/004</u> SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para. 5.58 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration 5/004, subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> substituting the following for Policy N39A: APPLICANTS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT LIKELY TO SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE RUN-OFF OF SURFACE WATER SHOULD DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY HAVE EXPLORED THE FEASIBILITY OF INCORPORATING SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS INTO THEIR PROPOSALS. SUCH SYSTEMS SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED UNLESS DEMONSTRABLY IMPRACTICABLE OR INAPPROPRIATE, AND PROVISION SHOULD BE MADE FOR THEIR FUTURE MAINTENANCE. substituting the following for the second sentence of para 5.5.11d of the supporting text: “The City Council’s Supplementary Guidance Note 22, “Sustainable Drainage”, summarises the scope of sustainable drainage and encourages its use.” adding the following at the end of para. 5.5.11d of the supporting text: “Proposals to which the Policy applies are those defined as significant developments in the Supplementary Guidance”. 	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 5.54-5.57 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector’s recommendation to substitute the Policy wording and make amendments to the supporting text.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> substituting the following for Policy N39A: <p>N39A: APPLICANTS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT LIKELY TO SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE RUN-OFF OF SURFACE WATER SHOULD DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY HAVE EXPLORED THE FEASIBILITY OF INCORPORATING SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS INTO THEIR PROPOSALS. SUCH SYSTEMS SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED UNLESS DEMONSTRABLY IMPRACTICABLE OR INAPPROPRIATE, AND PROVISION SHOULD BE MADE FOR THEIR FUTURE MAINTENANCE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> substituting the following for the second sentence of para 5.5.11d of the supporting text: “The City Council’s Supplementary Guidance Note 22, “Sustainable Drainage”, summarises the scope of sustainable drainage and encourages its use.” adding the following at the end of para. 5.5.11d of the supporting text: “Proposals to which the Policy applies are those defined as significant developments in the Supplementary Guidance”.

		<p>The revised para. 5.5.11d will now read as follows:-</p> <p>5.5.11d New developments should aim to limit surface water run off at source. The City Council's Supplementary Guidance Note 22, "Sustainable Drainage", summarises the scope of sustainable drainage and encourages its use. This advises developers to consider drainage proposals at an early stage in the planning process and to seek specialist advice on appropriate sustainable drainage techniques. Proposals to which the Policy applies are those defined as significant developments in the Supplementary Guidance."</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 5/006</p> <p>5/006/FD</p>	<p><u>PA 5/006</u> WASTE MANAGEMENT</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 5.61 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration 5/006.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para 5.60 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Leeds UDP Review in accordance with FD Alteration 5/006.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> None.</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 5/007</p> <p>5/007/FD</p>	<p><u>PA 5/007</u> AIR QUALITY</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 5.65 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration 5/007.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 5.63 and 5.64 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Leeds UDP Review in accordance with FD Alteration 5/007.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> None.</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. A8/017</p>	<p><u>A8/017</u> SEGI BOUNDARY CHANGE</p>	<p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the Proposals Map by altering the boundary of SEGI 07 at Bramham Park, Garforth/Wetherby to accord with the boundaries held by West Yorkshire Ecology. Map change (M/087/IC).
<p>Prop. Alt. A8/002</p>	<p><u>A8/002</u> SEGI BOUNDARY CHANGE</p>	<p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement of Leeds Nature Area 66 with SEGI 35 at Kippax Meadows, Garforth. Delete LNA 66 from the list of LNAs in Chapter A8.5 of Volume 2. Add Kippax Meadows to the list of SEGIs in Chapter A8.4 of Volume 2. Amend the Proposals Map by altering the boundary to accord with the boundaries held by West Yorkshire Ecology. Map change (M/073/IC).

**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLANS PANEL
DATE: 24 JANUARY 2006**

**SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON
CHAPTER 6 (TRANSPORT)**

Electoral Wards Affected:
ALL

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 6 (Transport) and to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 The subject of this chapter relates to transport. The main purpose in the Review of the Adopted UDP has been to:

1. Relate location, form and density of development to public transport services;
2. Update car parking policies and the need for Transport Assessments and Travel Plans; and
3. Update factual changes related to transport strategy proposals.

2.2 Outlined below is a very brief summary of the main points raised by representors.

- There is no planning justification for using the threshold set out in SPG5 which requires the submission of transport assessments and travel plans and for seeking contributions for public transport improvements.
- 1st deposit should be re-assessed to utilise sustainability criteria, one which will include proximity to Supertram.
- Policy T17 should allocate a Park & Ride site at the former Horsforth Sewage Treatment Works.
- A new orbital relief road (ELOR) is not required to address the problems of the Outer Ring Road.
- ELOR would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of residents of Scholes.
- Policy T20 should cover ELOR as a road to be built during the Plan period.
- The wording on the A6120 Ring Road Route Strategy is likely to impede desirable development, regeneration and resolution of long-standing transport

problems.

- The wording on the A65 Quality Bus Corridor would not ensure a safe, satisfactory and cost-effective scheme.
- Policy T24A is unreasonable in its application to existing businesses with inadequate parking provision.

2.3 The Council's principal arguments at the Inquiry was that;

- The intention behind Policy T2B, C and D is to set out the strategic context within which transport assessments, travel plans and the need for public transport contributions will be sought. As far as the threshold is concerned and other specific detail, this will be determined through the SPG5 review process.
- A sustainability appraisal has been undertaken of the Review which includes 'Movement' as an indicator. This includes all forms of public transport and not just the Supertram.
- Amendments made to Policy T17 simply reflect those locations identified in the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (LTP). It is considered that Policy T16 provides the appropriate supportive framework within which new locations for P&R facilities can be made. As far as the former Horsforth Sewage Treatment Works site is concerned the Council is not convinced of the suitability of this site nor has the operational case been made, hence it is considered that it is premature to advance this location at this time.
- The proposed alteration does not express any support for an orbital route. The Council will make every effort to assess the issues and implement the appropriate strategy. As far as the negative aspects are concerned every effort will be made to minimise the impact resulting from any road building scheme.
- Neither the principle nor the timing of ELOR has been established.
- The present wording of the A6120 Ring Road Route Strategy is an accurate reflection of the current status of the study. This would not preclude at a future date the implementation of a phased programme of works along the route to reflect differing development and transportation pressures.
- In relation to the A65 Quality Bus Corridor the alternative wording proposed does not reflect the present position as it implies a new strategy will be drawn up.
- Policy T24A is considered to be in line with national and regional planning guidance and the aim of reducing the need to use the car.

3.0 THE INSPECTOR'S REASONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Threshold for Transport Assessments & Travel Plans

- 3.1 The Inspector has supported the Council's position in his report that he sees no reason in principle why the Council should not take a more rigorous approach provided that the approach is fully justified in the light of local circumstances. As such he recommends that the UDP be modified in accordance with the alteration proposed by the Council, subject to the supporting text indicating briefly how the threshold of what is "significant" in terms of the Policy has been derived and how it would apply in practice.
- 3.2 The Inspector has also agreed with the Council on the need for interim Travel Plans with speculative developments and thus recommended a form of words to explain their role. This is on the basis that this approach would enable early agreement on elements of Travel Plans, such as public transport provision and levels of parking which need to be determined at the planning application stage. Waiting until the end users are known might mean that decisions on such matters have already been taken and options for the Travel Plan precluded.

Sustainable Development & Public Transport Corridors

- 3.3 The Inspector has agreed with the representor that it would be appropriate to record in the supporting text for Policy T13 that Supertram will make development that it serves significantly more sustainable.
- 3.4 The Inspector also feels the subsequent policy, Policy T14, is not a policy in any real sense but simply indicates an intention to carry out further work and as such it contributes nothing to the Plan's land-use strategy. It should be deleted and, if the Council wish, be transferred to the supporting text.

Park & Ride

- 3.5 The Inspector has agreed with the Council that the evidence presented by the objector does not constitute the type of assessment required in terms of PPG2, 12 and 13 and subsequently via the LTP process.
- 3.6 The Inspector comments as a general point, not directly related to the objections, that the Policy's stance of giving "support...wherever possible to the provision of park and ride facilities" is unhelpful as it provides no real guidance on what is meant by "support" or on the circumstances in which it would be given. As such he has recommended re-drafting Policy T16 to indicate that planning permission will be granted subject to stated criteria.

Major Highway Schemes

- 3.7 The Inspector has agreed with the Council that ELOR must remain as one possible approach, albeit subject to further detailed examination and hence no commitment could or should be made within the Plan period.
- 3.8 In relation to impeding development, the Inspector has commented that the LTP, where the proposed outer ring road strategy originated, talks of a need for "a combined approach for the entire route" and therefore he sees no good case to depart from this. It would not be appropriate for the UDP to attempt unilaterally to change the basis of a scheme included in the approved LTP, and on which preparatory work has commenced.... The Inspector further commented that with the Council's proposed wording it would be perfectly feasible to take a phased approach to works on the road within the overall scheme, and to advance the north-east sector in advance of the rest should there be good reason for this.
- 3.9 In relation to the A65 Quality Bus Corridor scheme the Inspector agrees with the Council that the Quality Bus Corridor scheme has clearly been worked up through the LTP process and it is through that process that concerns such as those Cllr. Illingworth expresses should have been aired. He further mentions that the wording in the supporting text is sufficiently broad as to be able to accommodate a number of the objector's concerns as and when the proposals are developed in more detail.
- 3.10 As such the Inspector, in relation to the objections received on this alteration, has made no recommendations to modify the supporting text and Policy. The Inspector has, however, recommended minor changes to the wording to make the policy clearer and also reflect changes made elsewhere in the Plan as part of the Review.

Free-Standing Long Stay Car Parking

- 3.11 Overall the Inspector felt that the approach of the Policy is broad-brush, but at the same time, it is also pragmatic and basically sound. However, he feels that the wording of the supporting text and the policy is confusing and unhelpful as it simply lists several matters which will be taken into account, rather than setting out clear criteria for determining applications. He has, therefore, recommended a form of words to provide further clarification.

4.0 THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE

Threshold for Transport Assessments & Travel Plans

- 4.1 The Inspector's conclusion reinforces the Council's position that a more rigorous approach can be adopted. The Council accepts his recommendation that the approach needs to be fully justified in the light of local circumstances. As such his recommendation to indicate briefly how the threshold of what is "significant" in terms of the Policy has been derived and how it would apply in practice needs to be addressed.
- 4.2 The proposed modification by the City Council indicates why 250 trips has been used to define 'significant' trip generating uses in draft SPG5A. It also indicates that as part of the LDF process draft SPG5A will be reviewed and replaced by a Supplementary Planning Document on Public Transport Improvements and Developer Contributions. The Inspector's recommendation together with the issues raised during the consultation stage will be taken into account to ensure that the threshold is robust and is fully explained in this forthcoming SPD. The Council clearly accepts the Inspector's recommendations in relation to the Proposed Alteration. However, it is considered that his additional suggestion would be better addressed through the planned Supplementary Planning Document rather than in this Review, in order to ensure that its scope is not unduly inhibited and that it fully reflects local circumstances.
- 4.3 Also at the national level, policy guidance is evolving regarding how best to secure these contributions (including the potential for a tariff system) - notably the Treasury's consultation paper on planning gain issued in December 2005. As a result, it is considered that the SPD is the most appropriate vehicle to address this issue as this would allow City Council policy to reflect up to date best practice and be able to react to changes introduced as a result of emerging alterations in national guidance.
- 4.4 The Council also agrees with the Inspector for the need to explain the role of interim Travel Plans with speculative developments.

Sustainable Development & Public Transport Corridors

- 4.5 The Council accepts and agrees with the Inspector's conclusions that Supertram or other Rapid Transit system will make developments that it serves significantly more sustainable.
- 4.6 However, the Council does not accept his recommendation of deleting Policy T14. Policy T14 already exists in the Adopted UDP and only minor alterations have been made which do not change the intent of the Policy. Notwithstanding the above, the Council appreciates that it may seem that Policy T14 indicates an intention to carry out further work and therefore may not contribute to the Plan's land-use strategy. However, in the context of not receiving any funding for the Supertram scheme, not only is it important to safeguard the existing lines identified for the Supertram scheme,

but also to explore the potential for other forms of rapid transit system and bring them forward as a matter of urgency.

Park & Ride

- 4.7 The Inspector's conclusion reinforces the view of the Council that the evidence presented by the objector does not constitute the type of robust assessment required under national and regional planning and transport guidance. The Council also accepts and agrees with the Inspector that it would be helpful if the policy provides guidance as to what is meant by support and the circumstances under which proposals would be considered acceptable. The criteria suggested by the Inspector are a direct reflection of national planning policy and have therefore been incorporated into the Policy.

Major Highway Schemes

- 4.8 The Council accepts and agrees with the Inspectors conclusions and subsequent recommendations and therefore have no further comments.

Free-Standing Long Stay Car Parking

- 4.9 The Council accepts and agrees with the Inspectors conclusions and subsequent recommendation. It is good to see that the Inspector feels the approach of the policy is pragmatic and basically sound despite having reservations that it may be broad-brush. Overall the tenor of his conclusions is a reflection of national planning policy guidance and his suggestion to re-cast the Policy and the supporting text will assist in having clear criteria for determining planning applications and remove any wording that may lead to confusion.

5.0 LEEDS SUPERTRAM

- 5.1 Shortly before the publication of the Leeds UDP Review Inspectors Report in November, Central Government announced that it could not support proposals to re-instate the Leeds Supertram scheme following the withdrawal of funding for the tram proposal in July 2004.
- 5.2 Clearly this decision has major implications for the City and a range of strategic, policy and implementation issues. In taking the City's transport strategy forward, the City Council is actively pursuing a range of alternatives and options with a number of partners and stakeholders including the West Yorkshire PTE and Central Government. Given the nature of these issues and the necessary processes to carefully consider the next steps, alternatives to the Supertram proposals will take time to become established.
- 5.3 In parallel to this approach, the City Council is keen to progress the UDP Review through to formal Adoption and to continue to move towards the Local Development Framework (LDF), as part of the new Development Plan system (introduced as part of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). Integral to the Adopted UDP (2001) and UDP Review are a number of specific policies, proposals and cross references to the Leeds Supertram. Given the on going work to develop alternative public transport proposals to the Leeds Supertram and the desire for early Adoption of the Review, no specific Modifications are proposed to delete references to the "Leeds Supertram". Clearly, once alternative public transport proposals have been developed, these in

turn will need to be incorporated and developed where appropriate as part of the LDF process.

6.0 OTHER MATTERS

Leeds Bradford International Airport

- 6.1 The Inspector was asked to consider Proposed Inquiry Change IC/003 which relates to an aspect of policy wording for the Airport in the Adopted UDP para. 6.7.4, regarding the preparation of an Airport Master Plan, required under the Government's White Paper "The Future of Air Transport" (2003). The Inquiry Change was prompted in response to receipt of objections and was subsequently agreed by the two objectors involved, resulting in the withdrawal of both objections. The Inspector did not report separately on this case, as it was uncontentious. The Inquiry Change IC/003 results in the need for a proposed Modification to be advertised and the wording is included in the attached schedule under PA 6/021.

7.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 7.1 Members are asked to agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter 6 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.

CHAPTER 6 – TRANSPORT

<p>Prop. Alt. 6/001</p> <p>6/001/RD</p>	<p><u>PA 6/001</u> PARA. 6.1.1 – 6.2.8</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para. 6.6 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with RD Alteration 06/001.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 6.2 to 6.5 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector’s recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with the alteration proposed by the Council at the Revised Deposit stage.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> None</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 6/003</p> <p>6/003/RD</p>	<p><u>PA 6/003</u> TRANSPORT ASSESSMENTS</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para. 6.12 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with RD Alteration 6/003, subject to amplifying para. 6.4.4a of the supporting text to indicate briefly how the threshold of what is “significant” in terms of the Policy has been derived and how it would apply in practice.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 6.8 to 6.11 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector’s recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with the alteration proposed by the Council at the Revised Deposit stage subject to amplifying para. 6.4.4a of the supporting text.</p> <p>In the interest of avoiding repetition of the same explanation for how ‘significant’ in terms of applying Policy has been derived under Policies T2B and T2C the proposed modification in para 6.4.4a cross references to a change proposed via para 6.4.4n. New para 6.4.4n indicates why 250 trips has been used to define ‘significant’ trip generating uses in draft SPG5A. Although the Inspector does not request clarification on the word ‘significant’ under Policy T2D, the definition is also relevant to this policy and the proposed new para 6.4.4n is best placed as part of the Proposed Alteration.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adding the words to the end of the para. 6.4.4a, “In relation to the threshold of what is considered to be ‘significant’ in terms of Policy T2B please refer to para 6.4.4n.”
<p>Prop. Alt. 6/004</p> <p>6/004/RD</p>	<p><u>PA 6/004</u> TRAVEL PLANS</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para. 6.18 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with RD Alteration 6/004, as further amended by IC/008, and subject to:</p> <p>a. amplifying para. 6.4.4f of the supporting text to indicate briefly how the threshold of what is “significant” in terms of the Policy has been derived and how it would apply in practice; and</p> <p>b. adding the following to the end of para. 6.4.4g:</p> <p>“For speculative proposals, where the identity of the end users is unknown, an interim Travel Plan should accompany the planning</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 6.14 to 6.17 of the Report and consequently accepts all his recommendations to modify the Plan.</p> <p>In the interest of avoiding repetition of the same explanation for how ‘significant’ in terms of applying Policy has been derived under Policies T2B and T2C the proposed modification in para 6.4.4f cross references to a change proposed via para 6.4.4n. New para 6.4.4n indicates why 250 trips has been used to define ‘significant’ trip generating uses in draft SPG5A. Although the Inspector does not request clarification on the word ‘significant’ under Policy T2D, the definition is also relevant to this policy and the proposed new para 6.4.4n is best placed as part of the Proposed Alteration.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (Revised Deposit) by:</p>

	<p>application to set out matters that need to be agreed prior to development taking place, and to provide a framework and timetable for later submission of a final, detailed Plan.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adding the words to the end of the para. 6.4.4f, “In relation to the threshold of what is considered to be ‘significant’ in terms of Policy T2C please refer to para 6.4.4n.” • adding the words to the end of the para. 6.4.4g, “For speculative proposals, where the identity of the end users is unknown, an interim Travel Plan should accompany the planning application to set out matters that need to be agreed prior to development taking place, and to provide a framework and timetable for later submission of a final, detailed Plan.” <p>Outlined below is the change proposed (IC/008) during the Public Inquiry that has been considered and recommended for insertion by the Inspector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Policy T2C of the Revised Deposit as follows: <p><i>T2C: ALL PLANNING APPLICATIONS WHICH ARE SIGNIFICANT GENERATORS OF TRAVEL DEMAND MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY A TRAVEL PLAN.</i></p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 6/005</p> <p>6/005/RD</p>	<p>PA 6/005 PUBLIC TRANSPORT CONTRIBUTIONS</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u></p> <p>Para. 6.32 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with RD Alteration 6/005, amended by IC/006 and IC/007, and subject to amending the first sentence of the Policy as follows:</p> <p>WHERE PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACCESSIBILITY TO A PROPOSAL WOULD OTHERWISE BE UNACCEPTABLE, THE COUNCIL WILL SEEK DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS OR ACTION TO MAKE ENHANCEMENTS, THE NEED FOR WHICH ARISES FROM THE PROPOSAL.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></p> <p>The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 6.20 to 6.31 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector’s recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p>As discussed under proposed alteration 6/003 and 6/004 that it would be appropriate to make an amendment here in the interest of avoiding repetition of the same explanation for how ‘significant’ in terms of Policy has been derived under Policies T2B, T2C & T2D. The proposed modification has been made by adding a new para after para 6.4.4m.</p> <p>The proposed modification indicates why 250 trips has been used to define ‘significant’ trip generating uses in draft SPG5A. However, as part of the LDF process draft SPG5A will be reviewed and replaced by a Supplementary Planning Document on Public Transport Improvements and Developer Contributions. The Inspector’s recommendation together with the issues raised during the consultation stage will be taken into account to ensure that the threshold is robust and is fully explained in this forthcoming SPD. The Council clearly accepts the Inspector’s recommendations in relation to the Proposed Alteration. However, it is considered that his additional suggestion would be better addressed through the planned Supplementary Planning Document rather than in this Review, in order to ensure that its scope is not unduly inhibited and that it fully reflects local circumstances.</p> <p>Also at the national level, policy guidance is evolving regarding how best to secure these contributions (including the potential for a tariff system) - notably the Treasury’s consultation paper on planning gain issued in December 2005. As a result, it is considered that the SPD is the most appropriate vehicle to address this issue as this would allow City Council policy to reflect up to date best practice and be able to react to changes introduced as a result of emerging alterations in national guidance.</p>

		<p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adding a new para. 6.4.4n, “In relation to the threshold of what is considered to be ‘significant’ in terms of Policy, the Adopted SPG5 fully acknowledges that in order to take account of the cumulative impact of new development, it could be argued that all new schemes should be liable to contributions to the necessary public transport infrastructure enhancements. However, it was considered to be inappropriate to seek contributions from small scale developments that did not generate or attract significant numbers of trips. Nor was it considered that this should apply to ‘major’ developments only. It is considered that the threshold of 250 trips per day is a level of trips which would, if catered for solely by the private car, aggravate existing problems of congestion and pollution in the City including accounting for the potential cumulative impact of such developments on the network. The review of draft SPG5A will assess whether it is still appropriate to use 250 trips as a determinant for what is considered to be ‘significant’ and how it will be applied in practice as far as Transport Assessments, Travel Plans, and seeking public transport contributions is concerned.” • amending the first sentence of the Policy as follows; “WHERE PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACCESSIBILITY TO A PROPOSAL WOULD OTHERWISE BE UNACCEPTABLE, THE COUNCIL WILL SEEK DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS OR ACTION TO MAKE ENHANCEMENTS, THE NEED FOR WHICH ARISES FROM THE PROPOSAL....” <p>Outlined below is the change proposed (IC/006 and IC/007) during the Public Inquiry that has been considered and recommended for insertion by the Inspector.</p> <p>Amend para. 6.4.4m of the Revised Deposit as follows (IC/006):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is essential ... in the Transport Assessment. A SPG/SPD will be produced to provide guidance and further details. <p>Amend Policy T2D of the Revised Deposit as follows (IC/007):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ... TO SUPPORT SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS WHERE REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE APPROPRIATE LEVELS OF ACCESSIBILITY. <p><i>WHEREVER POSSIBLE ...</i></p>
Prop. Alt. 6/007 6/007/RD	PA 6/007 POLICY T7	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 6.34 to 6.35 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector’s recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with the alteration proposed by the Council at the Revised Deposit stage.</p>

	<p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para. 6.36 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with RD Alteration 06/007.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Modification</u> None</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 6/009</p>	<p><u>PA 6/009</u> POLICY T9</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para. 6.40 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration 06/009.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 6.38 to 6.39 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with the alteration proposed by the Council at the First Deposit stage.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> None</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 6/010</p> <p>6/010/RD</p>	<p><u>PA 6/010</u> POLICY T10A</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para. 6.44 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with RD Alteration 06/010, as further amended by IC/002.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 6.42 to 6.43 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with RD Alteration 06/010, as further amended by IC/002. Outlined below is the change proposed during the Public Inquiry that has been considered and recommended for insertion by the Inspector.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Amend para. 6.5.3 of the Revised Deposit as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over recent years Metro has shown that investment in the rail network can be successful. This is reflected in the increase of passenger numbers from 11.5 million in 1994 to 16.6 million in 2002, an underlying growth of 6 per cent per annum:
<p>Prop. Alt. 6/011</p>	<p><u>PA 6/011</u> POLICY T14</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para. 6.48 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration 6/011 subject to:</p> <p>a. deleting Policy T14; and</p> <p>b. adding the following to the end of para. 6.5.8 of the supporting text:</p> <p>"Supertram services will help encourage journeys to be made by public transport rather than by car and thus will contribute to sustainability both in general and in the communities through which they pass. This will be a factor to be taken into account in decisions on the future location, scale and character of development along the routes."</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 6.47 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with the alteration proposed by the Council at the First Deposit stage subject to adding some words at the end of para. 6.5.8. However, the Council does not accept his recommendation of deleting Policy T14.</p> <p>Policy T14 already exists in the Adopted UDP and only minor alterations have been made which do not change the intent of the Policy. Notwithstanding the above, the Council appreciates that it may seem that Policy T14 indicates an intention to carry out further work and therefore may not contribute to the Plan's land-use strategy. However, in the context of not receiving any funding for the Supertram scheme, not only is it important to safeguard the existing lines identified for the Supertram scheme, but also to explore the potential for other forms of rapid transit system and bring them forward as a matter of urgency.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First Deposit) by adding the following to the end of para. 6.5.8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supertram or other Rapid Transit system will help encourage journeys to be made by public transport rather than by car and thus will contribute to sustainability both in general and in the communities through which they pass. This will be a factor to be

		taken into account in decisions on the future location, scale and character of development along the routes.
Prop. Alt. 6/013	PA 6/013 POLICY T16 & POLICY T17 <u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 6.58 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration 6/013, subject to Policy T16 being redrafted to state that planning permission will be granted for park and ride facilities associated with railway stations, Supertram and Quality Bus Services, subject to defined criteria being met.	<u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 6.50 to 6.57 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with the alteration proposed by the Council at the First Deposit stage, subject to Policy T16 being redrafted. <u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First Deposit) by amending Policy T16 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR PARK AND RIDE FACILITIES ASSOCIATED WITH RAILWAY STATIONS, RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEMS AND QUALITY BUS SERVICES, SUBJECT TO EVALUATION AGAINST THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA BEING MET. SUITABLE PROPOSALS SHOULD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DEMONSTRATE A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO THE OBJECTIVES AND TARGETS OF THE LOCAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY (THE LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN), • BE DERIVED FROM A THOROUGH ASSESSMENT OF POSSIBLE SITES, • BE ACCEPTABLE IN TERMS OF IMPACT ON LOCAL AMENITY, • BE ACCEPTABLE IN TERMS OF TRAVEL IMPACTS, INCLUDING TRAFFIC REDUCTION AND GENERATION, • BE SITED AND DESIGNED TO MAXIMIZE ACCESSIBILITY BY NON-CAR MODES NOTABLY WALKING AND CYCLING. <p>WHERE THEIR USE IS APPROPRIATE, SCHEMES NEED TO BE DESIGNED AND IMPLEMENTED IN ASSOCIATION WITH OTHER MEASURES, SUCH AS PUBLIC TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS, TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND PARKING CONTROLS.</p> <p>PROPOSALS TO DEVELOP PARK AND RIDE SITES IN THE GREEN BELT WILL BE JUDGED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ADVICE CONTAINED IN PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE NOTE 2</p>
Prop. Alt. 6/015 6/015/RD	PA 6/015 POLICIES T19 & T20 <u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 6.74 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with RD Alteration 6/015, subject to substituting:	<u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 6.60 to 6.73 of the Report and consequently accepts all his recommendations to modify the Plan. <u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (Revised Deposit) by substituting the words the Inspector has recommended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PROPOSED for SUPPORTED in the first sentence of Policy T20; and

	<p>a. PROPOSED for SUPPORTED in the first sentence of Policy T20; and b. "Phase 3" for "Phase 2" in para. 6.5.29[5] of the supporting text.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Phase 3" for "Phase 2" in para. 6.5.29[5] of the supporting text.
<p>Prop. Alt. 6/018 6/018/RD</p>	<p>PA 6/018 POLICY T24A</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 6.79 - I recommend that the UDP be modified as follows, in place of Alteration 6/018:</p> <p>6.6.2A In line with the strategy of reducing the need to use the car, proposals to create new long-stay car parking for those travelling to and from work by car, outside the curtilage of existing or proposed employment premises, will not generally be permitted. Exceptions may be made within the City Centre and Fringe City Centre Commuter Parking Control Area, and for park and ride schemes, for consistency with other Plan policies; and also where lack of parking within employment premises is causing, or would be likely to cause, serious problems in the surrounding area. The Policy does not apply to short-term parking for which there is a demonstrable operational need such as that for visitors to employment premises.</p> <p>T24A: PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR NEW LONG-STAY CAR PARKING OUTSIDE THE CURTILAGE OF EXISTING OR PROPOSED EMPLOYMENT PREMISES EXCEPT:</p> <p>a. WITHIN THE CITY CENTRE AND FRINGE CITY CENTRE COMMUTER PARKING CONTROL AREA, IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICY CCP2;</p> <p>b. FOR PARK AND RIDE SCHEMES IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICIES T16 AND T17;</p> <p>c. WHERE LACK OF PARKING WITHIN EMPLOYMENT PREMISES WOULD CAUSE SERIOUS TRAFFIC, SAFETY OR ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS IN THE SURROUNDING AREA.</p> <p>PROPOSALS UNDER c. MUST BE SUPPORTED BY A TRAFFIC ASSESSMENT, INCLUDING APPRAISAL OF OTHER MEANS OF ACCESSIBILITY TO THE SITE, INCLUDING PUBLIC TRANSPORT. WHERE PLANNING</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 6.76 to 6.78 of the Report and consequently accepts all his recommendations to modify the Plan.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (Revised Deposit) by:</p> <p>6.6.2A In line with the strategy of reducing the need to use the car, proposals to create new long-stay car parking for those travelling to and from work by car, outside the curtilage of existing or proposed employment premises, will not generally be permitted. Exceptions may be made within the City Centre and Fringe City Centre Commuter Parking Control Area, and for park and ride schemes, for consistency with other Plan policies; and also where lack of parking within employment premises is causing, or would be likely to cause, serious problems in the surrounding area. The Policy does not apply to short-term parking for which there is a demonstrable operational need such as that for visitors to employment premises.</p> <p>T24A: PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR NEW LONG-STAY CAR PARKING OUTSIDE THE CURTILAGE OF EXISTING OR PROPOSED EMPLOYMENT PREMISES EXCEPT:</p> <p>a. WITHIN THE CITY CENTRE AND FRINGE CITY CENTRE COMMUTER PARKING CONTROL AREA, IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICY CCP2;</p> <p>b. FOR PARK AND RIDE SCHEMES IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICIES T16 AND T17;</p> <p>c. WHERE LACK OF PARKING WITHIN EMPLOYMENT PREMISES WOULD CAUSE SERIOUS TRAFFIC, SAFETY OR ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS IN THE SURROUNDING AREA.</p> <p>PROPOSALS UNDER c. MUST BE SUPPORTED BY A TRAFFIC ASSESSMENT, INCLUDING APPRAISAL OF OTHER MEANS OF ACCESSIBILITY TO THE SITE, INCLUDING PUBLIC TRANSPORT. WHERE PLANNING PERMISSION IS GRANTED THE EXTENT OF PARKING ALLOWED WILL NOT EXCEED THAT WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE BE PERMISSIBLE UNDER THE CAR PARKING GUIDELINES, RELATED TO THE SCALE OF THE EMPLOYMENT USE.</p>

	<p>PERMISSION IS GRANTED THE EXTENT OF PARKING ALLOWED WILL NOT EXCEED THAT WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE BE PERMISSIBLE UNDER THE CAR PARKING GUIDELINES, RELATED TO THE SCALE OF THE EMPLOYMENT USE.</p>	
<p>Prop. Alt. 6/021</p> <p>6/021/RD</p>	<p><u>PA 6/021</u> LEEDS-BRADFORD INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT</p> <p><u>Inspector's Recommendation</u> No recommendation has been made by the Inspector as a result of Inquiry Changes being proposed during the Public Inquiry which lead to the Objectors withdrawing their representations.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Amend para. 6.7.4 of the Revised Deposit in accordance with IC/003;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend para. 6.7.4 as follows: <p>6.7.4 There...visitors. Some assumptions for growth at the airport have been incorporated into the UDP. These do not include proposals made in the recent Government White Paper "The Future of Air Transport" (December 2003). Leeds Bradford International Airport will be required to produce an Airport Masterplan, as indicated in the White Paper. The development implications of this will need to be considered in the context of the City Council's forthcoming Local Development Framework for the Leeds District. The retention and improvement of public transport links to the City Centre and elsewhere will also be encouraged by the Council.</p>

REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL
DATE: 24th JANUARY 2006

SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON CHAPTER 22 (South Leeds)			
Electoral Wards Affected:	Specific Implications for:		
ALL	Ethnic Minorities	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Women	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Disabled People	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Key Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	Major Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible for call in <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Eligible for call in <input type="checkbox"/>
Significant Operational Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	Administrative Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	(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 22 – South Leeds, and to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Although there were 19 Proposed Alterations in the South Leeds Chapter of the UDP, only two sites were the subject of objection and were consequently considered at Inquiry by the Inspector. These sites are Proposed Alteration 22/004 (FD) Beeston Hill/Holbeck Area Regeneration/Neighbourhood Renewal and Proposed Alteration 22/007 (FD & RD) Sharp Lane, Middleton. A summary of the Inspector’s conclusions are summarised below and the attached table highlights the proposed modifications in light of the Inspector’s recommendations.

Beeston Hill/Holbeck Regeneration/Neighbourhood Renewal

2.2 An objection was raised to the non recognition in the Beeston Hill/Holbeck Area NRA of its potential to provide for student housing to assist in the regeneration of the NRA. Whilst the Inspector referred to the Beeston Hill and Holbeck Land Use Framework as already identifying a number of areas where student housing could be accommodated, he did not think that the Proposed Alteration should be amended to take this into account. The suitability of this area and others, he recommends, should be considered as a part of a wider discussion between parties as suggested in his revision to Policy H15A on student housing (see separate Report on Housing reported to Panel 3rd January 2006). However, in the response to the Inspector’s recommendations on Chapter 7 (Housing), his recommendation that the Council list suitable locations where student housing would be promoted is rejected. Instead, it is proposed to modify the Plan by having a revised policy H15A which states that the Council will work with its partners to promote student housing development in

locations which would satisfy the criteria which the Inspector has recommended. The Beeston Hill/Holbeck NRA would not therefore be named as a specific location where student housing would be promoted but if locations within the area satisfy the criteria in revised policy H15A, such developments could be brought forward.

- 2.3 In the light of the Inspector's recommendations under Chapter 11 (reported to Panel 3rd January 2006), restricting Policy R1 to the 3 Special Policy Areas of Aire Valley, Gipton and Harehills, the Beeston Hill/Holbeck NRA should be listed under a new Policy R2 as described in the Report to Panel on Chapter 11.
- 2.4 A second objection related to the extension of Beeston Hill/Holbeck Area NRA to include a wider area encompassing Beeston, Mill Shaw and Elland Road and the need to identify a core renewal area within a broader Action Plan. The Inspector has concluded that the wider area which is largely employment in nature, would not necessarily bring the benefit identified by the objector and might endanger the policy approach to the rest of the regeneration area. In addition, the existing boundary does not exclude the improved linkages to employment opportunities sought by the objector. In addition, no obvious advantage could be seen in identifying a core renewal area and no detailed information was supplied by the objector which would allow consideration of a better boundary for the NRA than that advanced by the Council.
- 2.5 In the light of this the Inspector proposes no modification to the UDP other than that identified under PA 22/004 which is advanced without any further changes.

Sharp Lane Strategic Housing Site

- 2.6 An objection was lodged under PA 22/007, Sharp Lane, Middleton, Strategic Housing Site (SHS), on the grounds that the land should not be identified as a strategic housing site and that it be removed from Phase 1 of the Plan where it is identified as an 'existing commitment' because it had planning permission. The issue of Strategic Housing Sites and their definition was raised at the Housing Round Table which was held on the 20th & 21st July 2004.
- 2.7 The Council's principal argument at the Inquiry was that the site itself fully satisfied the functional role of a strategic allocation serving a much needed regeneration role in respect of the surrounding area, notably the Middleton District Centre as defined under Review Policy H2. This is accepted by the Inspector.
- 2.8 The Inspector has supported the Council's position in his report and commented that he considers "the size and nature of the site amply qualify it to be a building block of the Council's Housing Strategy in terms described in 'Planning to Deliver', and its inclusion within Phase 1, would enable an early start on the regeneration which is evidently very necessary....". He also concludes "...that development of the site would support regeneration not only of Middleton District Centre but also of at least part of the extensive housing area to the west."
- 2.9 The Inspector therefore recommends that no additional modification is made to the UDP other than that advanced by the Council under this proposed alteration. The land will therefore remain allocated as a Strategic Housing Site in Phase 1 for housing use.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 Members are asked to agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter 22 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.

CHAPTER 22 – SOUTH LEEDS

<p>Prop. Alt. 22/004</p>	<p><u>PA 22/004</u> BEESTON HILL/HOLBECK NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL AREA</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 22.4 I recommend that the Beeston Hill/Holbeck NRA be included among those locations to be considered for inclusion in Policy H15A, as recommended to be amended, and that appropriate references then be included in the relevant area chapters of the Plan.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council rejects the Inspector's conclusions in Para 22.2 of the Report to include Beeston/Holbeck as a suitable location for student housing under Policy H15A. It is not considered appropriate to identify specific locations but, instead, be guided by the criteria recommended by the Inspector in his para 7.203(5). However, the Council by listing Beeston Hill/Holbeck NRA under a new Policy R2 as described in the Report in Chapter 11, accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> As a consequence of accepting the Inspector's recommendation under Chapter 11 (11/002 & 11/002-RD), there is a need to Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by replacing the reference to Policy R1 with Policy R2 in the upper case policy wording in Proposed Alteration 22/004.</p> <p><u>Related Proposed Alteration</u> 11/002 and 11//002RD, delete Beeston Hill/Holbeck NRA from Policy R1 and list it under the new Policy R2.</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 22/007</p> <p>22/007/ RD</p>	<p><u>PA 22/007</u> SHARP LANE STRATEGIC HOUSING SITE</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 22.9 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with Proposed Alteration 22/007</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 22.6 to 22.8 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation not to modify the Plan. Although the Inspector's wording in his recommendation is that the UDP "be modified in accordance with Proposed Alteration 22/007", his clear intent is that no further modification to the Plan is required and that Proposed Alteration 22/007 is supported.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> None.</p>