



Report of the Director of Neighbourhoods & Housing Department

Inner North West Area Committee

Date: 30th March 2006

Subject: Area Manager's Report

Electoral Wards Affected:

ALL

Specific Implications For:

Ethnic minorities

Women

Disabled people

Narrowing the Gap

Council Function

Delegated Executive Function available for Call In

Delegated Executive Function not available for Call In Details set out in the report

Executive Summary

This report provides the Committee with an overview of significant current area management activities. It doesn't cover service activities which have been picked up in reports elsewhere on this agenda. The report focuses on:-

- Area Management Developments
- Town & District centre scheme progress.
- Little London regeneration

1.0 Area Management Developments

1.1 A report is going to Executive Board on 22nd March about proposals to transfer community centres to area management (and the budgets to the area committees). Subject to Executive Board decision a report detailing the arrangements will be brought to the first meeting of the 2006/07 municipal year. The centres affected in Inner North West Leeds are:-

- Beckett Park Centre
- Burley Lodge Centre
- Headingley Community Centre
- Little London Community Centre
- Meanwood Community Centre
- Woodhouse Community Centre
- Woodsley Road Community Centre

- 1.2 KPMG has been appointed to carry out a baseline progress review of area management. This review will be completed by April 2006. All chairs of area committees will be interviewed as part of the review. Following the KPMG review, an internal review will take place. The review board will be chaired by Neil Evans, Director of Neighbourhoods & Housing and will include representatives from key services associated with area management (e.g. streetscene) as well as two area managers.
- 1.3 The purpose of the reviews is to identify services and timescales for the development of area management. The following range of questions may be dealt with:-
- the extent to which area management is coherent with the Council's Corporate plan;
 - the implications for area management of changes in other partners structures and planned change within the Council in relation to children's and adult services;
 - the extent to which local views and needs are being taken into account successfully through area working;
 - the extent to which an additional administrative burden, if any, has been put on the Council by area committees;
 - the extent to which area management has led to changes in service delivery and service improvements;
 - whether further services or responsibilities should be added to area management and if so, which and when?

2.0 Town & District Centre scheme

- 2.1 The Headingley scheme has been resubmitted to include revised proposals based on discussions with the Central Headingley Strategy Group. As advised previously, the estimated costs are significantly higher than the £200,000 originally agreed in outline. This reflects a much more ambitious pedestrian-friendly treatment to North Lane, inclusion of improvements to the Rose Garden and significant landscaping / parking improvements at the parade of shops on the junction of Otley Road, St Anne's Road. In addition, the scheme includes landscaping improvements around the Arndale Centre and improved pedestrian priority at the Wood Lane/Otley Road junction, both contingent on a contribution from the owners of the Arndale Centre.
- 2.2 Subject to Asset Management group approval, feasibility work will take place on these schemes over the coming months.
- 2.3 In addition, the outline includes the potential to incorporate costs associated with any decision to retain Headingley Primary School. A decision on the future of Headingley Primary School site following its closure will need to be taken by Executive Board. Options include:-
- Straightforward sale to generate the highest capital receipt for the Council;
 - sale with detailed marketing brief, potentially for the purposes of social enterprise;
 - retention as a Council building for offices / community use;
 - lease to Headingley Development Trust.

3.0 Little London Regeneration

- 3.1 The main part of the consultation on the regeneration options for Little London took place in January and February 2006, starting with a newsletter to all households which provided information about the two options, the process of the consultation and a timetable of events during the consultation.
- 3.2 The newsletter was followed by the distribution of a more detailed guide providing information for residents about the options and the impact on their particular part of the estate (five different guides produced).
- 3.3 A door-to-door consultation took place from February 3rd to February 16th. Initially areas at potential threat of demolition or disposal were targeted and these residents were also asked to complete a housing needs questionnaire. All 1431 properties were visited a minimum of three times. Calling cards were left offering appointment times to suit the resident, home visits, and translation or interpretation services if needed. A number of exhibitions were held in tower block foyers. Towards the end of the consultation period, freepost return surveys were posted to any household not having responded to the survey in person.
- 3.4 The survey results were collated and analysed by Banks of the Wear. In summary:-
- Around two-thirds of the households on the estate returned reply slips - 967 replies from 1431 properties;
 - Residents expressed a preference in all areas other than the Lovell Park tower blocks for Comprehensive Regeneration;
 - The overall preference was 64% Comprehensive Regeneration, 36% Decent Homes;
 - Preference for Comprehensive Regeneration was highest in areas unaffected by potential demolition or disposal (456 to 195), with a majority also favouring this option in Carlton Towers (proposed for demolition, 44 to 33);
 - There was a majority preference stated for the Decent Homes option in the Lovell Park tower blocks (97 to 77). This preference was most pronounced in Lovell Park Grange (40 to 17), with a smaller majority in Lovell Park Heights (35 to 30) and evenly balanced in Lovell Park Towers (30 to 30);
 - There was a very strong statement from all residents in the area that they want to see it cleaner. People also want to see a good level of improvements and modern facilities, and the vast majority state that staying in the area is very important to them.
 - The Council's Housing PFI Project Board will decide on March 29th whether to submit an Outline Business Case to the ODPM for PFI credits to support the Comprehensive Regeneration and the Council's Executive Board will consider the matter in April.

4.0 Recommendation

- 4.1 Members are asked to note the contents of this report.

Report of the Director of Neighbourhoods & Housing

Inner North West Area Committee

Date: 30th March 2006

Subject: H15 UDP Modifications

Electoral Wards Affected:

ALL

Specific Implications For:

Ethnic minorities

Women

Disabled people

Narrowing the Gap

Council
Function

Delegated Executive
Function available
for Call In

Delegated Executive
Function not available for
Call In Details set out in the
report

Executive Summary

The report presents the proposed modifications to the UDP in line with the Inspector's Recommendations for discuss and joint response.

1.0 Purpose Of This Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide information on the proposed modifications to policy H15 of the UDP with a view to submitting a joint response to the consultation, should the Area Committee wish to do so.

2.0 Background Information

2.1 Following consideration of the Inspector's recommendations, the City Council has published modifications to the UDP.

3.0 Consultation

3.1 Attached at Appendix 1 to 4 are the reports and documents detailing the proposed modifications.

3.2 Anyone wishing to make representation, to object or support, the proposed modifications need to put in writing any such comment before noon on Monday 10th April 2006.

- 3.3 Objections and representations should specify the matters to which they relate and the grounds on which they are made.
- 3.4 If no objections are received, steps will be taken to adopt the plan, commencing with a report to the Development Plan Panel.

4.0 Recommendations

- 4.1 The Area Committee is asked to:
- a) note the contents of the report, and
 - b) decide whether it wishes to make a joint response to the proposed modifications

LEEDS UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

Response to the Inspector's Report and Proposed Modifications

THE MODIFICATIONS DOCUMENT

The Unitary Development Plan for Leeds was adopted in August 2001. A Selective Review of the Adopted Plan was published in two parts, in June 2003 (First Deposit) and in Feb. 2004 (Revised Deposit). The Review Plan has now been to a Public Inquiry, where objections to the Plan have been heard by an independent Planning Inspector. The City Council received the Inspector's Report on 23 November 2005 and published it on 30 November 2005.

This document sets out the Council's response to the Inspector's Report. In some cases this involves further changes, the Modifications, on which you now have the opportunity to comment.

The Modifications are changes to either the text or Proposals Map (or both) of the Leeds UDP Review rather than changes to the original UDP.

In responding to the Inspector's Report the Council has followed the Chapter and Alteration number order used by the Inspector. These are listed in the contents page. The Council's response is set out in individual chapters for the convenience of the public whose interest may well lie in a particular issue or geographic area.

Each chapter comprises (where relevant) the following:

- a schedule listing the Inspector's recommendations, the Council's decision and any Modifications arising as a result of that decision. In some instances a Proposed Modification has arisen as a result of a change which was promoted during the Public Inquiry – these are referred to as Inquiry Changes.
- where appropriate, a set of plans illustrating changes

Where Modifications are proposed, the full text of the change is provided where this is considered helpful to an understanding of the Council's intentions. Elsewhere, for instance when the change is the deletion or substitution of a few words, then the change is signalled by the modification, but is not given in full. In these cases it will be necessary to read the modification alongside the Leeds UDP Review (First Deposit & Revised Deposit) in order to see the precise wording of changes. Copies of these documents are available from:

- The Development Enquiry Centre, The Leonardo Building, 2 Rossington Street, Leeds, LS2 8HD. Tel. 2478000
Opening times are: 8.30 to 5.00 (apart from Wed. when the office opens at 9.30).
- The Council's web-site at: www.leeds.gov.uk/planning >UDP & Related SPG's
- Local Libraries and City Council One Stop Shops

Rejected Recommendations

A list of the Inspector's recommendations which the City Council is minded to reject, either completely or in part, is included in the front section of this document. Those topics are also highlighted by means of shading in the schedules for each chapter.

Modification Reference Numbers

The referencing system used for Modifications is based on the chapters of the Inspector's Report. Each chapter has a separate number sequence which appears in the right hand column of the schedule after "**Proposed Modification**" e.g. 4/001 is the modification for the first topic in Chapter 4: General Policies.

This number sequence mirrors the numbers of the Proposed Alterations in the UDP Review which were published for public comment prior to the Public Inquiry. For example, Proposed Modification 4/001 is the same topic as Proposed Alteration 4/001 which is given in the far left hand column of the schedule.

It is important to note that, in order to facilitate public comment on the Council's decision, a Modification number is provided even where the Inspector has agreed with the Council and no Modification is therefore needed.

Where the Inspector has reported separately on one of the Appendices in the Review, the Modification reference carries the prefix **A**.

Plans

The plans which illustrate the changes to the Adopted UDP Proposals Map have a separate reference number which has the prefix **M**. A single Modification may require a number of plans. It should be noted that not all changes to the Proposals Map are supported by a plan: plans are generally only provided where the proposed change or Modification cannot be adequately identified from the existing Proposals Map. For instance, where an allocation is to be deleted then no plan is provided, whereas a new allocation clearly requires a plan.

REPRESENTATIONS

At this stage in the UDP Review process duly made representations of objection or support may only be made to:

- **the proposed changes to the Leeds UDP Review as set out in the Proposed Modifications and which are described in the right hand column of the schedules.**
- **the Council's decision not to promote a change recommended in the Inspector's Report**

This is not an opportunity to object to matters in the original Adopted (2001) Plan which remains unchanged, or to re-visit issues already considered by the Inspector at the Public Inquiry.

Representations should be made to the Council in writing, preferably on the form provided which includes further guidance notes. A copy of the representation form and guidance notes relating to the Proposed Modifications may be downloaded from the Council's Web site (www.leeds.gov.uk/planning>UDP & Related SPG's. To be valid, representations must be received by the Council during the formal "deposit" period from **12.00 (noon) on Monday 27 February to 12.00 (noon) on 10 April 2006.**

CHAPTER 7 – HOUSING

Note: As a consequence of the Inspector’s recommendations to Chapter 7 and the Council’s response to these, the full revised text of Sections 7.1 – 7.3 is attached at the end of this report and should be read in conjunction with the schedule of responses to the Inspector’s individual recommendations.

<p>Prop. Alt. 7/001</p> <p>7/001/RD</p>	<p><u>PA 7/001</u> HOUSING - INTRODUCTION</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> That the UDP be modified</p> <p>1. in accordance with FD Alteration 7/001, subject to amending the last sentence of para. 7.1.7 to read:</p> <p>“It is anticipated that the strategy proposed here will maintain the rate of use of brownfield sites at a level in excess of Government targets throughout the Review Plan period.”</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s conclusions and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s recommendation to modify the plan</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification 7/001</u> Addition of recommended text to the end of paragraph 7.1.6 A number of other wording changes are made to the introduction to improve the clarity of the text but without altering its sense. The reference in paragraph 7.1.3 to 29000 dwellings being required in the Review period to 2016, which referred to the 15 years 2001-16 is amended to 25090 dwellings, to refer to the period 2003-16 which was then and is now the period of the plan.</p>
<p>Prop. Alts. 7/002-5</p> <p>7/001RD -5RD</p>	<p><u>PA 7/002</u> PHASED RELEASE OF LAND FOR HOUSING</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> That the plan be amended</p> <p>2. in accordance with RD Alteration 7/001(sic, but actually 7/002) subject to</p> <p>a. amendment of the first sentence of the first bullet point to read:</p> <p>“Most of the City’s housing land needs for the whole Review period to 2016 are likely to be met from existing brownfield land reserves within the Main Urban and Smaller Urban Areas as defined on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>b. deletion of Garforth, Kippax, Wetherby and Otley and the penultimate sentence from the first bullet point of para. 7.2.1 and</p> <p>c. explanation of the difference between the parts of the “Main and Smaller Urban Areas” designation;</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council generally accepts the thrust of the Inspector’s recommendations, except in certain detailed respects. The need for 5 mechanisms to regulate land release is rejected, as the essential tasks can be managed by two. The reference to greenfield land coming forward under policy H4 is rejected because it is clearly at odds with the Inspector’s intentions. Generally the text and presentation of policy has had to be substantially re-written to accommodate the Inspector’s conclusions. Because of this, the schedule of proposed modifications that follows frequently refers to paragraphs in the new text which is attached at the end. The nature of the response – acceptance, conditional acceptance or rejection – is apparent from the summary of the action.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification 7/002 (a)</u> Add the recommended text to the second bullet point of para 7.2.1</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification 7/002 (b)</u> Delete Garforth and Kippax from the list of locations within the Main Urban and Smaller Urban areas in the second bullet point. Otley and Wetherby are retained because these do form part of the combined areas as is clear from the Inspector’s recommendation 9a.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification 7/002 (c)</u> Addition of the text “together with the freestanding towns of Otley and Wetherby which are identified in RSS as urban areas” to the second bullet point in order to explain why these areas are added to the main urban core.</p>

<p>d. deletion of bullet point 4;</p> <p>e. rewording of bullet point 5 to reflect the recommendations relating to ELE;</p> <p>f. deletion of the last sentence of bullet point 6;</p> <p>g. rewording of H1 and inclusion of explanatory text as follows:</p> <p>H1 PROVISION WILL BE MADE FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE ANNUAL AVERAGE REQUIREMENT IDENTIFIED IN THE REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY [RSS].</p> <p>This is currently 1,930 dwellings per annum. The adequacy of completions, together with the number of dwellings with planning permission and the supply of sites allocated for development, will be monitored and assessed against the average annual requirement in RSS.</p>	<p>Proposed Modification 7/002 (d) Deletion of the following text: “provision for more specific additional developments may be needed in certain parts or localities within the District, reflecting local needs and circumstances”</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/002 (e) Replacement of the following text: “reflecting the sequential approach advocated in PPG3 and in RPG, the approach at that stage will need to focus on the scope to expand the main urban area of Leeds itself. Accordingly, the UDP proposes an extension of the main urban area in the north-eastern sector (adjacent to the Seacroft-Cross Gates areas). The wider regeneration and infrastructure implications of this development will be addressed and planned in a masterplan to be prepared for this development” with this new text: “A fifth Strategic Site, the East Leeds Extension, is identified in phase 3. This is a large greenfield urban extension in an area of Leeds where environmental constraints are less severe and where the coalescence of existing settlements can be avoided. It forms the largest component of the reserve of greenfield allocations identified in phase 3.”</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/002 (f) Deletion of this text so that the final bullet point reads: “Monitoring of development opportunities will be necessary throughout the Review period.”</p> <p>Some other additions are made to the text at para 7.2.1 – the function of which is to summarise the plan’s housing land strategy - in order to reflect the changes to this strategy which stem from the Inspector’s recommendations. These consist of the bullet points identifying the three phases of the plan, the key thrust of the plan to rely on windfall sites to meet requirements, with greenfield allocations held in reserve, and the role of Strategic sites.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/002 (g) Text inserted at paras 7.2.2 – 7.2.3.</p>
--	--

<p>h. insertion of a new Policy H2 to relate to monitoring as follows:</p> <p>H2 THE COUNCIL WILL UNDERTAKE REGULAR MONITORING OF THE ANNUAL COMPLETIONS OF DWELLINGS WITHIN THE DISTRICT, AS WELL AS THE NUMBER OF DWELLINGS WITH PLANNING PERMISSION AND THE SUPPLY OF SITES ALLOCATED FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.</p> <p>i. Insertion of new explanatory text immediately following, and relating to, Policy H2. This should explain the purpose of monitoring which is to ensure that housing requirements are being met in line with the sequential approach set out in PPG3. It should include the factors to be monitored and outline the monitoring process, with a commitment to working with the development industry, including dialogue through meetings to discuss the results of monitoring.</p> <p>j. Renumbering Policy H2 as H3 and rewording as follows:</p> <p>H3 THE DELIVERY OF HOUSING LAND RELEASE WILL BE CONTROLLED IN THREE PHASES:</p> <p>PHASE 1 : 2003-2008 PHASE 2 : AFTER PHASE 1, WHEN AND IF EXISTING HOUSING LAND SUPPLY IS DEMONSTRABLY SHORT OR 2008-2012 PHASE 3 : AFTER PHASE 2, WHEN AND IF EXISTING HOUSING LAND SUPPLY IS DEMONSTRABLY SHORT OR 2012-2016</p> <p><u>PHASE 1: 2003 - 2008</u> THIS WILL COMPRISE: A LAND ALLOCATED FOR HOUSING IN H3-1A [NB. MODIFIED TO INCLUDE SITES AT ALLERTON BYWATER, SHARP LANE, MIDDLETON AND HARE LANE PUDSEY]; B BROWNFIELD WINDFALL SITES WITHIN THE MUA; AND C THE ALLOCATIONS AT HOLBECK URBAN VILLAGE AND HUNSLET RIVERSIDE; ELSEWHERE (I.E. OUTSIDE THE DEFINED MAIN URBAN AREA AND ON GREENFIELD SITES) PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT</p>	<p>Proposed Modification 7/002 (h) Insertion of policy after para 7.2.3.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/002 (i) Insertion of following text:</p> <p>7.2.4 The purpose of monitoring is to assess whether H1 requirements have been met and can continue to be met in line with the sequential approach. Monitoring information will be used to help manage the phased release of land. In particular, it will provide indicators for a trigger mechanism (see below) which will help decide the need to release the reserve greenfield allocations in phases 2 and 3.</p> <p>7.2.5 Monitoring information will be published twice yearly in Housing Land Monitors relating to the position at 31 March and 30 September. These documents will cover rates of house building; the stock of land available in outstanding planning permissions and allocations at the reference date; the brownfield: greenfield make-up of the stock; projections of future output in the light of these stocks and of past trends; and other matters relevant to the housing land supply. The Monitors will be posted on the Council web site and also be available on demand. Meetings to discuss the results of monitoring will be held with the development industry if appropriate.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/002 (j) These recommendations are broadly accepted within policy H3 of the plan, reworded as follows: H3 THE DELIVERY OF HOUSING LAND RELEASE WILL BE CONTROLLED IN THREE PHASES:</p> <p>PHASE 1 : 2003-2008 PHASE 2 : AFTER PHASE 1 (PROVISIONALLY 2008-2012), WHEN AND IF EXISTING HOUSING LAND SUPPLY IS DEMONSTRABLY SHORT PHASE 3 : AFTER PHASE 2 (PROVISIONALLY 2012-2016), WHEN AND IF EXISTING HOUSING LAND SUPPLY IS DEMONSTRABLY SHORT</p> <p>EACH PHASE WILL COMPRISE THREE COMPONENTS OF SUPPLY: A : LAND ALLOCATED FOR HOUSING IN THIS PLAN B: UNALLOCATED LAND (WINDFALL SITES) GIVEN PLANNING PERMISSION UNDER THE TERMS OF POLICY H4 IN THE MAIN AND SMALLER URBAN AREAS C: UNALLOCATED LAND (WINDFALL SITES) GIVEN PLANNING PERMISSION UNDER THE TERMS OF POLICY H4 OUTSIDE THE MAIN AND SMALLER URBAN AREAS</p> <p>THE ESTIMATED DWELLING YIELD FROM THESE SOURCES IN EACH PHASE IS SUMMARISED IN THE TABLE BELOW</p>
---	--

WILL BE CONSIDERED AGAINST POLICY H4.

PHASE 2 : 2008 – 2012

THIS WILL COMPRISE

- A ANTICIPATED CONTINUING CONTRIBUTION [IF ANY] FROM PHASE 1 ALLOCATIONS/COMMITMENTS.
- B BROWNFIELD WINDFALL SITES WITHIN THE MUA; AND
- C SITES BROUGHT FORWARD FROM H3-3 AS FOLLOWS:

SITE	AREA [HA]	CAPACITY
GREENLEA ROAD, YEADON	1.06	30-45
GRIMES DYKE, WHINMOOR H4.8]	17.2	515-860
RED HALL [H4.6]	3.6	110-180
SEACROFT HOSPITAL	17.6	530-880
BRUNTCLIFFE ROAD, MORLEY	5.0	180-250
DAISY HILL, MORLEY	2.9	100-150
CHURCH LANE, ADEL	2.5	70-125
PUDSEY ROAD, SWINNOW	1.3	40-55
DELPH END, PUDSEY	1.4	40-55
POTTERY LANE, WOODLESFORD	2.5	105-175

ELSEWHERE (I.E. OUTSIDE THE DEFINED MAIN URBAN AREA, AND ON GREENFIELD SITES) PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT WILL BE CONSIDERED AGAINST POLICY H4

PHASE 3 : 2012-16

PHASE 3 SHOULD FOLLOW A SIMILAR PATTERN TO PHASES 1 AND 2 AND INCLUDE EAST LEEDS EXTENSION AND H3-3 SITES MODIFIED TO INCLUDE EAST OF OTLEY AND MICKLEFIELD SITES.

k. inclusion in the accompanying explanatory text of any necessary justification for the proposals in Phase 1 [including for the remaining Phase 1B sites of Hunslet Riverside and Holbeck Urban Village]. Reference should also be made to the preparation of planning briefs or other masterplans for their development.

l. inclusion for each Phase of a tabulation of the anticipated total, and annual number, of dwellings which each site and element of each Phase is expected to deliver.

- 3. a. to include the lists of phased sites proposed to be within H3-1 to

[see text for this table]

TABLES SHOWING THE ALLOCATED SITES IN EACH PHASE, THEIR ESTIMATED CAPACITIES AND ASSUMED PERIODS OF DEVELOPMENT ARE GIVEN AT THE END OF THIS SECTION. THESE TABLES ARE PART OF POLICY H3.

[see text for this table]

The re-worded policy incorporates several presentational changes and some adjustments of sense. Chief of these, and the reasons for making them, are:

1. The references to phase periods in the early part of the policy are amended to make it clear that the periods are provisional, as anticipated by the Inspector, e.g. at para 7.53 of his report.
2. The sources of supply in each phase are listed in the same order, so that each subcategory A always refers to allocations, B to H4 windfall in the MUA/SUAs and C to H4 windfall elsewhere. Further subdivisions are used within category A, to distinguish particular sub-classes of allocations (e.g. Strategic Sites). This means that the components of supply in each phase can be specified just once, without having to be repeated under each phase.
3. The descriptions of the make-up of each category of supply are amended, particularly to make it clear that apart from allocations, all other land will come forward under the provisions of policy H4. The reference to greenfield sites in the final clause of the Inspector's recommendation is deleted, as it is clear from paras 7.99 – 7.100 of his report that the Inspector does not intend policy H4 to be construed as inviting applications for greenfield windfall development even on a small scale.
4. Summary tables of sources of supply and of individual allocations are incorporated into the policy to meet recommendations made elsewhere.
5. The capacity ranges proposed by the Inspector for the phase 2 allocations are discarded in favour of the lower end of his suggested ranges. This is for consistency with all other allocation capacities, and for ease of presentation and monitoring. All capacities are indicative only, as emphasised by the Inspector, e.g. in para 3a of his recommendations, so there is no harm in using a single working assumption for each site.

Proposed Modification 7/002 (k)

Justification for the strategic sites is given in paras 7.3.5 and 7.3.6 of the text. There is no need to refer to briefs or masterplans here. Any such requirements are dealt with in the Area chapters of the plan.

Proposed Modification 7/002 (l)

The summary table built into the text of policy H3 gives the assumed yield from each of the three sources of supply, by single years within each phase.

Proposed Modification 7/002 (m)

The above summary table is a revised version of that referred to by the Inspector, and fulfils his

<p>H3-3 and the table on p. 40 of RDUDP as part of recommended tabulations in recommended Policy H3. They should be modified to include, for each phase, details of each site area, dwellings capacity and/or numbers of dwellings permitted, and anticipated yield within the relevant phase of the Plan. The figures should be totalled and summarised [as in the table on p.40 of RDUDP] at the end of the explanatory text. It should be explained that the capacity figures given are not maxima but indicative only and that the numbers of dwellings built may vary.</p> <p>b. to refer to the preparation of development briefs or masterplans for certain sites [such as Hunslet Riverside, Holbeck Urban Village and the East Leeds Extension] in the explanatory text accompanying each phase.</p> <p>c. to include the sentence "In accordance with PPG3, the sites allocated in Policy H3 provide in excess of the 5 year land supply requirement" at the end of the explanatory text relating to the 3 Phases.</p> <p>4. to include the content of para. 7.3.4 amended to relate to a revised Policy H4 as follows:</p> <p>a. Proposals for housing on land not specifically identified for that purpose in the UDP will be considered against Policy H4:</p> <p>H4: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON SITES NOT IDENTIFIED FOR THAT PURPOSE IN THE UDP BUT WHICH LIE WITHIN THE MAIN AND SMALLER URBAN AREAS AS DEFINED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, OR ARE OTHERWISE IN A DEMONSTRABLY SUSTAINABLE LOCATION, WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IS ACCEPTABLE IN SEQUENTIAL TERMS, IS CLEARLY WITHIN THE CAPACITY OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED INFRASTRUCTURE, AND COMPLIES WITH ALL OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES OF THE UDP.</p>	<p>requirements. The separate listing of allocated sites gives site areas, estimated capacities and possible yields by single years as also required by this recommendation. Explanatory notes attached to the table, as well as para 7.2.6 make it clear that capacities are indicative only.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/002 (n) Any requirement for briefs or masterplans is dealt with in the Area chapters of the plan.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/002 (o) This text is inserted in para 7.2.7</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/002 (p) This text is inserted at para 7.2.13 The following additional explanatory text is also added: "7.2.14 In this policy, acceptability in sequential terms is a reference to the principles set out in paragraphs 29-34 of PPG3 "Housing" (March 2000 edition), particularly paragraph 32 which says that there is a presumption that previously-developed sites should be developed before greenfield sites except in exceptional circumstances. This criterion is expected to mean that only brownfield sites will normally be acceptable under the terms of H4.</p> <p>7.2.15 Although most H4 sites will be in the Main and Smaller Urban areas, proposals are also likely to be acceptable in other locations which are demonstrably sustainable. Judgements will be made on the basis of consideration of the availability and frequency of bus and train services to service centres, and on the range of services available locally, including shops, health facilities and schools. It is likely that proposals will be acceptable in S2 service centres not within the MUA/SUAs, as well as some other settlements with a lesser but still adequate range of facilities, provided the other provisions of H4 are also satisfied."</p> <p>This text is added to help clarify the meaning of policy H4, which would otherwise stand alone. The first paragraph explains the meaning of a key clause of the policy which might not otherwise be readily understood by those unfamiliar with the expression "sequential terms" or its source. The second paragraph gives pointers to identifying other "demonstrably sustainable locations", a phrase introduced by the Inspector but not further explained. It draws on his discussion of the factors which lead him to conclude that site H3-2A.7 (Church Lane, Adel) was in a sustainable location and hence appropriate for inclusion as a phase 2 allocation (Alteration 18/006).</p>
---	--

<p>5. otherwise section 7.3 of the AUDP should be deleted without replacement by the remainder of Alteration 7/003.</p> <p>PA 7/004 JUSTIFICATION FOR HOUSING POLICIES</p> <p>6. in accordance with RD Alteration 7/004 subject to its amendment to reflect my specific recommendations, and in particular:</p> <p>a. addition of “and by RSS” to 7.4.1.1;</p> <p>b. deletion of East of Otley, Thorp Arch Trading Estate and Micklefield in para. 7.4.1.4;</p> <p>c. expansion of the justification, in terms of Government guidance, for Allerton Bywater and Sharp Lane Middleton being “Strategic Housing Sites”;</p> <p>d. renaming Holbeck Urban Village and Hunslet Riverside “Strategic Housing and Mixed-use Sites”;</p> <p>e. amendment of 7.4.1.5 to reflect my recommendations with regard to East Leeds Extension;</p> <p>f. amendment of the figures in para. 7.4.2 and text in 7.4.2a and b. to accord with my recommendations for modifications to housing allocations and to take into account the revised figures and table submitted as IC/009;</p> <p>g. including in para. 7.4.2 fuller explanation of the reasons for the generous provision of land, the fact that PMM will regulate its release, and clarification of how the residual requirement to be met in later phases follows on from allocations and windfall assumptions made at earlier stages in the process.</p>	<p>Proposed Modification 7/002 (q) Section 7.3 is amended as specified above and any residual elements of Alteration 7/003 are discarded. However, additional material is inserted to explain the operation of policy H3 and to introduce the trigger mechanisms advised by the Inspector under recommendations 7 and 8. These are considered under recommendations 7 and 8 below.</p> <p>This section deals with the justification for the plan strategy, as distinct from an explanation of how the strategy is intended to work. It has had to be completely re-written, for reasons explained below, but first the Council’s response to the Inspector’s individual recommendations is set out.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (a) (a) This phrase is added to the first sentence of para 7.3.1</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (b) (b) All references to strategic sites now exclude these sites</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (c) (c) Justification is included in para 7.3.7</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (d) (d) These sites are re-titled where relevant.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (e) (e) The Inspector’s recommended references to this site are included in para 7.3.6</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (f) (f) The summary table that formed part of RDUDP 7.4.2 has been re-located to the body of policy H3, since it is just a more summarised version of the table which was called for under recommendation 2I. There seems no point in having two levels of summarised data. The figures in this summary table differ from those in RDUDP 7.4.2 because they reflect the Inspector’s recommended changes – notably, the deletion of the Thorp Arch proposal, the substitution of the Inspector’s capacities for the new phase 2 allocations (these are slightly higher than those used before), and the revised estimates of windfall given in IC/009. The explanatory text in RDUDP paras 7.4.2, 7.4.2a and 7.4.2b is replaced by a much shorter statement of the new basis of the figures in para 7.3.3</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (g) (g) An explanation of the “generous provision of land” is given in paras 7.3.4 and 7.3.5. The remainder of this recommendation is more concerned with explanation of the plan’s strategy and the operation of its policies, than with their justification, and is therefore dealt with in section 7.2 of the modified text. This additional expository material is considered under recommendations 7 and 8.</p>
---	--

<p>h. deleting all after the first sentence in RD para. 7.4.6 and substituting:</p> <p>“Reflecting the sequential approach advocated by PPG3, a number of sites could be brought forward, if required, as sustainable urban extensions which could take advantage of existing physical and social infrastructure within the existing urban area, and have good access to public transport services, jobs, schools, shopping and leisure facilities. Their limited size would also enable development to take place at fairly short notice. In the longer term it will be necessary to consider a larger extension. The opportunities available to the north-east edge of the City, combined with the significant environmental constraints elsewhere and the need to prevent coalescence of existing settlements, indicate that this is in principle a suitable area for such an extension.”</p> <p>i. deleting “for a Phase 3 should this prove necessary” from para. 7.4.7.</p> <p>7. to include the phasing trigger mechanism as described in LCC/001, Ax. 2, “Guidelines for Controlling Housing Land Release” as a subsection of Policy H3 subject to:</p> <p>a. description of the three “criteria” for undersupply as indicators, rather than criteria, upon which a considered judgement would be made at each Monitoring Point after examining all the information in the HLMS, including the necessary lead-in times for the phased sites;</p> <p>b. explanation of the mechanism in the above terms;</p> <p>c. replacement in criterion i). in the sections on undersupply of 20% by 10% and reduction of the period from 3 to 2 years;</p> <p>d. rewording of criterion i). in relation to oversupply to read:</p>	<p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (h) (h) The sense of this alteration, with minor wording changes to fit into the adjoining text, is included in para 7.3.6</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (i) (i) The essential point of this paragraph is now subsumed within paras 7.3.1 and 7.3.2.</p> <p>The whole of RDUDP section 7.4 has been re-written as section 7.3, both to incorporate the Inspector’s recommendations and to clarify the text. Much of the content is in any case superseded (the basis of the figures has changed, the summary table appears elsewhere in the text, references to phases are out of date). There is also scope for compression without loss of meaning. Although the text could theoretically be patched up without fundamental change, this would be at the cost of continuity and readability and is not a desirable option.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (j) The UDP housing land strategy and the role of the phasing trigger mechanisms in it are set out in paras 7.2.7 – 7.2.12 of the revised text. The Inspector conditionally endorses the mechanisms described in LCC/001, but adds a fifth mechanism to control the release of greenfield allocations in phases 2 and 3. The Council considers that this additional mechanism duplicates or supersedes three of the original mechanisms, and so retains only the Inspector’s mechanism, and a mechanism for dealing with severe over supply. The reasons for this decision are explained more fully in the covering report.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (k) Paras 7.2.10 and 7.2.12 explain that the measures are indicators of the probable need for action rather than criteria which irrevocably trigger the related action.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (l) As above, paras 7.2.10 and 7.2.12 cover this point.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (m) The undersupply measure is superseded by the Inspector’s new measure for controlling the release of greenfield allocations and is no longer required. However, this clause is incorporated in a modified version of the Inspector’s new mechanism.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (n) This measure is superseded by the Inspector’s new measure for controlling the release of</p>
---	---

	<p>“average completions during 3 years prior to the MP exceeding the average annual rate by 20%”;</p> <p>e. description of the two “criteria” for oversupply, as amended by d. above, as indicators rather than criteria upon which a considered judgement should be made at each Monitoring Point;</p> <p>8. to include a trigger mechanism to ensure that greenfield sites within Phase 2 are only released if the stock of available housing land, and anticipated brownfield windfall, are demonstrably inadequate to meet defined housing needs; together with the indicators to be used as a basis for a decision;</p> <p>9. a. to include definition of “Main and Smaller Urban Areas” as defined on Plan M/096 but including Otley and Wetherby as Smaller Urban Areas and to exclude Garforth, Boston Spa and Kippax.</p> <p>b. consequent amendment of Main Urban Area to read “Main and Smaller Urban Areas”, where the name occurs.</p>	<p>greenfield allocations and is no longer required.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (o) This wording is used to describe the surviving measures defined in paras 7.2.10 and 7.2.12.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (p) This trigger mechanism is set out in para 7.2.10 and takes the following form. “The main indicators of shortage will be if the average completion rate in the two years preceding the Monitor is over 10% below the H1 requirement and if the supply of land – defined as unused allocations from the last phase plus outstanding permissions for dwellings on sites for 5 or more dwellings - amounts to less than a two years’ supply at the H1 rate.” The indicators are a combination of the Inspector’s recommendation for the treatment of completions in the Council’s original under supply proposals (recommendation 7c) with the current supply component of his new mechanism. The Inspector did not propose a completions clause in his new mechanism, but the Council considers this necessary because otherwise it would theoretically be possible to build no dwellings but still avoid the need to release allocations, if the current supply was adequate. The Inspector had endorsed reference to completions in the superseded measures originally proposed. The measurement of supply is also limited to readily verifiable sources of land, that is outstanding allocations and planning permissions. Although windfall will almost certainly come forward in the future, estimating the amount is inherently speculative, and to include future windfall would reduce the transparency and objectivity of the release mechanism. It is also made clear that the mechanism will be used in phase 3 as well as phase 2 as clearly intended by the Inspector (see e.g. para 7.93 of his report) although not specifically said in his recommendation.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (q) This definition is included in the second bullet point of para 7.2.1.</p> <p>Proposed Modification 7/004 (r) This change is made where the name occurs.</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 7/006</p>	<p><u>PA 7/006</u> <u>AFFORDABLE HOUSING (TARGETS FOR STRATEGIC SITES)</u></p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para 7.145, I recommend that the last sentence of para. 7.6.19 of the AUDP be modified to refer to 25% of all new houses being affordable.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council agrees with the Inspectors overall conclusion that 50% affordable housing targets for the two Strategic Housing Sites in the Rural North of Leeds are unjustified but rejects the Inspector’s recommendation to replace the affordable housing target range of 15-25% for the whole district with a single target figure of 25%. The target percentage for the delivery of affordable housing for the whole of Leeds was not part of the City Council’s UDP Review proposals, and the evidence put forward was never intended to justify change to that overall target range of 15 – 25%. The City Council believes that a comprehensive assessment of housing need and a comprehensive review of affordable housing policy should be the basis for changing the overall UDP target.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification 7/006</u></p>

		<p>Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reverting to the original AUDP wording. Deleting the following from para 7.6.19, “For the strategic sites of East of Otley and Thorp Arch, indicative targets of 50% affordable housing are set. These are justified on the basis that housing need in the Rural North of Leeds exceeds potential supply by a large margin”. <p>The original and retained wording for para 7.6.19 is as follows:</p> <p>7.6.19 Despite the efforts of the Leeds Partnership Homes Scheme these recent trends suggest a growing problem. The scale of need for affordable housing can be expected to grow at a far greater rate than the increased need for housing generally throughout the District over the UDP period. Current levels provide a guide only of a minimum overall requirement for future provision. By expressing these figures as a proportion of overall housing need for the Plan period, a measure may be obtained of the "average" level of provision for affordable housing, District-wide, which should be sought from individual sites. Section 7.2 and 7.3 established the overall need for 28,500 dwellings in the period 1991 to 2006, of which 2,300 had already been built. A further 4,560 have planning permission (Policy H3A). This leaves 21,600 which will need to be built. As a reasonable target, if affordable housing is to be constructed by the end of the Plan period which at least matches the scale of the priority homeless categories indicated in Table 2, on average some 15 - 25 % of all new houses built should be "affordable".</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 7/007</p>	<p>PA 7/007 <u>AFFORDABLE HOUSING (SITE DEVELOPMENT THRESHOLDS)</u></p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para. 7.156 I recommend that the UDP be not modified in accordance with FD Alteration 7/007</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 7.156 to modify the First Alteration of the UDP Review and revert to the wording of the Adopted UDP.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification 7/007</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reverting to the original AUDP wording. Deleting from para 7.6.20 “except in the Rural North of Leeds (as defined on the Proposals Map) where affordable housing will not be sought on developments of less than 10 dwellings. This is justified on the basis that housing need in this area exceeds potential supply by a large margin, and that site availability, with the exception of the two strategic sites, is very limited” <p>The original and retained wording of para 7.6.20 will therefore read as follows:</p> <p>7.6.20 It is reasonable for consideration of the provision of affordable housing on all qualifying sites to relate to this "average" requirement as a starting point, or initial benchmark but the exact proportion of affordable housing to be provided on each site would be determined according to Policy H12. Affordable housing will not be sought on the smaller sites which fall below the general size thresholds of 25 dwellings or 1 ha. In rural areas of 3000 population or less affordable housing will be sought according to local assessment of housing need and land supply. Therefore:</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 7/008</p>	<p>PA 7/008 STUDENT HOUSING</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council rejects the Inspector’s recommendations in part. The City Council accepts all of the Inspectors recommendations with the exception of the re-wording of Policy H15A involving listing</p>

<p>7/008/RD</p>	<p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 7.203, I recommend that the UDP be modified by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. incorporating paras. 7.6.28 – 7.6.30 of the supporting text of RD Alteration 7/008 subject to the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. updating the second sentence of para. 7.6.28 to reflect the latest available information on past growth in student numbers and future projections; b. deleting the final two sentences of para. 7.6.28 and substituting the following: <p>“The fact that large numbers of properties in and around Headingley are let to students inevitably puts pressure on the housing stock available for other sectors of the population and reduces that suitable for families. This encourages the view that the population overall is out of balance and that action is needed to ensure a sustainable community.”</p> c. inserting the following at the end of para. 7.6.29: <p>“It is not suggested that all these problems are solely attributable to the presence of students, or that all students create such problems. Nor are the majority of them capable of being solved directly through planning powers. Nevertheless they are particularly associated with a high concentration of student occupancy, and planning has an important role in reducing and managing them through working to ensure that the community as a whole is well balanced and sustainable for the long term.”</p> 2. deleting paras. 7.6.31 – 7.6.31b of the supporting text and inserting the following: <p>“Area of Housing Mix</p> <p>Planning control over student housing is limited because a change from a family dwelling to one occupied by students living together as a household does not generally require planning permission. Accordingly it is only purpose-built student housing, extensions to existing properties occupied by students and changes of use that will require permission.</p> <p>Within these limitations the Council will use its development control powers to manage provision of additional student housing as far as possible so as to maintain a diverse housing stock that will cater for</p> 	<p>the areas of Leeds where student housing developments will be promoted. The Council thinks that the process of identifying and agreeing such areas with stakeholders will take too long, will hold up adoption of the Plan, and would be better achieved through preparation of the Local Development Framework's Area Action Plans. The Council believes that the second part of Policy H15 would be better as supporting text rather than upper case policy because it concerns a cross reference to Policy R1 & a commitment to drawing up a “Student Housing Strategy”, not a policy for dealing with planning applications.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification 7/008</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing the purpose of the area policy (Policy H15) to that of managing provision of student housing development to maintain a diverse housing stock that will cater for all sectors of the population, including families • Revising the wording of Policy H15 as recommended by the Inspector • Revising the wording of the supporting text as recommended by the Inspector to reflect the purpose of Policy H15 and to update figures illustrating student housing growth • Changing the wording of Policy H15A as recommended by the Inspector, with the exception of not listing areas of Leeds where student housing developments will be promoted • Changing the title of Plan M/071 to “Area of Housing Mix” and amending the boundary to include Kirkstall Hill, Beckett Park Campus, Lawnswood and Moor Grange <p><u>The modified plan will read as follows:</u> Student Housing</p> <p>7.6.28 Over the last decade there has been a city-wide increase in the private rented sector from 7 to 12% of total dwellings, but Headingley and adjoining areas have experienced a far greater increase than comparable inner areas of Leeds because of the growth in student numbers. The number of full time students in Leeds has risen from 22,000 in 1991 to 40,000 in 2005 and it is estimated that this will grow by another 5000 over the UDP Review period. This growth brings benefits to Leeds in terms of widening educational opportunity, injection of spending power into the local economy, enhancement of the City's academic status and contribution to the City's culture. However, the uneven distribution of the resulting student population poses a serious problem. Headingley has proved to be the most popular location for students because of proximity to Universities, location of existing halls of residence, shops, pubs and that it is perceived to be an attractive & safe area. The fact that large numbers of properties in and around Headingley are let to students inevitably puts pressure on the housing stock available for other sectors of the population and reduces that suitable for families. This encourages the view that the population overall is out of balance and that action is needed to ensure a sustainable community.</p> <p>7.6.29 Problems associated with concentrations of student housing include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • short term residency engenders a lack of community integration and creates problems of service delivery • dwelling to dwelling noise from neighbours,
-----------------	---	--

all sectors of the population including families. It will also encourage proposals for purpose-built student housing, specifically reserved and managed for that purpose, that will improve the total stock of student accommodation, relieve pressure on conventional housing and assist in regenerating areas in decline or at risk of decline. This approach will apply within an Area of Housing Mix covering Headingley, Hyde Park, Burley and Woodhouse where students form a significant part of the population, together with the adjoining areas of Moor Grange and Lawnswood where pressure is likely for further student housing.

The Council will also work with the universities and with providers of student accommodation to agree a student housing strategy for the Area which will aim to strike a balance between this and other forms of housing; to set out Headingley's role in terms of accommodating student housing and to progressively improve the student housing stock."

3. deleting Policy H15 and inserting the following:

WITHIN THE AREA OF HOUSING MIX PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR HOUSING INTENDED FOR OCCUPATION BY STUDENTS, OR FOR THE ALTERATION, EXTENSION OR REDEVELOPMENT OF ACCOMMODATION CURRENTLY SO OCCUPIED WHERE:

- i) THE STOCK OF HOUSING ACCOMMODATION, INCLUDING THAT AVAILABLE FOR FAMILY OCCUPATION, WOULD NOT BE UNACCEPTABLY REDUCED IN TERMS OF QUANTITY AND VARIETY;
- ii) THERE WOULD BE NO UNACCEPTABLE EFFECTS ON NEIGHBOURS' LIVING CONDITIONS INCLUDING THROUGH INCREASED ACTIVITY, OR NOISE AND DISTURBANCE, EITHER FROM THE PROPOSAL ITSELF OR COMBINED WITH EXISTING SIMILAR ACCOMMODATION;
- iii) THE SCALE AND CHARACTER OF THE PROPOSAL WOULD BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE SURROUNDING AREA;
- iv) SATISFACTORY PROVISION WOULD BE MADE FOR CAR PARKING; AND
- v) THE PROPOSAL WOULD IMPROVE THE QUALITY OR VARIETY OF THE STOCK OF STUDENT HOUSING.

- late night street noise and disturbance from revellers returning home
- unsightliness of preponderance of to-let boards
- house appearances neglected by unconscientious landlords
- garden planting replaced by inert surfaces giving an unattractive appearance to streetscenes
- dumping of house clearance material at the end of term
- pressure for greater provision of establishments catering for night time entertainment and consequent detrimental impact on residential amenity
- gradually self-reinforcing unpopularity of area for families wishing to bring up children and consequent surplus of local school places
- transient population reduces the ability to self-police and avert crime

It is not suggested that all these problems are solely attributable to the presence of students, or that all students create such problems. Nor are the majority of them capable of being solved directly through planning powers. Nevertheless they are particularly associated with a high concentration of student occupancy, and planning has an important role in reducing and managing them through working to ensure that the community as a whole is well balanced and sustainable for the long term.

7.6.30 There has long been concern about the over-concentration of students living in the wider Headingley area and recognition that the issue of population imbalance as well as the various problems it generates need to be tackled in a multi-disciplinary way and in partnership with other relevant bodies. A number of Council services have a part to play particularly Environmental Health, Housing, Street Cleansing, Licencing and Planning, but also the Universities and landlords. The objective has to be better planning and management of the growth of students coming to study in Leeds. This section deals with planning policy to control the growth of the student population in the wider Headingley area and measures to disperse students to other appropriate parts of the City. In essence, the overall objective will be to achieve a more mixed population which is inclusive and sustainable. In addition, there is a commitment to address the problems associated with the concentration of students in the area identified in paragraph 7.6.29 above. This commitment is reflected generally in the second part of Policy H15 which provides a starting point for area based work to develop detailed proposals and projects in co-operation with stakeholders.

Area of Housing Mix

7.6.31 Planning control over student housing is limited because a change from a family dwelling to one occupied by students living together as a household does not generally require planning permission. Accordingly it is only purpose-built student housing, extensions to existing properties occupied by students and changes of use that will require permission.

7.6.31a Within these limitations the Council will use its development control powers to manage provision of additional student housing as far as possible so as to maintain a diverse housing stock that will cater for all sectors of the population including families. It will

<p>THE AREA OF HOUSING MIX IS IDENTIFIED UNDER POLICY R1 AS AN AREA POLICY INITIATIVE WHERE THE COUNCIL WILL WORK WITH THE UNIVERSITIES, PROVIDERS OF STUDENT ACCOMMODATION AND THE LOCAL COMMUNITY TO DRAW UP A STUDENT HOUSING STRATEGY. SO FAR AS IS POSSIBLE IN PLANNING TERMS THAT STRATEGY WILL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MANAGE PROVISION OF NEW STUDENT ACCOMMODATION SO AS TO MAINTAIN A REASONABLE BALANCE WITH OTHER TYPES OF HOUSING • SEEK PROGRESSIVE IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDENT HOUSING STOCK • IDENTIFY OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROVISION OF PURPOSE-BUILT AND MANAGED STUDENT HOUSING THAT WOULD REDUCE PRESSURE ON THE REST OF THE HOUSING STOCK. <p>4. incorporating para. 7.6.31c of the RD supporting text;</p> <p>5. deleting Policy H15A and inserting:</p> <p>STUDENT HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS WILL BE PROMOTED IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS, WHERE THE COUNCIL WILL WORK WITH THE UNIVERSITIES AND WITH ACCOMMODATION PROVIDERS TO IDENTIFY AND BRING FORWARD FOR DEVELOPMENT SITES THAT WOULD SATISFY THE CRITERIA SET OUT BELOW:</p> <p><i>Council to insert locations following discussions with the universities and accommodation providers.</i></p> <p>AND IN OTHER LOCATIONS, WHERE PROPOSALS WOULD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) HAVE GOOD CONNECTIONS BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT TO THE UNIVERSITIES, EITHER EXISTING OR TO BE PROVIDED TO SERVE THE DEVELOPMENT; OR BE CLOSE ENOUGH TO ENABLE EASY TRAVEL ON FOOT OR BY CYCLE; ii) BE ATTRACTIVE TO STUDENTS TO LIVE AND OF SUFFICIENT SCALE TO FORM A VIABLE STUDENT COMMUNITY, EITHER IN THEMSELVES OR IN 	<p>also encourage proposals for purpose-built student housing, specifically reserved and managed for that purpose, that will improve the total stock of student accommodation, relieve pressure on conventional housing and assist in regenerating areas in decline or at risk of decline. This approach will apply within an Area of Housing Mix covering Headingley, Hyde Park, Burley and Woodhouse where students form a significant part of the population, together with the adjoining areas of Moor Grange and Lawnswood where pressure is likely for further student housing.</p> <p>7.6.31b The Council will also work with the universities and with providers of student accommodation to agree a student housing strategy for the Area which will aim to strike a balance between this and other forms of housing; to set out Headingley’s role in terms of accommodating student housing and to progressively improve the student housing stock.</p> <p>POLICY H15</p> <p>WITHIN THE AREA OF HOUSING MIX PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR HOUSING INTENDED FOR OCCUPATION BY STUDENTS, OR FOR THE ALTERATION, EXTENSION OR REDEVELOPMENT OF ACCOMMODATION CURRENTLY SO OCCUPIED WHERE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) THE STOCK OF HOUSING ACCOMMODATION, INCLUDING THAT AVAILABLE FOR FAMILY OCCUPATION, WOULD NOT BE UNACCEPTABLY REDUCED IN TERMS OF QUANTITY AND VARIETY; ii) THERE WOULD BE NO UNACCEPTABLE EFFECTS ON NEIGHBOURS’ LIVING CONDITIONS INCLUDING THROUGH INCREASED ACTIVITY, OR NOISE AND DISTURBANCE, EITHER FROM THE PROPOSAL ITSELF OR COMBINED WITH EXISTING SIMILAR ACCOMMODATION; iii) THE SCALE AND CHARACTER OF THE PROPOSAL WOULD BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE SURROUNDING AREA; iv) SATISFACTORY PROVISION WOULD BE MADE FOR CAR PARKING; AND v) THE PROPOSAL WOULD IMPROVE THE QUALITY OR VARIETY OF THE STOCK OF STUDENT HOUSING. <p>7.6.31c The area of housing mix is identified under policy R1 as an area policy initiative where the council will work with the universities, providers of student accommodation and the local community to draw up a student housing strategy. So far as is possible in planning terms that strategy will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • manage provision of new student accommodation so as to maintain a reasonable balance with other types of housing • seek progressive improvement of the student housing stock
---	---

	<p>ASSOCIATION WITH OTHER DEVELOPMENTS;</p> <p>iii) BE WELL INTEGRATED INTO THE SURROUNDING AREA IN TERMS OF SCALE, CHARACTER AND ASSOCIATED SERVICES AND FACILITIES;</p> <p>iv) CONTRIBUTE DIRECTLY TO THE REGENERATION OF THE SURROUNDING AREA, PREFERABLY AS PART OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROPOSALS; AND</p> <p>v) NOT UNACCEPTABLY AFFECT THE QUALITY, QUANTITY OR VARIETY OF THE LOCAL HOUSING STOCK.</p> <p>6. incorporating Plan M/071, amended to include Kirkstall Hill, Beckett Park Campus, Lawnswood and Moor Grange [as shown in S/21770 etc.] and retitled "Area of Housing Mix".</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify opportunities for provision of purpose-built and managed student housing that would reduce pressure on the rest of the housing stock. <p>7.6.31d Outside of the Area of Housing Mix, students make up a small fraction of the population. This is beginning to change in the City Centre where a number of student accommodation schemes are materialising. Significant potential exists for further student housing provision in the City Centre and in locations elsewhere. To be successful, such provision will need to be well served by public transport connections to the Universities, have the potential to appeal to students and be capable of being assimilated into the existing neighbourhood without nuisance. The City Council will encourage and support pioneer developments in such locations to help establish a critical mass of student presence and, ultimately, generate alternative popular locations for students to live, other than the wider Headingley area. In order to boost the attractiveness of developments in new locations and counter negative perceptions of insecurity, there will be a need for good design, and measures such as good lighting, CCTV, secure parking, good visibility, and habitable room windows overlooking spaces to provide natural surveillance. Consideration should extend beyond the boundaries of the site to ensure that the development integrates into the neighbourhood and enhances security for all.</p> <p>Policy H15A</p> <p>THE COUNCIL WILL WORK WITH THE UNIVERSITIES AND WITH ACCOMMODATION PROVIDERS TO PROMOTE STUDENT HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS IN OTHER AREAS BY IDENTIFYING AND BRINGING FORWARD FOR DEVELOPMENT SITES THAT WOULD SATISFY THE CRITERIA SET OUT BELOW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) HAVE GOOD CONNECTIONS BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT TO THE UNIVERSITIES, EITHER EXISTING OR TO BE PROVIDED TO SERVE THE DEVELOPMENT; OR BE CLOSE ENOUGH TO ENABLE EASY TRAVEL ON FOOT OR BY CYCLE; ii) BE ATTRACTIVE TO STUDENTS TO LIVE AND OF SUFFICIENT SCALE TO FORM A VIABLE STUDENT COMMUNITY, EITHER IN THEMSELVES OR IN ASSOCIATION WITH OTHER DEVELOPMENTS; iii) BE WELL INTEGRATED INTO THE SURROUNDING AREA IN TERMS OF SCALE, CHARACTER AND ASSOCIATED SERVICES AND FACILITIES; iv) CONTRIBUTE DIRECTLY TO THE REGENERATION OF THE SURROUNDING AREA, PREFERABLY AS PART OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROPOSALS; AND v) NOT UNACCEPTABLY AFFECT THE QUALITY, QUANTITY OR VARIETY OF THE LOCAL HOUSING STOCK.
--	---	--

<p>Prop. Alt. 7/009</p>	<p>PA 7/009 POLICIES H18 AND H19</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para. 7.206 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration 7/009</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 7.206 not to modify the First Alteration of the UDP Review.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification 7/009</u> None</p>

	Para. 7.203 (5)	<p>providers of student accommodation and the local community to draw up a Student Housing Strategy and to explain what the strategy will aim to do. This is still the Council's intent but it is not considered appropriate to include it within the Plan as part of the upper case policy. It is therefore proposed to change this to lower case supporting text.</p> <p>Reject that part of the Inspector's recommendation which invites the Council to list locations where student housing would be promoted. However, the Council accepts the criteria recommended by the Inspector to assist in the selection of suitable locations for student housing. The effect of this partial rejection is revised wording for Policy H15A which will form a Proposed Modification.</p>
Chapter 15 15/015	Para. 15.100	<p>The Council rejects the Inspector's recommendations in part – Recommendation 1 which relates to a re-assessment of the site to confine the bulk of built development to the north of the A64, and south of Leeds-Barwick Road; and the inclusion of outline phasing proposals in the Plan. The council agree that the area between the A64 and Leeds – Barwick Road is a sensitive area in terms of the need to minimise impact on the Green belt and maintain a significant separation between communities. However, it is considered premature to define the specific location and nature of development at this time. The Inspector's phasing proposals, which the Council has accepted, means that development here is many years away. The Council considers that these matters should be considered within a development framework for the site. The process of identifying which areas may be developed, the purpose for which they should be developed and their potential phasing is likely to take some time, will hold up adoption of the Plan and would be better achieved through detailed consideration as part of the Local Development Framework.</p>
Chapt. 22 22/004	Para. 22.4	<p>The Council reject the recommendation that Beeston Hill/Holbeck NRA be included amongst those locations to be considered for inclusion in Policy H15A., i.e. the recommended list of sites where student housing would be acceptable. This is linked to the rejection of the recommendation in para. 7.203(5) as described above.</p>

Report of the Director of City Services

North West Inner Area Committee

Date: 30th March 2006

Subject: Street Lighting Advertising

Electoral Wards Affected:

**Headingley
Hyde Park & Woodhouse
Kirkstall
Weetwood**

Specific Implications For:

Ethnic minorities
Women
Disabled people
Narrowing the Gap

Council
Function

Delegated Executive
Function available
for Call In

Delegated Executive
Function not available for
Call In Details set out in the
report

Executive Summary

During the October and December 2005 Area Committee cycle, Members received a report on the Street lighting PFI and the proposals to generate third party income through street lighting advertising. A number of issues were raised and this report is intended to address the points.

1.0 Purpose Of This Report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to respond to issues raised by Area Committees on the Street lighting PFI and Street Lighting Advertising Trial.

2.0 Background Information

2.1 Negotiations are currently ongoing with the Council's preferred bidder to replace 80,000 street lights across Leeds over the next five years, which is due to start at the end of June 2006. This work will be carried out under a Private Finance Initiative agreement (PFI) which means that the Council pays back the cost of the scheme to the private company involved over a 25-year period.

2.2 Part of the Council's plans to replace old, worn out street lights involves generating income to reduce the cost to council-tax payers by advertising on the street lights themselves. Advertising on street lights across Leeds could generate as much as £1 million per year equivalent to a 0.5% saving on annual Council Tax.

- 2.3 In October this year, the council agreed to run a pilot scheme to see how effective street light advertising is and gauge the views of Leeds' residents. The pilot also involves finding out if local businesses are interested in advertising on street lights and if the signs will have any effect on issues like road safety, planning and future developments.
- 2.4 The city-wide pilot is proposed to involve 70 different sites across Leeds in 10 wards where it is deemed that advertising would be viable.

3.0 Main Issues

3.1 Street lighting PFI

Consultation with Area Committees on Roll-out Programme

It is proposed to consult with Area Committees on the proposed plan for the implementation of the Street lighting PFI and how this will affect each ward. The preferred bidder is currently developing these proposals which it is anticipated will be available for discussion in April 2006.

Erection of Hanging Baskets/Christmas Lightings, etc.

Where hanging baskets are currently attached the new columns will be strong enough to continue to hold (2) hanging baskets. The new column design for other columns will be strong enough to hold "floral displays" (wrap around attachments) as opposed to hanging baskets. Similarly with festive lights the arrangements in the contract will reflect current arrangements.

Connection of New Lighting Columns

One of the major risks is that the jointers (who connect the lights to the supply) will not keep pace with the column installation work. To mitigate against this risk the preferred bidder is already in discussion with YEDL. The preferred bidder will do all the trench excavation and reinstatement work. But the actual connection of the lighting to the supply is non-contestable work, which means that it can only be carried out by YEDL. To promote closer working, the YEDL jointers will share an office with the preferred bidder and will work exclusively on the Leeds contract. Since the preferred bidder will only be paid when the replacement lighting is fully working, this incentivises them to ensure that this relationship works well. YEDL are fully aware of the size of the task and have adequate time to resource up to meet the demands of the Leeds PFI. A similar arrangement between the Wakefield PFI and YEDL appears to be working smoothly.

Output Specification and Payment Mechanism

The output specification has been built upon guidance provided in standard documentation from the 4P's, HM Treasury and documentation developed by other local authorities in the Street Lighting sector

The payment mechanism is based on the payment of the Unitary Charge for the delivery by the Contractor of the City Council's Output Specification for the Project. The objectives in developing the Payment Mechanism have been to:

- incentivise the Contractor to deliver to required service standards, timetables and objectives

- be bankable, whilst at the same time only requiring the City Council to pay for the level of performance actually delivered
- reflect sound commercial principles that the performance should be objective, clear, simple, cost effective and capable of measurement.

There are a number of performance standards which fall into the following categories:

- Design, renewal or refurbishment of apparatus
- Planned Maintenance, inspection and testing
- Operational response
- Customer interface and contract management
- Best Value
- Working practices; and
- Monitoring and reporting

The preferred bidder will be largely self monitoring and will submit monthly reports on performance against all the standards. The client team retained by the Council will have full access to the asset monitoring system where all fault identification and repairs are entered and will be able verify the information as both a desk top exercise and through spot checks on site.

Heritage Lighting

There are a number of conservation areas across the city which currently have lighting in keeping with the area. Where these exist and the lighting is maintained by the Highways Services this will be replaced, if necessary, by the PFI provider with conservation style lighting columns. There is, however, an assumed level of enhanced apparatus within the contract (approx 5,000 columns) - if replacement of heritage columns falls below this then there is potential for the balance to be used to provide additional heritage lighting.

Gas lighting

There are approximately 30 sites across the city where gas lighting columns exists. Some of these are housed in historic columns which are listed structures. However, the majority are serviced by gas mains which do not meet current regulations and bringing them up to standard will incur significant costs as new gas supplies will need to be fitted where possible.

Currently work is ongoing with the Council's Conservation Officer to agree the refurbishment of a small number of locations which will then be included in the PFI for ongoing maintenance.

3.2 Street Lighting Advertising

The Street lighting advertising trial was established to determine the following issues:

- Public reaction to the advertising, and any adverse health and safety issues
- Views of local communities and members to the merits of the project
- Views of local businesses as to the value of the advertising
- Likely impact on the Supplementary Planning Document

- Potential scope of the project

The trial is not due to be completed until December 2006 and therefore work is still ongoing on many of the issues raised by Elected Members.

Public Consultation

An article was placed in the 'About Leeds' newspaper which is circulated to all households within the city requesting views on the proposals for street lighting advertising. The citizen's panel is also being used to obtain public views. Additionally, the local media have published a number of articles calling for views.

Detailed analysis of these responses is currently being carried out.

Planning Process

Requests were made to have prior knowledge of the proposed sites which would be submitted for planning permission. It proposed that Elected Members receive written notification prior to any planning application being submitted for planning approval.

Veto on Adverts

The type of advertisements placed is regulated by the Advertising Standards Council. For the purpose of the trial the contractor has been given criteria, in line with draft guidance which states that certain types of locations are generally unsuitable for advertising. These include primarily residential roads, "green" radial routes into the city and green corridors, open countryside, green belt and rural villages.

More detailed work will take place as the trial develops on the type of advertising acceptable in Leeds.

Business Sector Consultation

Consultation is currently being carried out with businesses in the city to gauge their views on the proposals for street lighting advertising.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

The Guidance document is currently being drafted with a view to consultation on the contents in the Spring 2006.

4.0 Implications For Council Policy And Governance

- 4.1 Street lighting advertising is currently being trialed to inform a report to Executive Board in January 2007 where a decision will be made on future Council Policy on this issue.

5.0 Legal And Resource Implications

- 5.1 Negotiations are still taking place with the preferred bidder and therefore certain information cannot be disclosed without compromising these negotiations.

6.0 Recommendations

- 6.1 Members of the Area Committee are requested to note the content of this report



Report of the Chief Streetscene Services Officer

Inner North West Area Committee

Date: 30th March 2006

Subject: What Should Leeds Do With Its Waste? – Consultation on the Integrated Waste Strategy for Leeds 2005-2035

Electoral wards affected:

All

Specific implications for:

- Ethnic minorities
- Women
- Disabled people
- Narrowing the gap

Council function

Delegated executive function available for call in

Delegated executive function not available for Call In. Details set out in the report

Executive Summary

In December 2005, Executive Board approved proposals for public consultation on the draft Integrated Waste Strategy for Leeds. The strategy sets out Leeds City Council's vision of a zero waste city, where we reduce, re-use, recycle and recover value from all waste, and where waste becomes a resource.

The European Union and our government are demanding that local authorities reduce the amount of waste that they bury in landfill sites. It is estimated that the Council could face fines of around £217 million by 2020 alone if we don't take action now. Leeds City Council's Integrated Waste Strategy for Leeds 2005-2035 sets out long term plans for dealing with our city's waste.

Executive Board agreed that there should be public consultation on major service improvements that would enable the Council to meet statutory recycling and landfill diversion targets, and manage the financial impact of penalties resulting from failure to achieve these targets.

The report also highlights the work undertaken to evaluate options for a waste treatment solution for the City, and recommended that we develop a Sustainable Energy and Resource Park which would include a Materials Recycling Facility, composting facilities, an Energy from Waste facility to process waste that we can't recycle, an education centre and business units for new businesses that make products from recycled materials.

Executive Board also agreed to support the submission of an Expression of Interest to DEFRA for Private Finance Initiative (PFI) credits of £110m to fund the development of the Sustainable Energy and Resource Park facilities.

1.0 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The Integrated Waste Strategy for Leeds was first adopted by Leeds City Council in 2003, and has now undergone a scheduled review. The revised strategy was approved for public consultation by Executive Board in December 2005, and the Council is now in a period of formal consultation that is scheduled to run until the end of May 2006. The purpose of this report is to provide Area Committees, as key stakeholder groups, with an overview of the revised Waste Strategy and the report considered by Executive Board in December, and to seek feedback on the proposals set out within the Strategy.

2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

European Union and UK Government legislation and targets now mean that local authorities must develop plans for the diversion of significant proportions of municipal waste from landfill. Landfill is a major contributor to harmful greenhouse gases, and failure to meet these targets may result in massive financial penalties. Leeds City Council landfilled 80% of the 340,000 tonnes of household waste collected in 2004/5, and is typical of many local authorities in terms of how it disposes of the majority of its waste. However, it is estimated that failure to take action to address landfill diversion targets could result in cumulative fines to the Authority of £217m by 2020 alone.

3.0 MAIN ISSUES

3.1 Waste Strategy Vision

The Integrated Waste Strategy for Leeds sets out Leeds City Council's strategic vision and key objectives for waste management over the next thirty years. We'd like Leeds to be a *zero waste* city. By reducing, re-using, recycling and recovering value from all our waste, we can treat it as a resource. *Zero waste* cannot be achieved by local government alone, as it involves all sectors of the supply chain from design, production, manufacturing, packaging, through to retail and final consumption. However, Leeds City Council can take a lead by raising awareness in the local community and encouraging community, business and householder participation.

3.2 Principles of the Strategy

The key principles on which the Waste Strategy is based are as follows:

- *Sustainability* - to develop and promote sustainable waste management;
- *Partnership* - to work in partnership with communities, businesses and other stakeholders to deliver sustainable waste management;
- *Realistic and Responsive* - to ensure that the Strategy is realistic and responsive to future changes.

3.3 Reducing Our Waste

As stated above, last year the Council collected around 340,000 tonnes of household waste, and this is currently predicted to increase. If we stop making so much waste we can save resources and energy, reduce pollution, provide cheaper goods and reduce demand for waste disposal. Some of the ways in which we plan to reduce the City's waste are as follows:

- Public education and awareness campaigns in Leeds;
- Lobbying the Government to tighten legislation on excessive packaging, etc.;
- Working together with other sectors (i.e. private, voluntary, community) to change waste habits and develop waste minimisation initiatives;
- Considering incentive schemes.

3.4 Re-using Our Waste

As well as using a product again or finding a new use for it, things can be 're-used' by borrowing, sharing, hiring, repairing or renting. Re-using is different from recycling because products are not broken down into their raw materials and reprocessed. Re-use reduces the use of raw materials, energy and transport.

3.5 Recycling Our Waste

3.5.1 Recycling remains a key priority for Leeds City Council, and the Authority and the people of Leeds received national recognition for the household waste recycling rate of 19.6% achieved in 2004/5. However, by 2010 Leeds must be recycling 30% of its waste if it is to meet national targets. Although we have seen major increases in recycling levels over the last five years, we need to do more to educate the public about the importance of recycling, and to enhance the household recycling services that we currently provide.

3.5.2 We are looking at options for changing the frequency of collections and the range of recyclable materials that we collect from households, to keep the amount of waste that we need to treat or bury to a minimum. One initiative currently under consideration is to empty your green bin more often and your black bin less often, in order to minimise waste and encourage recycling. The Council is currently gathering views from the public on this and a range of other possible service changes. Some of the main service proposals on which we are consulting the public are set out below:

- Kerbside collections of garden waste;
- Reduced frequency of black bin collections and increased frequency for green bins;
- Increased range of materials collected in green bins;
- Enhanced participation in recycling through increased education.

3.6 Recovering Value from Our Waste

3.6.1 Even after we've taken all of these steps, there will still be some waste that we can't recycle, but can't be landfilled if we are to meet our environmental targets. Following a detailed evaluation of the technical options by a wide range of stakeholders, Energy from Waste is being proposed as a method for dealing with the waste that we can't recycle. The Energy from Waste process involves burning the waste that we can't recycle under tightly controlled conditions to generate electricity. The energy generated can also be used to supply heat and power to local businesses and housing. These facilities have high-tech, multi-million pound systems for cleaning emissions and most of what's left over at the end of the process can be recycled.

3.6.2 Our vision is of a Sustainable Energy and Resource Park that brings together a range of state-of-the-art facilities for recycling, composting, energy recovery, education and business development in a single location. We see this as an opportunity, not simply to ensure that we meet our waste targets, but also to

develop a feature of significant educational and environmental importance for both the City and the region. We are currently exploring the opportunities for realising this vision.

- 3.6.3 The Council is currently in the process of carrying out a comprehensive, citywide site selection exercise to assess the most suitable potential location(s) for the proposed waste facilities. Any proposals for sites will be subject to strict planning and environmental controls, and there will also be extensive consultation with local communities at key stages during the process.

3.7 Working Together and Ensuring Public Participation

We need your support to make this Strategy work. We will help people manage their waste through publicity, support for waste prevention, recycling initiatives, education for children and young people, providing feedback on our progress and through public consultation. We'll do everything we can to get people involved, but there will inevitably be a minority who undermine the efforts of everyone else, and we are looking at ways of enforcing some of the vital steps that need to be taken.

3.8 Dealing with Commercial and Industrial Waste

Far more waste is produced by the commercial and industrial sectors each year than by households. Although the Council does not have any direct control over these sectors, we do have a key role in influencing how waste from shops, supermarkets, restaurants, other businesses and local industry is managed. We will be working with the Government and with representatives from business and industry to develop ways in which their waste can be managed so as to protect the environment.

3.9 Key Targets

- 3.9.1 Reducing the high growth in waste provides a primary focus for the Waste Strategy for Leeds and a range of policies and initiatives to achieve this aim are set out in the Strategy. Our aim is **to reduce annual growth in municipal waste in Leeds to 0.5% per household by 2016.**
- 3.9.2 Recycling remains a key priority for Leeds City Council. We will need to get even better at recycling if the statutory recycling targets of 30% by 2010 and 33% by 2015 are to be met. Our aim is **to achieve a recycling rate of 40% by 2020.**
- 3.9.3 Leeds City Council buried over 80% of the 340,000 tonnes of household waste that it collected in 2004/5 in landfill sites. We have been looking at new alternatives for moving away from this form of disposal towards treatment methods that recover value from our waste (i.e. through recycling or energy recovery). Our aim is **to achieve the recovery of value from 90% of our waste by 2020.**

4.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNCIL POLICY AND GOVERNANCE

It is anticipated that a revised version of the Integrated Waste Strategy for Leeds, incorporating the feedback from the current, formal consultation, will be considered by the Council's Executive Board in July 2006. Once approved, the Strategy will be formally adopted.

5.0 LEGAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Whilst failure to take action to address landfill diversion targets, and the resulting financial penalties, would undoubtedly be the most expensive option for the City, the development of new facilities for dealing with waste will also require significant funding. Leeds City Council is currently assessing the costs of the options available to the City, and deciding upon the best means of securing the necessary funding. At its December 2005 meeting, the Council's Executive Board gave approval for the submission of a formal expression of interest to DEFRA for £110m of Private Finance Initiative (PFI) credits. Officers are currently working on this submission.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 The Integrated Waste Strategy for Leeds has been developed in discussion with a wide range of stakeholders, and was approved by the Council's Executive Board in December 2005 for public consultation. We are currently carrying out an extensive programme of public consultation on the draft Strategy, and this will continue until the end of April 2006. This includes providing information to all Community Forums, the majority of which will be attended by Council officers.
- 6.2 Attached as an appendix to this report is a copy of the community leaflet that is being circulated to residents and stakeholder groups throughout the City to ensure as much feedback and as many views as possible on what Leeds should do with its waste. This includes some key questions on which we have been seeking feedback.
- 6.3 A full copy of the Integrated Waste Strategy for Leeds can be found at www.leeds.gov.uk/leedswaste or by visiting local one-stop centres or libraries. Comments on the Integrated Waste Strategy for Leeds can be e-mailed to cs.communication.city.services@leeds.gov.uk, or sent to:

*Freepost RLXJ-ZYHY-GRSG
Waste Strategy Consultation
City Services (Performance Management Section)
Knowsthorpe Gate
Leeds, LS9 0NP*

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Area Committee members are requested to note the contents of the report and the draft Integrated Waste Strategy for Leeds. The discussion of this report represents an important opportunity for individual Area Committees to influence the provision of recycling and waste management services in their area. Area Committee members are requested to provide formal feedback on the main proposals within the Strategy, in particular in relation to the following proposals:

- a) Main targets in the draft Integrated Waste Strategy for Leeds (see 3.9);
- b) Kerbside collections of garden waste (see 3.5);
- c) Reduced frequency of black bin collections if green bins collected more regularly (see 3.5);
- d) Development of an Energy from Waste facility to deal with waste that can't be recycled (see 3.6).



Report of the Director of Legal and Democratic Services

North West (Inner) Area Committee

Date: 30th March 2006

Subject: Dates, Times and Venues of Area Committee Meetings 2006/07

Electoral Wards Affected:

Specific Implications For:

Ethnic minorities

Women

Disabled people

Narrowing the Gap

Council
Function

Delegated Executive
Function available
for Call In

Delegated Executive
Function not available for
Call In Details set out in the
report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the report is to request Members to give consideration to agreeing the dates, times and venues of their meetings for the 2006/07 municipal year which commences in May 2006.

1.0 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Area Committee Procedure Rules stipulate that there shall be at least six ordinary meetings of each Area Committee in each municipal year (May to April).
- 1.2 The Procedure Rules also state that each Committee will agree its schedule of meetings for the year at its first meeting in the municipal year. If this was strictly adhered to, unfortunately it would mean that none of the dates and times would be agreed early enough to appear in the Council's official diary.

2.0 OPTIONS

2.1 The options are:-

- To approve the list of dates and times provisionally agreed with the NW Area Manager based on the existing pattern;
- To consider other alternative dates;
- To continue to meet at 7.00 pm, or to consider alternative times;
- To continue to alternate suitable venues between the four wards of Headingley; Hyde Park and Woodhouse; Kirkstall and Weetwood

3.0 MEETING DATES

- 3.1 The following *provisional* dates have been agreed in consultation with the NW Area Manager. They follow the same pattern as last year, i.e. Thursday's in June, September, October, December, February and March:-

29th June 2006, 21st September 2006, 26th October 2006, 7th December 2006, 8th February 2007 and 29th March 2007.

- 3.2 A similar pattern of meetings is being suggested in respect of the other 9 Area Committees, so that for co-ordination purposes, all Committees are meeting in the same basic cycle and months. Whilst Members have discretion as to which actual dates they wish to meet, they are requested to take into consideration that any proposed substantial change to the cycle e.g. changing months rather than dates within the suggested months, will cause disruption and lead to co-ordination problems between the Area Committees.

4.0 MEETING DAYS AND TIMES

- 4.1 Currently the Committee meets on Thursday's at 7.00 pm, and the above suggested dates reflect this pattern.
- 4.2 Meeting on set days and times has the advantage of certainty and regularity, which assists people to plan their schedules. The downside might be that it could serve to exclude certain people, for instance, who have other regular commitments on that particular day or who might prefer either a morning meeting or a meeting later in the evening after normal work hours.
- 4.3 For these reasons, some Area Committees have chosen to vary their meeting days and times, alternating between different weekdays and holding daytime and evening meetings alternately. Others, however, have chosen a regular pattern similar to this Committee's existing arrangements – it really is a matter for Members to decide.

5.0 MEETING VENUES

- 5.1 Currently, the Committee alternates venues between the four wards which has proved to be a successful arrangement.
- 5.2 If the Committee were minded to request the officers to explore possible alternative venues, then the considerations Members and officers would have to take into account are matters such as cost, accessibility – particularly for people with disabilities – and the facilities available at the venue, e.g. IT facilities for presentations etc.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 Members are requested to consider the options and to decide their meeting dates, times and venues for 2006/07 in order that they may be included in the Council's official diary for 2006/07.