

Public Document Pack

DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL

19TH JULY 2016

SUPPLEMENTARY PACK

Agenda Item 6 – Minutes of the previous meeting

This page is intentionally left blank

Development Plan Panel

Tuesday, 28th June, 2016

PRESENT: Councillor F Venner in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,
M Coulson, C Gruen, T Leadley, R Lewis,
J McKenna, J Procter and N Walshaw

10 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against the refusal of inspection of documents.

11 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

The agenda contained no exempt information

12 Late Items

No formal late items of business were added to the agenda however the following supplementary documents were despatched to Members of the Panel prior to the meeting:

Item 6, Minutes – minutes of the meeting held 14th June 2016 which were not available when the agenda for this meeting was despatched on 17th June 2016

Item 7, Site Allocations Plan – revised schedule plans

13 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest were made at the meeting.

14 Minutes

RESOLVED - That the minutes of the Development Plan Panel meeting held on 14th June 2016 be approved.

15 Matters Arising

Minute 8 – Site Allocation Plan Ward Member representations – The Chair drew Members' attention to a CD which had been presented to them, in response to the request made by Members at the meeting on the 14th June, as this contained all of the representations submitted by local ward Councillors to the SAP consultation.

Green Flag site, adjacent Pudsey Civic Centre – It was reported that the Inspector will be updated on all new planning permissions between April 2016 and submission, and these will count towards the overall housing target.

Grove Road planning inquiry – The Panel noted that a legal opinion from leading Counsel had been sought and that based on this advice the Council had decided to challenge the decision of the Secretary of State.

16 Site Allocations Plan Consultation Outcomes and Proposed Changes

Further to minutes 23; 52 and 8 of the meetings held 19th January; 10th May and 14th June 2016, the Chief Planning Officer submitted a report presenting a summary review of the outcome of consultation on the Site Allocations Plan (SAP) Housing Market Characteristic Areas (HMCAs): for the Aireborough, North, Outer South East and Outer South West areas.

The report highlighted that based on consultation outcomes and further technical work undertaken; changes were proposed where issues raised were considered to go to the soundness of the Plan.

The scale of the consultation response was highlighted including a breakdown of the 9644 responses received by HMCA which raised over 45,997 specific points. Each of these had been inputted into the database, checked and analysed with further technical work undertaken where necessary and had been summarised in Appendix 1 of the report.

The report noted that a number of factual and technical updates had also been made in relation to HMCA and site information - this included updated planning application approvals up to 5th April 2016, where proposed new allocations had become "identified" sites already benefitting from allocation or permission which established the principle of development in the context of the Adopted Core Strategy. These instances were detailed for each of the four HMCA's covered in the report along with a summary of new site submissions.

The report included the following appendices:

Appendix 1 - representations on each individual site.

Appendix 2 - plans showing changes to boundaries of sites or new sites.

In introducing the report, the Chair reported that a recurring issue in the representations she had received directly from members of the public was concern that Panel Members did not see all the representations submitted. Councillor Venner reiterated that all 45,997 submissions had been analysed and summarised by officers and that all representations would be available to view on-line by the end of the week by members of the public and Panel Members. All representations would be available to the Planning Inspector at the time the Plan was submitted. Receipt of a petition just prior to the meeting was also reported.

Additionally, Councillor Venner clarified that the purpose of this particular consultation was to see if the Publication draft Plan was sound, it was emphasised that a single representation which focused on soundness issues could make a difference, rather than a large volume of representations that did not go to the soundness of the Plan. Finally, the Chair highlighted that further consultation would be held on the proposed pre-submission changes to the Plan.

Members had a number of queries and comments and the following key matters were discussed:

- All representations received prior to the close of consultation had been processed. Additional representations received would be reported verbally at the meeting
- The availability of ward Member responses prior to the meeting and sight of all public responses to the consultation, noting that Appendix 1 summarised all those received in support and objection and included a précis of the issues
- The guidance offered to members of the public about the purpose of the consultation.
- The sensitivity of the treatment of green belt was acknowledged and it was reported that a green belt background document had been prepared to support the evidence to be presented to the Executive Board, based on the policy context set out in the Core Strategy and that the approach to the green belt assessment had been agreed at previous Development Plan Panel meetings. Views which differed to the officer assessments based on that policy would be for the Inspector to consider and determine.
- The Heritage Background Paper will cover over 30 specific heritage assessments on sites across Leeds which will be presented to Executive Board along with all updated background documents.

(Councillor R Lewis joined the meeting at this point)

The Head of Strategic Planning responded to the comments, re-affirming that all representations from the public and those with a professional interest had been evaluated in a similar fashion. Any representation which tested the soundness of the Plan had been considered along with the evidence presented, and where evidence supported a different approach; that had been examined and changes made where applicable. Those proposed changes were contained within the report before the Panel. Additionally, further representations had been received prompted by the despatch of the agenda for the meeting.

The Site Allocations Plan Team Leader introduced information on each of the HMCAs areas in turn for the Panel to consider. Large plans were tabled to show the changes referred to in the report and as a guide to highlight the ongoing work and the following key issues were noted and discussed:

AIREBOROUGH

Retail – A request at the April meeting for officers to review primary and secondary shopping retail frontages had been considered however no changes to the proposals were proposed. The Panel noted the response that the purpose of Protected Shopping Frontages was to protect A1 retail, not all town centre uses.

HG2-5 Coach Road/Park Road, Guiseley – The boundary had been redrawn to follow the line of existing fields in response to the representation from Historic England and heritage assessment. Comments that the use of the existing hedge as a boundary offered no protection against future development and that previous advice suggested that all new sites coming forward through this process would need to be bounded by residential were

noted. The reasoning behind the alteration was explained and the site had been assessed by the Heritage Officer who wished to utilise the existing “on the ground” boundary of the hedge.

HG2-12 Woodlands Drive, Rawdon – the boundary had been redrawn in response to a representation received from Historic England which reduced the site capacity to 25 units. Receipt of an additional representation from Rawdon GAG objecting to part of the site remaining allocated was reported.

Four new sites had been proposed and investigated, of which two brownfield sites – **HG2-229** The Old Mill, Yeadon and **HG2-230** LCC Depot, Henshaw Lane, Yeadon, were both proposed as new housing allocations. In respect of HG2-230, comments were made regarding this sites’ current use as a Council depot and whether local ward Councillors were aware of the allocation proposals and whether this site was located on a safeguarded waste site. Additionally, the Panel noted comments that existing employment land in Aireborough should be allocated as employment land.

HG2-1 Ings Lane – Members requested the flood risk assessment and impact of the 2015 flooding. It was noted that the flood risk assessment for this site would form part of the updated Flood Risk Background Paper to accompany the Site Allocations Plan presentation to Executive Board.

NORTH

An amendment to the table within paragraph 4.4.7 was reported to show the ‘post public consultation identified sites total’ as 4126.

Retail – information on Kirkstall Town Centre would be reported to the 19th July 2016 meeting

HG2 – 236 Former West Park Community Centre – This site was no longer required to be allocated for a school as additional capacity was being provided through expansion of existing schools. The contents of a representation received from West Park Residents Association Group were reported.

HG2 – 41 South of A65 from Horsforth & Rawdon RA to crematorium – An amendment to the site boundary was proposed to exclude private properties and include additional land to the southern boundary which would allow development to occur in the least sensitive part of the site. Further letters of representation and a petition had been received. Concerns raised about development near the adjacent Conservation Area had led to the requirement for a planning framework to be established for the site. It was reported that there was a lot of local concern over the impact of future development on the valley setting, the proposed density and boundary treatment. The Panel noted a request to amend the site plan to clearly show where the green buffer would be located within the site boundary. Members requested further consideration of the site at the 19th July meeting within the context of the overall housing target position across the District and in relation to individual HMCAs. The Head of Strategic Planning reminded Members that the site had previously

been agreed as sound and consequently included within the Publication draft Plan.

HG 2 – 46 Horsforth waste treatments works. One Member recalled that, at the time the original planning permission was considered, Plans Panel West been advised that Yorkshire Water retained the right to discharge water over the site. Officers agreed to further consider this information and any impact it may have.

HG2 – 49 off Weetwood Avenue, Headingley – Members discussed their recollection that previously they had been advised that this site was regarded as an “enabling site” and key to the redevelopment of Headingley Stadium. It was reported that a Notice of a forthcoming Key Decision to grant funding support for the redevelopment of Headingley Stadium had been published that day, but the link between HG2-49 and the Stadium was not referred to. In response, the Legal Adviser referred to the minutes of the relevant Panel meeting where advice had been given that, at the time when Members had to consider whether HG2-49 was suitable for housing, they had been told it would come forward prior to the SAP process and that the relevant planning application would be considered on its own merits. As such, the SAP allocation for HG2-49 could be considered as a separate matter. Members noted a request for the recording of that earlier Panel meeting to be made available.

(Councillor J McKenna withdrew from the meeting for a short while at this point)

HG2-217 land at former Eastmoor Regional Secure Unit, Adel – This site and the adjacent HG1-60 to be brought forward together and a planning brief to be established for the whole site. One Member referred to the representation submitted by the local Neighbourhood Forum and a local architect which suggested development of just the brownfield area with a larger number and greater mix of units; and the removal of the Greenfield element of the site. Ongoing issues with the state of the Grade 2 Listed Building were reported and if it was decided to demolish the building, a larger developable area would be created. Members discussed the suggestion that this larger site could result in the removal of two smaller site allocations (HG2 – 38 Dunstarn Lane greenfield site or the HG2-18 Church Lane site) and noted the officer response that the North HMCA would remain marginally below the target allocation and Church Lane, Adel is in Outer North West HMCA, not North. Members further discussed the capacity of the site, comparing the indicative number proposed with that suggested by the Neighbourhood Forum and noted that standard site capacities do not apply to sites which include a listed building because such sites require a specific approach to the Listed Building.

The Panel broadly supported further investigation of this proposal on Council owned land having regard to the emerging local Neighbourhood Plan, and shared the concern expressed about achieving a better housing mix on this site, as long as further consideration of this additional proposal was defensible. However, consideration of ‘site swaps’ could be problematic as the

SAP needed to be consistent and there was general agreement that further discussion of the principle was required.

It was agreed that HG2-217/HG1-60 would be deferred until the Panel meeting on 19th July 2016 to allow officers more time to consider the proposal from the Neighbourhood Forum and the implications of “site swaps”.

Green Space site G1111 Crag Hill Farm/Newton Green – Receipt of a submission requesting that the central part of the site not be designated as greenspace was reported.

Green space – A correction was reported to the table at paragraph 4.4.17 in order to delete the reference to G1921 Potternewton Lane as this site had now been developed

OUTER SOUTH EAST

HG2-124 Stourton Grange Farm South – Receipt of representations from Garforth Neighbourhood Forum, local ward councillors and Pegasus Planning were reported along with a letter from a house-builder confirming their current interest in the site. Overall, 9 new sites had been proposed – of which three were now amalgamated into HG2-124 Stourton Grange Farm South. Turning to the submission from Garforth Neighbourhood Forum, one member highlighted that the landowner of SHLAA sites 3110 and 1244 objected to the incorporation of the sites into HG2-124, noting that the landowner retained options to create suitable access for development on the sites. Officers responded that there were several available access points for the HG2-124 site. The landowner had made a submission asking for their two SHLAA sites not to be included as they sought to develop their two sites separately.

HG2-128 Selby Road/Leeds Road, Kippax– a concern seeking to ensure the green buffer is provided within the site boundary was noted. Additionally a query was raised on how the buffer at Roach Hill would be achieved and what type of mitigation could be anticipated, as the area was referred to in both HG2-124 and HG2-128. It was noted that Natural England had agreed with the proposed additional site requirement to protect Roach Lime Hills Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which could include stepping back any development from the SSSI and seeking to ensure that the buffer would be usable greenspace and not decrease site capacity.

HG2-235 Stocks Blocks Garforth – Objections received following the despatch of the agenda from local ward councillors were reported.

OUTER SOUTH WEST

HG2-167 West Ardsley – An additional site requirement seeking the inclusion of a local centre was reported

HG2-170 Land off Haigh Moor Road, East Ardsley – An objection received to the principle of the allocation from a local ward Councillor was noted, although the proposed site requirements for green space to protect views and retention of the public car park were an improvement. The Panel noted a comment that

part of the site was Special Landscape Area on the UDP and part brownfield land. The comments from the Morley Borough Independents objecting to the number of units proposed in the allocation, that any development should be phased and that the site should be split were noted.

New Housing – Receipt of a new site submission in respect of the former “The Nook” Public House was reported, however this site has been submitted too late to seek comments from infrastructure providers and is considered unsuitable for housing allocation. An additional representation had been received from Barton Willmore stating that land off Millard Way, East Ardsley as an extension to HG2-171 (Westerton Road, East Ardsley) had not been considered. This will be deferred to 19th July meeting.

Correspondence received from Quod (for Land Securities) over discounted site 1208 south of White Rose, Morley was reported. Officers confirmed this was an isolated green belt site, and that eastward development had been discounted so the assessment and representations would go forward to the Inspector to determine.

An amendment to the Outer South West Target was reported as follows:
4315 Housing Allocation total 6963 overall Total Target -237

Green Space - G832 Haigh Wood (amended from G823 in the report) is proposed to be extended.

Retail – Additional representations from Morley Town Council and the Morley Borough Independents focusing on the retail site boundary were reported. In response to comments over whether all representations had been received and assessed and over the number of representations submitted due to concerns that some sites drew many representations, but other sites where Members had expected there to be more interest had garnered few, officers responded that 9 comments specific to retail had been received, including from Morley Town Council. More representations had been received but these covered a breadth of responses and were included within the ‘general comments’ summary

RESOLVED –

- a) That the overall consultation outcomes as summarised in the submitted report and the comments made during discussions, be noted,
- b) To agree the proposed changes to the Site Allocations Plan, together with the updated sustainability appraisal report and other relevant supporting documents,
- c) That, with the exception of the sites listed below, to recommend to the Executive Board that the proposed changes, the updated sustainability appraisal report and other relevant supporting documents, are approved for pre-submission consultation, prior to the submission of the Plan for independent examination.
- d) That consideration of the following sites be deferred to the meeting scheduled for 19th July 2016 to allow officers more time to undertake further investigation of the points raised by Members:

Reference	Site
HG2- 41	South of A65 Horsforth
HG2-217 - HG1-60	Tile Lane, Eastmoor, Adel
Extension to HG2-171	Westerton Road, East Ardsley

(In respect of a); b) and c) above, Councillors Anderson and J Procter required it be recorded that they abstained from voting on these matters)

17 Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED – To note the date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday 19th July 2016 at 1.30pm