

Public Document Pack

EXECUTIVE BOARD

14TH FEBRUARY 2014

**LATE ITEM OF BUSINESS: AGENDA ITEM 13: 'LEEDS CORE STRATEGY:
INSPECTOR'S MAIN MODIFICATIONS'**

This page is intentionally left blank

To: Members of the Executive Board

Democratic Services

Civic Hall
Leeds LS1 1UR

Contact: Gerard Watson
Tel: (0113) 3952194
Fax: (0113) 3951599
Email: gerard.watson@leeds.gov.uk
Our Ref: A61/GWHG
Your Ref:

10th February 2014

Dear Councillor

EXECUTIVE BOARD – FRIDAY, 14TH FEBRUARY 2014 – LATE REPORT FOR BOARD MEMBERS’ CONSIDERATION

With the agreement of the Chair, please find enclosed a late item of business entitled, ‘Leeds Core Strategy: Inspector’s Main Modifications’ to be considered as agenda item 13 at the meeting of the Executive Board on Friday, 14th February 2014.

I should be grateful if you could attach this document to your agenda papers for the meeting.

Yours sincerely

Gerard Watson
Senior Governance Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

Report of Director of City Development

Report to Executive Board

Date: 14th February 2014

Subject: Leeds Core Strategy – Inspector`s Main Modifications

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): District-wide	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

1. The Council's Publication Draft Core Strategy was agreed by Executive Board on 10th February 2012, submitted for public examination in April 2013, with Hearing sessions taking place in July/October 2013. The Core Strategy has been specifically identified within the Best Council Plan as a key action; delivering on the best council objective to promote sustainable and inclusive economic growth. The Core Strategy therefore provides an overall framework for the scale and location of housing and economic growth until 2028.
2. Following the October Hearings, the Inspector has now issued a schedule of 'Main Modifications' to the plan, which he considers necessary in order to make the plan sound. These will need to be advertised for a 6 week period of consultation, subject to Executive Board's Consideration.
3. The purpose of this interim report is to inform Executive Board of the overall content of the Modifications and to highlight the key issues and next steps. A further report will be prepared for the March Executive Board, setting out the implications for the Council and seeking formal approval to publish the modifications for consultation.

Recommendations

4. Executive Board is requested to note the contents of this report.

1. Purpose of this report

- 1.1 To update members on progress on the Core Strategy, in particular recent correspondence from the Core Strategy Inspector and to consider the next steps.

2 Background information

- 2.1 The Core Strategy is one of the key policy documents of the Council in giving spatial expression to many of the “Best Council” ambitions. It seeks to establish the scale of new housing that we should plan for and to guide its location. In doing so, the plan is concerned to protect the separate character and identity of the many and varied communities across the district and to ensure that we deliver the right mix and quality of development supported by appropriate facilities. The Core Strategy is designed to ensure that new development reflects a range of Council objectives including the need for more jobs, and the “Child Friendly” and health agendas.
- 2.2 The scale of growth envisaged in the Core Strategy is ambitious and unprecedented. In this respect it supports the role of Leeds at the heart of the Leeds City Region, including reflecting the importance of Leeds City Centre. The approach is entirely consistent with the City Region ambitions set out in the emerging Strategic Economic Plan.
- 2.3 The Council published its draft (Publication) plan in February 2012. Following consideration of representations received on the draft, pre-submission changes were published in December 2012 and the plan was then submitted to the Secretary of State in April 2013, for independent examination. An inspector, Mr Anthony Thickett was appointed to undertake the examination of the plan. This commenced with a hearing in July to consider whether the Council had fulfilled the duty-to-co-operate. The Inspector confirmed that he was satisfied that the Council had met the legal requirements and the plan could therefore proceed to examination to test its soundness. The examination Hearings subsequently took place in October 2013.

3 Main Issues

- 3.1 As promised the Core Strategy inspector has written to the Council (Appendix 1) to clarify outstanding issues. The key points are:
- that he will deal with the outstanding issues of affordable housing and Gypsy and Traveller policy at further hearing sessions in May;
 - the Council therefore needs to advertise its policies to enable consultation to take place in advance of the hearings. (the affordable policy has already been approved by Exec Board and the revised position on Gypsy & Travellers will go in March); and
 - he has provided a schedule of Main Modifications (Appendix 1) that address changes arising from the debate to date which he considers necessary to make the plan sound. The Council is expected to advertise the Main Modifications (for a 6 week period) to allow representations to be made.

- 3.2 The inspector has now issued a revised schedule of Main Modifications (following the clarification of a number of points), which has been appended to this report for information (and has also been put on the Council's web site at the request of the Inspector). These Main Modifications have been made by the inspector, following his consideration of the evidence and arguments before him and he considers necessary in order to make the plan "sound". It should be noted that the issue of the 'soundness' of the plan is a matter solely for the inspector (subject to challenge only on grounds such as irrationality).
- 3.3 There are many aspects of the inspector's correspondence that are welcome and very positive in that he leaves many of the key components of the plan unchanged. He accepts:
- The overall Spatial Vision and Objectives (including urban regeneration, the promotion of a diverse and enterprising economy and the commitment to 'place making');
 - the 70,000 net dwelling target;
 - the plan period (2012 – 2028);
 - the housing distribution figures for each Housing Market Characteristic Area (HMCA), including the numbers in the City Centre;
 - the concentration of new development around the settlement hierarchy;
 - the 'centres' based approach to retail development;
 - the 'windfall allowance' of 500 dwellings p.a. on small and unidentified sites;
 - the previously developed land (PDL)/greenfield split, including a 65% PDL /35% greenfield split for the first 5 years;
 - the concept of phasing allocations; and .
- 3.4 Acceptance of these broad aspects of the plan means that the Council can continue to press ahead with the Site Allocations plan, for publication later in the year.
- 3.5 However, there is one change that the inspector requires that is of potential significance to the Council. This is that he does not accept a 'stepping-up' of the housing requirement (set out within Spatial Policy 6 – The Housing Requirement and the Allocation of Housing Land). The Core Strategy proposed a requirement of 3,660 dwellings p.a. for 2012/13-2016/17 and 4,700 p.a. from 2017/18. The inspector's change means that the Council now has a single average rate throughout the plan period of 4,375 p.a. In relation to this Modification, the Council is currently assessing the implications and has sought urgent legal advice.

4. Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1.1 The Core Strategy is at an advanced stage and has therefore been subject to several phases of consultation and engagement since 2006. This includes early engagement work in 2006, 'Issues & Alternative Options' consultation 2007, 'Preferred Approach' Consultation 2009, Publication Draft Consultation in 2012, 'Pre Submission' Consultation in 2013 and public examination (following submission in April 2013). These stages of consultation have been undertaken consistent with the

Local Development Framework Regulations and the statutory requirements under the Duty to Cooperate.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

- 4.2.1 As outlined in previous reports to Executive Board on the Core Strategy, due regard has been given to Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration issues in the formulation of the Core Strategy. This has included meeting the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive, which has meant that the Core Strategy has been subject to the preparation of a Sustainability Appraisal (and an Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal based upon a review of the pre-submission changes). The purpose of this Appraisal is to assess (and where appropriate strengthen) the document's policies, in relation to a series of social, environmental and economic objectives. As part of this process, issues of Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration, are embedded as part of the Appraisal's objectives. In complementing the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal, a Health Impact Assessment exercise, has also been undertaken in the preparation of the emerging document, the conclusions of which have also been embedded within the document.
- 4.2.2 Given this approach, considerations of equality of opportunity and good relations have been integrated into the formulation of the Core Strategy and an assessment of the impact of the policies on the advancement of equality and good relations has been carried out. This is evidenced in the completion of a comprehensive Equality Impact Assessment Screening document (previously reported to Executive Board November 2012), prior to submission in April 2013.

4.3 Council policies and City Priorities

- 4.3.1 As highlighted in this report, the Core Strategy, plays a key strategic role in taking forward the spatial and land use elements of the Vision for Leeds and the aspiration to the 'the best city in the UK'. Related to this overarching approach and in addressing a range of social, environmental and economic objectives, where relevant the Core Strategy also seeks to support and advance the implementation of a range of other key City Council and wider partnership documents. These include the Best Council Plan (2013-17) and Leeds Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (2013-2015).
- 4.3.2 In reflecting the requirements of national legislation, prior to submission (and as part of the City Council's Hearing Statements), a number of changes to the Core Strategy text were proposed to reflect the 'duty to cooperate' (Localism Act 2011) and the duty of local authorities to improve public health (Health & Social Care Act 2012). The inclusion of reference to these duties, not only clarifies and strengthens the wording of the Core Strategy text, as part of the overall strategic approach but also helps to support City Council commitments as part of the Leeds City Region / Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and priorities associated with the Leeds Health and Well Being Strategy.

4.4 Resources and value for money

- 4.4.1 The preparation of statutory Development Plan Documents is an essential but a very resource intensive process. This is due to the time and cost of document preparation (relating to public consultation and engagement), the preparation and monitoring of an extensive evidence base, legal advice and Independent Examination. These challenges are compounded currently by the financial constraints upon the public sector and resourcing levels, concurrent with new technical and planning policy pressures arising from new legislation (including the Community Infrastructure Levy and Localism Act). There are considerable demands therefore in taking forward the Core Strategy and related work, including the preparation of the Site Allocations plan, which is due to quickly follow on.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- 4.5.1 This report is to note for information but it is not Exempt from Call In. However, as set out in the report a further report will be prepared for 5 March Executive Board considering the implications of the Main Modifications in more detail.

4.6 Risk Management

- 4.6.1 As emphasised in this report, there is considerable urgency to take the Core Strategy forward. This is needed to provide clarity for investment decisions, to take forward the Council's strategic priorities and to provide an up to date planning framework for the emerging Site Allocations document and Neighbourhood Plans.
- 4.6.2 The preparation of the Core Strategy document has been a complex process. Given the range of issues covered, the City Council will need to continue to take appropriate advice, in order to respond to issues which may arise and in order to keep the momentum behind the process.

5 Conclusion

- 5.1 As outlined in this report, following the submission of the Core Strategy for examination, the inspector has now issued a schedule of Main Modifications. These are Modifications which the inspector considers to be necessary in order to make the plan sound.
- 5.2 Overall, the inspector's correspondence is very positive in endorsing the overall strategy and policy approach of the plan, which in turn help support and deliver key corporate objectives. However, as set out in para.3.5 above, the inspector has not accepted a 'stepping up' of the housing requirement. The implications of this are currently being assessed, with a view to preparing a further report to Executive Board in March. It is proposed to seek authority to publish the modifications for the 6 week consultation period at the March Executive Board once the changes have been more fully considered.

6 Recommendations

6.1 Executive Board is requested to note the contents of this report

7 Background documents¹

7.1 None

7 Appendices

8.1 Inspector's Covering Letters (dated 31st January and 4th February)

8.2 Schedule of Main Modifications

¹ The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

This page is intentionally left blank

Examination of Leeds City Council Core Strategy

Mr S Speak
Deputy Chief Planning Officer
Leeds City Council
City Development
The Leonardo Building
2 Rossington Street
LEEDS
LS2 8HD
By email only

**Inspector: Anthony Thickett BA(Hons) BTP
MRTPI Dip RSA**

Programme Officer: Helen Wilson
Tel: 01527 65741
E mail: progofficer@aol.com

Date 31 January 20143

Dear Mr Speak,

As promised accompanying this letter is a schedule of Main Modifications. I understand that you hope to consult on the schedule in March.

As you are aware the schedule does not include the Council's proposed changes to Policies H5 (Affordable Housing) and H7 (Gypsies and Travellers). Those proposed changes are to be the subject of a separate consultation (leading to hearings on 13 May) and I have already provided Mr Feeney with a list of questions to guide representors.

Also missing from the schedule are the Council's proposed changes to Policies EN1 and the reasoned justification to Policy EN4. This is because I have concerns regarding the viability implications of these policies and Policy EN2 and these viability concerns are inextricably linked with the proposed targets and thresholds for affordable housing.

I have considered your proposals with regard to monitoring and consider that, in order for the Plan to be effective and sound, a monitoring table should be included in the Core Strategy. I agree that the Monitoring Framework (CD1/18a) is unwieldy and should not be appended to the Plan. Below are links to monitoring tables included in the Joint Core Strategy produced by East Hampshire District Council and the South Downs National Park Authority and in North Warwickshire Borough Council's Core Strategy (both of which I am examining). These examinations are ongoing and these schedules are presented as example layouts only and not so much for their specific indicators and triggers although clearly some may be relevant to the policies in the Core Strategy.

I will be conducting hearings in East Devon soon (starting on 11 February until 13 March). However, should you wish to include the monitoring framework in the March consultation I will assist (as far as it is appropriate) and will endeavour to respond to any suggestions and queries quickly.

Yours faithfully
A Thickett
Inspector

Monitoring Frameworks

North Warwickshire Borough Council

https://secure.northwarks.gov.uk/downloads/file/5104/hearing_7-nwbc_response

East Hampshire and South Downs National Park (for monitoring table click on 'proposed Main Modifications')

<http://www.easthants.gov.uk/ehdc/planningpolicy.nsf/webpages/Joint+Core+Strategy:+Main+Modifications>

Examination of Leeds City Council Core Strategy

Mr S Speak
Deputy Chief Planning Officer
Leeds City Council
City Development
The Leonardo Building
2 Rossington Street
LEEDS
LS2 8HD
By email only

**Inspector: Anthony Thickett BA(Hons) BTP
MRTPI Dip RSA**

Programme Officer: Helen Wilson
Tel: 01527 65741
E mail: progofficer@aol.com

Date 4 February 2014

Dear Mr Speak,

Thank you for your letter of 3 February.

My apologies for not being clear with regard to the revision to Policy H7 regarding travelling showpeople. Although I am content with the evidence, I consider that the all the proposed modifications to the policy should be subject to the separate consultation exercise.

Queries relating to the content of the Main Modifications

For ease of reference I have copied your questions in full, with my response in italics.

- IMM1 after 'Main Urban Area' I assume 'with' should be struck through as deleted. *Agreed, schedule amended accordingly.*
- IMM1 should it say 'unchanged' after (ix). *Agreed, schedule amended accordingly.*
- MM4 as the range of housing to be provided has been removed then 'between' and 'and' should be deleted. *Agreed, schedule amended accordingly.*
- MM8 in (ix) the word 'links' should be underlined as new text. *'Links' is in the pre submission changes so is not new text.*
- MM21 The Councils modification MM12 included an incorrect table at para 5.2.46. The first two rows referring to "small" developments have been superseded by the new "small" on row 3 and should therefore be deleted. *Noted, schedule amended.*
- MM22 The Councils modification includes two paras numbered 5.4.26. The modification relates to text that should be re-numbered 5.4.27. *Noted, schedule amended.*

- MM24 for clarity, after the words ‘Exceptions would apply where’ it is suggested adding ‘either (iii) or (iv) below are applicable’. *Agreed, schedule amended accordingly.*
- MM25 it is assumed that ‘Spatial Policy 8 and 9’ should read ‘Spatial Policy 9’ and that ‘8’ should therefore be shown deleted. *Spatial Policy 8(iii) refers to job retention as well as creation but the Council has my permission to delete reference to Spatial Policy 8 from this modification if it wishes.*
- MM25 the last sentence in 5.2.57 repeats the last sentence in 5.2.56 and it would seem that the whole of 5.2.57 can therefore be deleted. *Agreed, schedule amended accordingly.*
- MM28 part B has a typo, it should read ‘No change’. *Agreed, schedule amended accordingly.*
- MM28 in the third row of the table ‘0-’ should be deleted and it should simply be ‘1,500+'. *Noted, schedule amended accordingly.*
- MM31 after the new text ‘response which copies the host’ should presumably be shown struck through. *Agreed, schedule amended accordingly.*
- MM32 ‘The Council maintains’ is shown deleted in the Council’s proposed wording. However, on re-reading this does not make sense if it is deleted and it is therefore suggested that the wording be retained. *Agreed, schedule amended accordingly.*

In addition it is noted that you have not included the changes to paragraph 5.2.41, included in the Council’s MM12 proposed deletion of the percentages in the interests of clarity. *Noted, schedule amended.*

As to when my letter (now letters) and the schedule should be put on the web site, the fact that I would provide you with some main modifications by 31 January is public knowledge and Mrs Wilson has received a number of queries. I understand that Mrs Wilson has discussed this with Mr Bodiya. In light of the public interest, I consider that the schedule should be published but with a statement to the effect that they are not yet subject to consultation and that I will not accept any submissions on them until they are subject to formal consultation. It would be helpful if you could indicate when that is likely to be.

Yours faithfully
A Thickett
Inspector

Leeds City Council: Core Strategy Main Modifications

Main modifications are changes that must be made to the Local Plan to make it sound.

Main Modifications not suggested or agreed by the Council but considered necessary by the Inspector to make the Core Strategy sound are listed as IMM (Inspector Main Modifications). Where a modification includes changes proposed by the Council and includes an Inspector modification the Inspector's modification is highlighted in red.

The table includes a brief explanation of the reason for the main modifications. More detail will be included in the Inspector's report.

Further hearing sessions are to be held on 13 May 2014 to discuss changes the Council propose to Policy H5 (Affordable Housing) and Policy H7 (Gypsies and Travellers). Changes to the submitted policies are likely and there may also be changes to other policies (see the letter to the Council which accompanies this schedule). The Inspector has also invited the Council to incorporate a monitoring table into the Core Strategy. It is likely, therefore, that there will be another set of main modifications which will be subject to consultation later in 2014.

Page and paragraph numbers relate to the Consolidated Core Strategy (comprising Publication and Pre-Submission Changes Version alongside changes post Pre-Submission): Core Document reference CD1/1

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough	Reasons for modification
IMM1	23	Spatial Policy 1	<p>To deliver the spatial development strategy based on the Leeds settlement hierarchy and to concentrate the majority of new development within and adjacent to urban areas, taking advantage of existing services, high levels of accessibility, priorities for urban regeneration and an appropriate balance of brownfield and greenfield land, the distribution and scale of development will be in accordance with the following principles: - the broad spatial framework for the location and scale of development is:</p> <p>(i) To concentrate the majority of new development within urban areas taking advantage of existing services, high levels of accessibility and priorities for urban regeneration and an appropriate balance of brownfield and greenfield land. The largest amount of development will be located in the Main Urban Area with <u>and</u> Major Settlements. delivering significant amounts of development. Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability.</p> <p>(ii) In applying policy (i) above, the priority for identifying land for development will be as follows: That settlements within the hierarchy will guide the identification of land for development, with priority given in the following order:</p> <p>a. Previously developed land and buildings within the <u>Main Urban Area / relevant settlement</u>,</p> <p>b. Other suitable infill sites within the <u>Main Urban Area / relevant settlement</u>,</p> <p>c. Key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the <u>Main Urban Area / relevant settlement</u>.</p>	Clarity and effectiveness and to reflect evidence

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	<u>New text; underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough	Reasons for modification
			(iii) Unchanged (iv) Unchanged (v) Unchanged (vi) Unchanged (vii) Unchanged (viii) To undertake a selective review of the Green belt (asset out in Spatial Policy 10) to direct development consistent with the overall strategy. (ix) Unchanged	
IMM2	29		Insert Maps showing the boundaries of the East Leeds, Leeds Bradford Corridor and South Leeds Regeneration Priority Areas	Clarity and effectiveness
MM3	31	Para. 4.5.2	The unique selling point for AVL remains the delivery of a sustainable new district for the city and its region, delivering new jobs and homes. AVL, which has been identified as one of Leeds City Region's Urban-Eco Settlements, will promote sustainable development by seeking the delivery of commercial and residential areas which have high quality environment, energy efficient buildings and operations, low carbon and green business, sustainable transport, <u>retail and</u> community facilities and linked areas of green infrastructure including a new city park in the South Bank area of the City Centre. Remainder unchanged.	Clarity and effectiveness
MM4	32	Spatial Policy 5	Aire Valley Leeds (Urban Eco-Settlement) is identified (see Key Diagram) as a strategic location, providing between a minimum of 6,500 and 9,000 new homes, and at least 250 hectares of land for employment uses (including research and development, industrial, and warehouse development) and new retail services of an appropriate scale (in accordance with the approach set out in Policies P5 and P7). Remainder unchanged.	To reflect evidence
IMM5	33	Para 4.6.7	Delete paragraph 4.6.7 and renumber paragraphs	To reflect evidence
IMM6	35	Spatial Policy 6	The provision of 70,000 (net) new dwellings will be accommodated net between 2012 and 2028 will be accommodated at a rate of: 3,660 per annum from 2012/13 to the end of 2016/17 (18,300) 4,700 per annum from 2017/18 (51,700) Remainder unchanged	Step up not justified by evidence
MM7	40	Paras 4.7.12 to 4.7.18	4.7.12 Overall a balance needs to be struck between providing local employment opportunities, promoting sustainable patterns of development and protecting the character of the countryside and reflecting Green Belt purposes designations . The District's Major Settlements have a vital role in serving surrounding rural areas and in providing local job opportunities. In preparing the LDF Allocations documents, sufficient land needs to be made available for economic development purposes (for example rural social enterprises) in these locations taking into account the needs of the wider rural catchment area. 4.7.13 Outside the major settlements, small businesses and local services are a vital part of the	Clarity and effectiveness

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough	Reasons for modification
MM8	41	Spatial Policy 8(v) & (ix)	<p>economy and the life of the community. In order to grow and diversify the rural economy the following proposals should be supported, where appropriate;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • conversion of existing buildings promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-base rural businesses • support provision & expansion of tourist and cultural facilities in appropriate locations • retention and development of local services and community facilities. <p>Supporting training / skills and job creation initiatives</p> <p>4.7.14 In order to ensure residents are able to access local job opportunities, employers and developers will be required through planning obligations to enter into local labour and training agreements and apprenticeships, appropriate to the individual development.</p> <p>Supporting most new employment development within urban and rural areas</p> <p>4.7.15; unchanged and becomes 4.7.14</p> <p>4.7.16; unchanged and becomes 4.7.15</p> <p>4.7.17; unchanged and becomes 4.7.16</p> <p>4.7.18 Leeds and the region have an important play an integral role in assisting emerging new businesses links (business start-up, investment in new projects) and encourage young entrepreneurship. These will be supported by the retention and provision of new small start up units including workshops in appropriate locations.</p> <p>(v) Supporting the growth and diversification of the rural economy, consistent with the Settlement Hierarchy and the protection and enhancement of a high quality rural environment. <u>Outside the Main Urban Area, Major Settlements and Small Settlements, small businesses and local services are a vital part of the economy and the life of the community. In order to grow and diversify the rural economy the following proposals should be supported, where appropriate;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>conversion of existing buildings</u> • <u>promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses</u> • <u>support provision & expansion of tourist and cultural facilities in appropriate locations</u> • <u>retention and development of local services and community facilities.</u> <p>(ix) Support the advancement of high quality communications infrastructure to foster sustainable economic growth and to enhance business links <u>subject to landscape, townscape and amenity considerations.</u></p> <p>Remainder unchanged</p>	Clarity and effectiveness
MM9	42	Para 4.7.22	<p>The methods for forecasting demand used in the Leeds ELR (2010 Update) concluded 706,250 square metres of office floorspace would be required over the period 2010-28 as a minimum (this includes the margin of choice discussed above). Currently 840,000 square metres already exists in planning permissions. However the City Centre and Town Centres are identified as being priority locations for office development, and a large proportion of the existing supply is in an out of centre location. Therefore additional land in the City and Town Centres should be identified for office use. Therefore a minimum of 1,000,000 square metres of land floorspace will be identified for office use, through LDF allocations documents of which 840,000 square metres is already</p>	Clarity and effectiveness

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough	Reasons for modification
IMM10	44	Para 4.8.5	<p>identified in <u>planning permissions</u>. The additional floorspace will be identified in or on the edge of the City and town centres. By identifying floorspace in excess of need, the Council will be in a position to re-examine any renewals for out of centre office locations and direct them to more central locations as appropriate. No new out of centre office locations will be allocated.</p> <p>To meet Leeds' housing and employment requirements, it is anticipated that some land will need to be taken out of the Green Belt to provide for these allocations. As emphasised throughout the Core Strategy, a key priority for Leeds is to respond to the consequences of population growth and demographic change and the development needs associated with this. Within the Core Strategy, focus is therefore placed upon opportunities for growth within Regeneration Priority Programme Areas (Spatial Policy 4) and within the Main Urban Area and settlements identified as part of the Settlement Hierarchy. This framework (and as directed by Spatial Policy 1) will be used to direct growth to the most appropriate and sustainable locations, to meet housing need and other growth requirements. The Core Strategy provides the overall basis for a selective Green Belt review (as set out in Spatial Policy 10 below). The detailed mechanism for the review will be through the Site Allocations DPD, informed by the above approach and through consultation with stakeholders including local communities, developers and infrastructure providers, to determine the precise extent and location of boundary changes.</p>	
IMM11	45	Spatial Policy 10; second paragraph and (v)	<p>A selective review of the Green Belt will need to be carried out to accommodate the scale of housing and employment growth identified in Spatial Policy 6 and Spatial Policy 9, as well as an additional contingency to create new Protected Areas of Search (to replace those in the UDP which will be allocated for future development). The selective review will generally consider Green Belt release around:</p> <p>Criteria i to iii unchanged</p> <p>Exceptionally, sites <u>outside</u> unrelated to the Main Urban Area, Major Settlements and Smaller Settlements, Settlement Hierarchy could be considered, where they will be in sustainable locations and are able to provide a full range of local facilities and services and within the context of their Housing Market Characteristic Area, are more appropriate in meeting the spatial objectives of the plan than the alternatives within the Settlement Hierarchy. Otherwise review of the Green Belt will not be considered to ensure that its general extent is maintained.</p> <p>(v) Development proposals not part of the selective Green Belt review will be considered against the suite of Green Belt policies saved from the UDP and through the emerging guidance and legislation of the Localism Act.</p> <p>Remainder unchanged</p>	Clarity and effectiveness and to reflect evidence
MM12	57	Policy CC1 (d) new criterion (e) & (g)	<p>d) <u>Comparison retail proposals will be subject to a sequential order of preference of Primary Shopping Quarter, then edge of the Primary Shopping Quarter, then the rest of the City Centre.</u></p> <p><u>Proposals for comparison retail space located outside of the Primary Shopping Quarter will undergo a sequential assessment to demonstrate that there are not site opportunities within other sequentially preferable locations. Impact Assessments will be in line with the requirements of Policy P8. Comparison retail space will only be permitted outside of the Prime Shopping Quarter when it cannot be accommodated within the Prime Shopping Quarter, or in the case of</u></p>	Clarity, effectiveness

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough	Reasons for modification
MM13	62	Policy H1	<p>bulky goods retailing space cannot be accommodated also in areas designated for bulky goods retailing. This will be according to NPPF sequential testing, and, in the case of proposals of 2,500sqm or more according to NPPF impact testing.</p> <p>e) It is recognised that in many cases the Primary Shopping Quarter will not be an appropriate location to direct Bulky Goods. Therefore, where this is demonstrated through a Sequential Test, Bulky Goods proposals will be directed to within the City Centre boundary, and then on to fringe areas beyond the City Centre boundary that are well connected by Public Transport corridors and that are not more than 300m from the City Centre boundary. Impact Assessment will be in line with the requirements of Policy P8.</p> <p>e) f) Considering proposals for convenience retailing and convenience facilities (such as dry cleaners, off licences, small branch banks, cafes and pubs) as follows:</p> <p>Criteria i to v unchanged</p> <p>g) All other Town Centre uses will be supported within the City Centre boundary provided the use does not negatively impact on the amenity of neighbouring uses and that the proposal is in accordance with all other Core Strategy policies.</p> <p>Existing criteria (f) becomes (h)</p> <p>Remainder unchanged</p> <p>LDF Allocation Documents will phase¹ the release of allocations according to the following criteria in order to ensure sufficiency of supply, geographical distribution in accordance with Spatial Policy 7, and achievement of a previously developed land target of 65% for the first 5 years and 55% thereafter. Subject to these considerations, phases with the earliest release should be made up of sites which best address the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Location in regeneration areas, ii) Locations which have the best public transport accessibility, iii) Locations with the best accessibility to local services, iv) Locations with least impact on Green Belt objectives, v) Sites with least negative and most positive impacts on existing and proposed green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation, <p>Consideration will be given to bringing forward large sites, of more than 750 dwellings, to facilitate, early delivery in the Plan period.</p> <p>In special circumstances, allocated sites may be permitted to be released in advance of their phasing outlined above, so long as the permitted site delivers infrastructure and housing investment that is needed within Regeneration Priority Areas. In such cases, suitable mechanisms will be agreed to ensure that delivery within the Regeneration Priority Area occurs either before, or in conjunction with the delivery of the permitted site.</p> <p>The Council will maintain Where a five year supply (plus appropriate NPPF buffer) of deliverable housing sites cannot be demonstrated through annual monitoring, consideration will be made to through considering release of the subsequent phase or phases of sites to help address the shortfall. Any release of further phases of housing land will only be considered if it is found that either:</p>	To reflect evidence

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough	Reasons for modification
MM14	63	Para. 5.2.9	<p>i) <u>Delivery on PDL in the past year has met the target;</u> ii) <u>Delivery on PDL is expected to meet the target for the next five years; or</u> iii) <u>A sufficient number of sites (equivalent to the five year supply figure minus the windfall allowance) are reasonably capable of being developed;</u> 1 Phase means a series of sequential bandings of site preference</p> <p>Add the following to the end of the paragraph: Density is measured by the number of dwellings per hectare (dph). Net housing density is calculated by dividing the developable area (i.e. excluding land for roads, greenspace etc.) within the red line boundary of the planning approval by the total number of units granted permission. Delete the definition of density from the glossary.</p>	Clarity and effectiveness
MM15	68	Paras 5.2.25 to 5.2.27	<p>5.2.25 Leeds has a diverse housing stock ranging from large Victorian terraces to modern city centre flats. Some houses tend to be more suitable for families and when these are in areas with high concentrations of HMOs they should remain available for occupation by families. Factors to consider include the size of the dwelling, the amount of garden and private amenity space available, location of the property and any prolonged period of vacancy. <u>In the interpretation of H6Aiii it is recognised that some streets (or a part of a street) may already have such a high concentration of HMOs that the conversion of remaining C3 dwellings will not cause further detrimental harm. Also, in the interpretation of H6Av it may be the case that the remaining C3 dwellings would be unappealing and effectively unsuitable for family occupation. In such circumstances policy H6A would not be used to resist changes of use of such dwellings to HMOs.</u></p> <p>5.2.26 In order to encourage landlords to experiment with lettings of HMOs to non-HMO occupants, the Council will consider granting flexible C3/C4 permissions for new and existing C4 HMOs. This will enable a C4 HMO to convert to a C3 dwelling house without losing the potential to revert back to C4 use within a fixed period (normally 10 years). If a property has a lawful C4 use when applying for a flexible permission this will then be a material consideration when the Council considers the planning application. The permission will enable flexibility to let a property between C3 and C4 uses during the specified period. On expiry of the dual use period, the use of the property at that time would become the permitted use of the property.</p> <p>5.2.267 The decade period 2001 – 20102 witnessed considerable development of new purpose built student accommodation particularly in and around the north west sector of the City Centre. Growth in this accommodation is to be welcomed in order to meet need and to deflect pressure away from private rented houses in areas of over-concentration. Nevertheless, care is needed to ensure that purpose built accommodation does not itself become over-concentrated and is located with good access to the universities. The existing 5.2.27 becomes 5.2.28</p>	Clarity and effectiveness and to reflect evidence
IMM16	69	Policy H6	<p>A) No change B) Add new criteria (v) v) <u>The proposed accommodation provides satisfactory internal living accommodation in terms of daylight, outlook and juxtaposition of living rooms and bedrooms;</u></p>	Clarity and effectiveness

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough	Reasons for modification																								
MM17	72	Table above para 5.2.34	C) No change	To reflect evidence																								
MM18	73	Para 5.2.38	Delete paragraph 5.2.38	Clarity and, effectiveness																								
MM19	74	Policy EC1(C)	Delete Policy EC1(C)	Clarity and, effectiveness																								
MM20	75	Para 5.2.41	The breakdown of the existing supply of commitments includes for out of centre sites amount to 322,470 sq.m, with a further 19,290 sq.m is located in or on the edge of town centres and 498,736sq.m is located in the City Centre. Spatial Policy 9 states that an additional 160,000 sqm will be identified in, or on the edge of City and Town centres. Policy CC1: City Centre Development proposes to accommodate at least 655,000sq.m of office-based development, equating to 98% of the total provision with a further 3,710sq.m to be identified in or on the edge of town centres (2%). The proposed total of offices in or on the edge of centres reflects the current percentage of commitments, scaled up to the new requirements.																									
MM21	75	Table above para 5.2.42	<p>The proposed distribution of office development allocations will be:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Gross Total Floorspace</th> <th>Net total Floorspace*</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Existing planning permissions</th> <th>Proposed new locations</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Out of Centre</td> <td>322,470 sq.m</td> <td></td> <td>322,000 sq.m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>n or On Edge of Town Centres</td> <td>19,290 sq.m</td> <td>3,710sq.m</td> <td>23,000 sq m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>City Centre</td> <td>498,736 sq.m</td> <td>156,264sq.m</td> <td>655,000 sq m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total proposed allocations office provision</td> <td>approx. 840,000 sq.m</td> <td>Approx 160,000sq.m</td> <td>Approx 1,000,000sq.m</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Gross Total Floorspace			Net total Floorspace*	Location	Existing planning permissions	Proposed new locations		Out of Centre	322,470 sq.m		322,000 sq.m	n or On Edge of Town Centres	19,290 sq.m	3,710sq.m	23,000 sq m	City Centre	498,736 sq.m	156,264sq.m	655,000 sq m	Total proposed allocations office provision	approx. 840,000 sq.m	Approx 160,000sq.m	Approx 1,000,000sq.m	To reflect evidence
Gross Total Floorspace			Net total Floorspace*																									
Location	Existing planning permissions	Proposed new locations																										
Out of Centre	322,470 sq.m		322,000 sq.m																									
n or On Edge of Town Centres	19,290 sq.m	3,710sq.m	23,000 sq m																									
City Centre	498,736 sq.m	156,264sq.m	655,000 sq m																									
Total proposed allocations office provision	approx. 840,000 sq.m	Approx 160,000sq.m	Approx 1,000,000sq.m																									
MM22	76	Table below the first para 5.2.46	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scale</th> <th>Office Floorspace (Gross Internal)</th> <th>Sequential Assessment</th> <th>Impact Assessment</th> <th>Other Requirements</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Small</td> <td>Under 250 sq.m located within rural-areas or villages</td> <td>No</td> <td>No</td> <td>Accessibility standards*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Small</td> <td>Under 250 sq.m</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>No</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Scale	Office Floorspace (Gross Internal)	Sequential Assessment	Impact Assessment	Other Requirements	Small	Under 250 sq.m located within rural-areas or villages	No	No	Accessibility standards*	Small	Under 250 sq.m	Yes	No	n/a	To reflect evidence									
Scale	Office Floorspace (Gross Internal)	Sequential Assessment	Impact Assessment	Other Requirements																								
Small	Under 250 sq.m located within rural-areas or villages	No	No	Accessibility standards*																								
Small	Under 250 sq.m	Yes	No	n/a																								

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough				Reasons for modification
			located within urban areas	Up to 500 sq m	No	Accessibility standards*	
			Up to 500 sq m	No	No	Accessibility standards* n/a	
			254 501 – 2,499 sq m	Yes	No	n/a	
			Over 2,500 sq m	Yes	Yes	n/a	
MM23	76	Change the second para 5.2.46 to 5.2.47 and modify as shown	<p>It is considered appropriate for small scale offices and office extensions to be supported in regeneration areas and in accessible rural locations away from town and local centres, without the need for a sequential test. The threshold size of small scale is defined as 250-500 sq.m. Therefore in regeneration areas and in those areas not served by a centre in rural areas or villages (as shown on Map 4) small scale office development (up to 250-500 sq.m) will be permitted without the need to undertake a sequential test. Locations outside of the Settlement Hierarchy will need to demonstrate compliance to accessibility standards as outlined in Table 1, Appendix 2 of the Core Strategy. All office development larger than 500 sq m will need to undertake a sequential assessment.</p>				To reflect evidence
MM24	77	Para 5.2.49	<p>National planning guidance advises that when assessing applications for office development outside of town centres, an impact assessment should will be required if the development is over 2,500sq.m. This threshold will be used in the application of Policy EC2. For the purposes of the Core Strategy it is considered appropriate to apply this threshold to large scale office development.</p>				Clarity and effectiveness
MM25	77	Policy EC2	<p>Appropriate locations for allocations and windfall office development; (i) A target of 655,000sqm for the city centre and 23,000 sqm (equivalent to 2.3% of identified need over the plan period) of new office floorspace is set for locations in or on the edge of town centres to guide allocation documents. (ii) The focus for most office development will be within and/or edge of the City Centre, and designated town and local centres. Due to the availability of development opportunities in centre and edge of centre, out of centre proposals would normally be resisted. <u>Exceptions would apply where either (iii) or (iv) below are applicable, with the exceptions of:</u> (iii) There are existing commitments for office development will that can be carried forward to meet the identified floorspace requirement over the plan period, unless it would be more sustainable for the land to be re-allocated to meet identified needs for other uses. (iv) <u>There is a need to provide flexibility for businesses, so that small scale office development (up to 250-500 sqm) will not be subject to sequential assessments in the following locations;</u> i. Regeneration areas identified under Spatial Policy 4 ii. Settlements within the Hierarchy which do not have a designated centres as outlined in Map 4 iii. Villages or rural areas that are not included in the Settlements Hierarchy, which will also be subject to the accessibility standards as defined by Table 1 in Appendix 2. v) Not changed</p>				

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough	Reasons for modification
MM26	77	Paras 5.2.50 to 5.2.57	<p>Map 13: shows which locations are subject to a sequential assessment</p> <p><u>Heading above para 5.2.50</u> Safeguarding existing industrial and warehouse employment sites and premises Safeguarding existing employment land and industrial areas 5.2.50; no change</p> <p>5.2.51 Policy EC3 applies to proposals on sites currently or last in use for employment purposes within the B-Class Uses (B1a – offices, B1b – Research & Development, B1c – Light industry, B2 – General Industrial, and B8 – Storage or Distribution). The issue to be determined is whether there is a planning need for the site to remain in employment uses. There is a shortage of employment sites in certain locations but potential oversupply in others. The conclusions relating to land supply in the Leeds Employment Land Review (2010 Update) and subsequent updates will be a key consideration when making assessments of proposals for the development of existing employment sites.</p> <p>5.2.52; no change</p> <p>5.2.53 This is a criteria based policy which applies to the consideration of planning applications. Part A, which includes bullet points (i) to (iii), relates to all sites not identified in an area of shortfall and therefore assessed on a District-wide basis. Whilst Part B (iv) refers to only sites located within areas of shortfall.</p> <p><u>Part A: For all sites across the District outside of areas of shortfall</u> <u>Bullet point (i) relates to employment allocations and other land identified in the Leeds Employment Land Review (2010 Update) or future updates of the review. Employment needs are identified in Spatial Policy 9 which sets out the amount of land needed over the plan period.</u> <u>Bullet point (ii) applies to all existing premises and land previously or currently used for employment uses but which are not allocated. Non-viable may be defined as:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>property or land has remained empty or vacant for a period of time despite being marketed (for a minimum of 12 months), or</u> • <u>the employment space no longer serves the needs of businesses, and may be incompatible with neighbouring uses through noise and amenity issues.</u> <p><u>Bullet point (iii) provides opportunity for mixed use proposals to deliver the Core Strategy employment objectives as identified in Spatial Policy 8 and 9.</u></p> <p>(i) Relates to points (ii) and (iii) where existing premises/site are considered nonviable in marketability terms. Non-viable may be defined as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • property or land has remained empty or vacant for a period of time despite being marketed, or • the employment space no longer serves the needs of businesses, and may be incompatible with neighbouring uses through noise and amenity issues. <p>(ii) (i) Relates to any proposals on employment land, sites or premises which already have an employment allocation* or identified in the Employment Land and Review in place for B-Use-Class employment type.</p> <p>(* Current land/premises allocated for employment uses will be safeguarded until their long-term</p>	

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough	Reasons for modification
MM27		Map 13: Key	<p>future is reviewed and determined through the LDF Allocation documents.) Employment needs are identified in Spatial Policy 8 which defines the key job sectors whilst Spatial Policy 9 sets out the amount of land needed to deliver these employment sectors over the plan period. Applies to land or premises previously or currently used for employment but which are not allocated. Part B: Proposals in shortfall areas Part B refers to general employment sites in shortfall areas. Please see Glossary for the definition of general employment land. Applications will be assessed using an appropriate definition of "surrounding area" as agreed between the Council and the applicant with reference to Table 1 – Accessibility Standards and Indicators for Employment and Social Infrastructure Uses in Appendix 2. The availability of sites and past take up in the surrounding area will be assessed to determine how much supply should be maintained to achieve the economic objectives of the Core Strategy. 5.2.54 Local need is calculated for the total amount of land that will be required in an area based on <u>local population projected population change</u>. This calculation will identify surplus and deficit of any local provision. 5.2.55 Leeds Employment Land Review (Update 2010) identified a potential shortfall of available general employment land in some areas of the district, particularly in the north and west of the city. Over the last decade there has also been a significant loss of existing employment sites to other types of development, particularly new housing encouraged by the focus on Brownfield development. While redevelopment is often positive, consideration also has to be given to retention of local employment opportunities. Therefore, in areas where there is an identified shortfall in the provision of general employment land there will be a presumption against loss of general employment sites to other uses. 5.2.56 The Leeds Employment Land Review (2010 Update) identifies the following local sub areas - Inner North East, Inner North West, Inner West, Outer North West and Outer North East where there are currently shortfalls in employment land provision. <u>It may not always be possible to address deficiencies in some area due to the lack of availability of suitable sites.</u> Accessibility is also an important issue, particularly the needs of businesses to access transportation networks. Subsequent updates of the Leeds Employment Land Review will monitor and bring up to date any changes to these areas and identify any new areas. 5.2.57 Many of these areas where deficiencies exist are in locations where land is not available and accessibility is also an important issue, particularly needs of businesses to access transportation networks. Subsequent updates of the Leeds Employment Land Review will monitor and bring up to date any changes to these areas. Smaller Settlements without an identified centre: offices smaller than <u>500m² 250m²</u> not subject to sequential test Rural Areas: Offices smaller than <u>500m² 250m²</u> not subject to sequential test but must demonstrate compliance with Appendix Two Accessibility Standards</p>	To reflect evidence

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough	Reasons for modification										
MM28	80	Policy EC3	<p>Regeneration Areas: Offices smaller than <u>500m² 250m²</u> not subject to sequential test Remainder unchanged</p> <p>Part A: For all sites across the District outside of areas of shortfall</p> <p>A) Proposals for a change from B-Use Classes of use on sites which were last used or allocated for employment to other economic development uses including town centre uses or to non-employment uses will only be permitted where:</p> <p>(ii) The proposal would not result in the loss of a deliverable employment site necessary to meet the employment needs during the plan period ('employment needs' are identified in Spatial Policy ies-8-& 9).</p> <p><u>Or</u></p> <p>(ii) Existing buildings and land are considered to be non-viable in terms of market attractiveness, business operations, age, condition and/or compatibility with adjacent uses.</p> <p><u>Or</u></p> <p>(iii) The proposal will deliver a mixed use development which continues to provide for a range of local employment opportunities and would not undermine the viability of the remaining employment site;</p> <p>And where appropriate,</p> <p><u>Part B: For sites in shortfall areas</u></p> <p><u>B) Where a proposal located in an area of shortfall as identified in the most recent Employment Land Review would result in the loss of a general employment allocation or an existing use within the Use Classes B1b, B1c, B2 and B8, non-employment uses will only be permitted where:</u></p> <p>The loss of the general employment site or premises the employment provision on the site can be mitigated offset sufficiently by the availability of existing general employment land and premises in the *surrounding area (including outside the areas of shortfall) which are suitable to meeting the employment needs of the area</p> <p>Leeds City Council has adopted a centres first approach to main town centre uses* as set out in Policy SP2. Proposals must accord with the following sequential and impact assessment requirements. <u>Impact assessments should be proportionate to the level of development proposed.</u></p> <p>A) No change B) No change C) No change D) Proposals for all other edge of centre or out of centre <u>Class A, leisure or office uses. A sequential assessment will not be required for rural offices or other rural development with a floorspace of less than 500sqm (see Policy EC2 iv).</u></p>	To reflect evidence										
IMM29	95	Policy P8	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>TOTAL GROSS SIZE OF BUILT DEVELOPMENT</th> <th>SEQUENTIAL ASSESSMENT</th> <th>IMPACT ASSESSMENT</th> <th>WITHIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS: CATCHMENT</th> <th>OUTSIDE RESIDENTIAL AREA: CATCHMENT</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	TOTAL GROSS SIZE OF BUILT DEVELOPMENT	SEQUENTIAL ASSESSMENT	IMPACT ASSESSMENT	WITHIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS: CATCHMENT	OUTSIDE RESIDENTIAL AREA: CATCHMENT						To reflect evidence
TOTAL GROSS SIZE OF BUILT DEVELOPMENT	SEQUENTIAL ASSESSMENT	IMPACT ASSESSMENT	WITHIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS: CATCHMENT	OUTSIDE RESIDENTIAL AREA: CATCHMENT										

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough				Reasons for modification	
			A2, A3, A4, A5 0-1,499 SQM	YES	NO	5 MINUTE	AREA (RADIUS) INBOUND DRIVE TIME	
			A2, A3, A4, A5 0-1,500+ SQM	YES	YES	10 MINUTE AND CITY CENTRE (INCLUDING EDGE OF)	AREA (RADIUS) INBOUND DRIVE TIME	
			MAIN TOWN CENTRE USES EXCEPT CLASS A 0-500SQM	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	5 MINUTE	10 MINUTE AND CITY CENTRE (INCLUDING EDGE OF)	
			MAIN TOWN CENTRE USES EXCEPT CLASS A 0501-1,499 SQM	YES	NO	10 MINUTE AND CITY CENTRE (INCLUDING EDGE OF)	15 MINUTE AND CITY CENTRE (INCLUDING EDGE OF)	
			MAIN TOWN CENTRE USES EXCEPT CLASS A 1,500+ SQM	YES	YES	15 MINUTE AND CITY CENTRE (INCLUDING EDGE OF)	10 MINUTE AND CITY CENTRE (INCLUDING EDGE OF)	
MM30	98	Paras 5.3.41 & 5.3.42	<p>5.3.41 Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and essential in creating places in which current and future generations can <u>live-enjoy</u> a high quality of life which is fulfilling and healthy. Remainder of paragraph unchanged</p> <p>5.3.42 The urban-environment-of Leeds is rich in-quality-and-ranges Leeds has a rich and diverse urban environment. It ranges from leafy suburbs, and rural villages, to market and towns, industrial towns, inner urban areas and a vibrant city centre. Good Urban Design can <u>reinforce</u> the distinctiveness of these unique and special places, and-it should inform opportunities for <u>appropriate contextual</u> development that is-respectful-and enhances our City as a whole. An overarching aim is to create and sustain people-friendly places for the benefit of the residents and businesses of Leeds, and <u>whilst</u> endeavouring to support developers seeking to deliver <u>the</u> highest quality design solutions.</p>					Clarity and effectiveness
MM31	100	Policy P10	New development for buildings and spaces, and alterations to existing, should be based on a thorough contextual analysis and provide good design that is appropriate to its location, scale					Clarity and effectiveness

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough	Reasons for modification
MM32	100	Paras 5.3.45 & 5.3.46	<p>and function.</p> <p>New development will be expected to deliver high quality inclusive design that has evolved, where appropriate, through community consultation and thorough analysis and understanding of an area. Developments should respect and enhance existing landscapes, waterscapes, streets, spaces and buildings according to the particular local distinctiveness and wider setting of the place with the intention of contributing positively to Place Making, quality of life and wellbeing. Proposals will be supported where they accord with the following key principles;</p> <p>(i) No change (ii) No change (iii) The development protects the visual, residential and general amenity of the area through <u>positive high quality design</u> that protects and enhances surrounding routes, useable space, privacy, air quality and satisfactory penetration of sunlight and daylight, (iv) No change (v) No change (vi). No change</p> <p>Insert the following paragraph after the Conservation heading 5.3.45 There are complementary 'Saved' Development Plan conservation policies which should be considered in conjunction with this policy (see paragraph xxxx and appendix xxxx). 5.3.45 <u>5.3.46</u> The historic environment of buildings and spaces is one of the key contributors to Leeds' identity, making it visually distinct from other cities. Leeds' historic environment is a finite resource which needs careful management, particularly in the balance between preservation and change. In new design, On the whole, considered innovation which takes account of its surroundings should be encouraged except where the context demands a response which <u>fully</u> reflects the character of adjoining properties response which copies the host. Sustainable construction is as relevant in an historic context as it is elsewhere. 5.3.46 <u>5.3.47</u> In all cases change, especially harmful change, should be justified. The good management of the historic environment relies on informed conservation which identifies the historic significance of buildings and spaces and strategies to overcome harm. <u>Except for the most minor changes, it is expected that developers will consult the Heritage Environment Record maintained by the West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service which contains information on all know archaeological sites, including battlefields, historic parks and gardens and some conservation areas.</u> On the whole, considered innovation should be encouraged, except where the context demands a response which copies the host. Sustainable construction is as relevant in an historic context as it is elsewhere. Re number following paragraphs</p>	Clarity and effectiveness
MM33	102	Policy P11	<p>The historic environment, consisting of archaeological remains, historic buildings townscapes and landscapes, including locally significant undesignated assets and their settings, will be conserved and enhanced, particularly those elements which help to give Leeds its distinct identity.</p>	Clarity and effectiveness

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough	Reasons for modification
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Victorian and Edwardian civic and public buildings, theatres, arcades, warehouses and offices within the city centre and the urban grain of yards and alleys. the nationally significant industrial heritage relating to its textile, tanning and engineering industries, including its factories, chimneys and associated housing. its legacy of country houses, public parks, gardens and cemeteries. the 19th century transport network, including the Leeds and Liverpool Canal. <p>Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate a full understanding of historic assets affected, including any known or potential archaeological remains. <u>Where appropriate</u>, heritage statements assessing the significance of assets, the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will be required to be submitted by developers to accompany development proposals. Innovative and sustainable construction which integrates with and enhances the historic environment will be encouraged.</p> <p>Conservation-led regeneration schemes will be promoted. Priorities for new schemes will be in Regeneration Priority Areas, but schemes outside these areas may also be considered identified where eligibility criteria are met the historic environment offers potential as a catalyst for the wider regeneration of the area.</p> <p>The Council maintains a register of historic assets at risk to help it prioritise action and will seek to impose planning conditions or obligations for their repair and refurbishment where appropriate. Where appropriate, the City Council will use the statutory provisions of the planning acts to secure repairs. Enabling development may be supported in the vicinity of Listed Buildings and in Conservation Area Areas <u>historic assets</u> where linked to the refurbishment or repair of heritage assets. This will be secured by <u>planning condition or planning obligation</u>.</p>	
MM34	104	Para 5.4.1	<p>Increased economic prosperity and population growth are likely to lead to increasing pressure upon the local transport infrastructure. In particular, greater levels of car use will lead to significantly higher levels of congestion affecting more hours of the day, and will also generate greenhouse gases that contributes towards climate change. In order to tackle these two issues new transport infrastructure will be provided during the plan period (See Spatial Policy 11). However it will also be necessary to use other initiatives to manage the level of car use and to gain maximum benefits from investment in more sustainable choices as <u>outlined in Proposal 11 of the Local Transport Plan.</u> and 4 This will be delivered through Policy T1.</p> <p>To complement the provision of new infrastructure and Proposal 11 of the Local Transport Plan the Council will support the following management priorities: Remainder unchanged</p>	Clarity and effectiveness
MM35	104	Policy T1		Clarity and effectiveness
MM36	104	Para 5.4.3	<p>A key element of accommodating an increased population whilst minimising traffic growth is to ensure that new development is located in accessible locations that provide a real choice of sustainable transport alternatives. <u>In accordance with Proposal 12 of the Local Transport Plan</u> As part of this, accessibility standards have been developed (based on the RSS evidence base) that define the minimum standards that a new development will need to meet. The standards are set to ensure that all new development, including sites in rural areas and smaller settlements, occurs in sustainable locations which are accessible to a range of key destinations. Where these</p>	Clarity and effectiveness

Modification No.	Page No.	Policy /Paragraph	New text; <u>underlined</u> Deleted text Struckthrough	Reasons for modification
MM37	105	Policy T2	standards do not apply, investment will be required so that they can be achieved. New development should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways, by public transport and with safe and secure access for pedestrians, cyclists and people with impaired mobility, in accordance with Proposal 12 of the Local Transport Plan. (i) No change (ii) No change (iii) Significant trip generating sites uses will need to provide Transport Assessments/ Transport Statements in accordance with national guidance. Remainder unchanged.	Clarity and effectiveness
MM38	110	Policy G4	On site provision of greenspace of 80 square metres per residential unit, will be sought for development sites of 10 or more dwellings that are outside the City Centre and in excess of 720 metres from a community park, and for those which are located in areas deficient of greenspace. In areas of adequate supply, contributions of an equivalent value towards the safeguarding and improvement of existing greenspace will take priority over the creation of new areas. <u>In this circumstance, qualitative improvements would be needed to address the pressures placed upon existing greenspace in the form of increased usage and increased demand arising from new residential development.</u>	Clarity and effectiveness
MM39	122	Policy EN5	The Council will manage and mitigate flood risk by: Avoiding development in flood risk areas, <u>where possible</u> , by applying the sequential approach and where this is not possible by mitigating measures, in line with the NPPF, both in the allocation of sites for development and in the determination of planning applications. Remainder unchanged	Clarity and effectiveness

This page is intentionally left blank