

Development Plan Panel

Tuesday, 27th February, 2007

PRESENT: Councillor D Blackburn in the Chair

Councillors J Blake, B Cleasby,
D Congreve, R Harker, G Latty, T Leadley
and N Taggart

Councillor

36 Declaration of Interests

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

Councillor D Blackburn – agenda item 8 – Leeds Local Development Framework – Revised Local Development Scheme - declared a personal interest as a member of the West Leeds Gateway Regeneration Board, which had been consulted on the West Leeds Gateway Area Action Plan which was referred to in the report (minute 40 refers)

Councillor Cleasby – agenda item 8 – Leeds Local Development Framework – Revised Local Development Scheme – declared a personal interest as a member of the Airport Consultative Committee, as reference was made in the report to Leeds/Bradford Airport (minute 40 refers)

37 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor A Carter and Councillor J Procter, who was substituted for by Councillor Latty

38 Minutes

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Development Plan Panel meeting held on 2nd January 2007 be agreed

39 UDP 'Saved Policies' Review

Members considered a report by the Director of Development setting out the conclusions of UDP policies consistent with Government advice and submitted a schedule of policies proposed to be 'saved' and those proposed to be 'deleted', for Members' approval

Officers presented the report and advised the Panel that those policies which would be saved would be done so for an indefinite period or until they were superseded by an LDF (Local Development Framework) document

Over 680 policies had been examined by officers and tested against a set of criteria determined by the Government, as set out in the submitted report, with 131 policies being proposed for deletion. The deletions were for a variety of reasons

including that some policies were now contrary to national guidance, or that they were superfluous. The Head of Planning and Economic Policy stated officers were of the view that no policy which could be regarded as being contentious was being deleted

The Panel discussed the following matters:

- whether there was an opportunity for a third party challenge to any deleted policies
- the need for further clarification of some policies identified by a code, ie N01, N5, and the inclusion of a glossary of terms within the document

Officers stated that there was nothing built into the process to allow for public consultation about which policies were saved/deleted, and that it was for Officers and the Government Office to decide

RESOLVED – That the following be endorsed by Development Plan Panel

- (i) To approve the proposals to save and delete UDP policies as set out in the schedules contained within the submitted report
- (ii) To recommend that the Executive Board approves the proposals to save and delete UDP policies as set out in the schedules contained within the submitted report, for submission to the Secretary of State

40 Leeds Local Development Framework - Revised Local Development Scheme

Members considered a report setting out proposed updates, the 'rolling forward' and new injections in to the current LDF Local Development Scheme programme. Appended to the report was a revised LDS scheme dated March 2007

Updated Development Plan Documents to reflect the latest changes in respect of Aire Valley Leeds AAP and West Leeds Gateway AAP were tabled at the meeting, together with a GANNTT chart

Officers explained that Local Planning Authorities were now assessed in terms of the Planning Delivery Grant on how they performed in respect of the milestones set out in the LDF, and that officers had reviewed the timetable for the existing Leeds LDS and had made some revisions to this

Four new strategic pieces of work had been put in place, these being Development Plan Documents relating to:

- Greenspace/Housing and employment site allocation
- Transport issues
- Environment designations
- Retail and Town Centre issues

Progress on the work programme would be reviewed yearly through the Annual Monitoring Report, with timescales being adjusted further if necessary

Members commented on the following matters:

- the timescales for the preparation of AAPs
- travel plans and the monitoring arrangements for these
- the retention of SPG relating to Supertram
- whether a policy for road charging was being considered as part

of the LDS

Officers responded as follows:

- regarding AAPs , four were currently being prepared but consideration was being given to whether in some areas AAPs were the most effective tool to address certain issues, or whether a strategic context for broader policy issues, eg transport, might be more appropriate
- on the monitoring of Travel Plans, it was considered that the provision of a framework would help with better enforcement of them
- whilst Supertram was not proceeding, the relevant SPG was being retained as the Bus Rapid Transport was being considered and could utilise some of the routes set aside for Supertram. Officers confirmed the policy would be kept under review
- regarding road charging, the Council had not taken a view on this matter, and the LDS would not be the mechanism to introduce any such policy

RESOLVED –

- (i) To note the updates and revisions to the Local Development Framework – Local Development Scheme, included as Appendix 1 of the submitted report and the comments now made
- (ii) That Development Plan Panel recommend that Executive Board approve the updates and revisions to the Local Development Scheme included as Appendix 1 of the submitted report, for submission to the Secretary of State in due course

41 City Centre Area Action Plan (CCAAP) Preferred Options

The Panel considered a detailed report setting out the Preferred Options in respect of the city centre area, following the informal, Regulation 25 consultation process. Notes of an informal consultation which took place on the CCAAP in October 2005 were tabled as additional background information

Officers presented the report and highlighted the main points of the Preferred Options

Members were informed that whilst Leeds had always been a commercial centre with leisure and retail facilities, due to the number of residential units which had, and were, emerging in the city centre, there was now an established residential use in the area. This use was welcomed and added to the vitality and diversity of the city centre. However, it was important that the commercial function of the area was not displaced, and that the 125,000 jobs within the city centre needed to be sustained to support the other functions

Regarding the size of the city centre, the Panel was informed that consultation had been carried out last year on whether this should be extended on three corners, these being at Kirkstall Road, Mabgate and South Accommodation Road. Varying responses had been received with one view being that the city centre should remain compact, ie walkable, whereas some land owners considered that extensions to the city centre should be made as these would add to the renaissance of the city

Research on the amount of office space likely to be required in the city centre had formed the view that the city boundary need not be extended to include the Kirkstall Renaissance Area. However, unless office development can be allowed at ground floor levels, the regeneration of the area will be thwarted as the flood risk in this area would preclude ground floor residential uses. Therefore, the area should be included within the city centre but with the scale of office uses strictly limited

The need to attract families to live in or near the city centre had been identified and proposals were included which would secure an amount of larger residential units with private amenity space within developments

To ensure there were good transport links and to enable office accommodation to remain in the city centre, connectivity and accessibility was fundamental. The CCAAP highlighted the importance of buses as a solution to transport congestion, with bus interchanges being proposed on the edges of the city centre to improve bus movement and circulation

Members commented on the following matters:

- that the proposed extension of the city centre boundary to Kirkstall Road was unrealistic and that it was too far from the hub of the facilities within the city centre
- that family housing should be of a more human scale than was currently being built
- concerns that a residential area outside of the city centre boundary was marked as possible long stay commuter parking, and the view this should be considered for Affordable Housing
- the need for good linkages and the provision of health and education facilities in areas of family housing
- how no increases in surface water run off from new development would be achieved and monitored, and the importance of Plans Panels having regard to the potential flood risks when approving new developments
- the importance of having a realistic and accurate flood map for the city
- green corridors and whether there was a minimum width for these
- the lack of green space south of the river and the need for this to be addressed as a matter of urgency
- that the existing permeability of the centre of the city should be marked on the plan which was included within the CCAAP document
- the need for some separation between cycle and other vehicle routes, possibly through kerbing, which would increase safety for cyclists
- the proposed bridge crossings and whether these were designed for the benefit of pedestrians or as a way to deal with traffic problems
- the importance of retaining bus routes which cross-linked the city
- the need for better ticketing arrangements to speed up journey times and prevent delays, and the difficulties of achieving such outcomes until there was greater control over private bus operators

- the need for Traffic Regulation Orders to be enforced to prevent delays and congestion
- that the number of transponders should be increased
- to welcome the possibility of developing Marsh Lane and the provision of a rail halt, the financial and legal ramifications of undertaking such a project, particularly in view of the graves which existed within the site and the complex process which would be required to relocate these
- the need to reconsider the Loop road and whether the southern loop concept could be extended to include certain roads in Holbeck
- that any remodelling of the Loop road should not result in the demolition of buildings
- that areas around Great George Street could be pedestrianised to enhance the vitality of this area

Officers welcomed the comments made by Members and provided the following responses:

- that considerable internal dialogue had taken place regarding the size of the city centre, and that the proposals were a compromise, with the Kirkstall Road extension being seen as exceptional. Furthermore, it was the view that any substantive office accommodation should be at the city centre end of the extension
- that the term 'fringe areas' as sites for larger family housing would be deleted from the CCAAP as the informal consultation had led to the view that such areas should not be defined
- whilst noting Members' concerns regarding the area outside the city centre boundary marked for possible long stay commuter car parking, this was an area which had been carried forward from a UDP policy, and that for the purposes of the CCAAP, this was outside the remit of the plan
- that thorough consideration had been given to walking distances to schools and access to health facilities, and that city centre health care provision had recently been augmented by the opening of an NHS walk-in centre within The Light development
- that developers would need to convince officers that their proposals would not result in increased surface water run off prior to any officer recommendation to Panel. Whilst it was accepted there might be a need for increased monitoring, there was a sustainable drainage policy in place together with current guidance regarding urban drainage, and that officers were working closely with the Environment Agency on this to better understand and work with the guidance contained in PPS25

- that it was important for biodiversity that narrow green strips remained within the city centre as well as the creation of larger, open areas
- that increased green space to the south of the river was planned, with schemes beginning to deliver, for example at Sweet Street and Clarence Dock. The CCAAP also proposed that major development would need to provide at least 20% of a site area as open space, and this could not include walkways etc in the calculation. Members were advised that work was ongoing to raise the profile of green space in the city centre and the creation of meaningful open areas
- that the permeability map of the city centre would be amended as suggested
- that there was a need to ensure new development contributed positively to cycle and pedestrian circulation
- the use of bridges would achieve the desire to connect the north and south sides of the city centre more effectively
- that the proposals did not put a stop to cross-linkage of buses, but was more related to having an infrastructure in place to enable some buses to stop and turn around. This would be part of a range of other interlinking initiatives, ie BRT, extension to the free Orbital Bus and tram/train alignments from the Harrogate and Castleford lines
- regarding the enforcement of TROs, Members were informed this was beyond the remit of the AAP
- that the southern loop extension had been included as a concept which would lead to other outcomes, particularly if road pricing was ever introduced which could lessen the volume of traffic through Leeds

RESOLVED –

- (i) To note the outcome of the informal consultation undertaken as part of the preparation of the preferred options (as set out in Appendix 2 of the submitted report)
- (ii) To recommend to Executive Board that it approves the City Centre Area Action Plan Preferred Options, for publication along with its Sustainability Appraisal and other supporting documents, with the exception of the proposal to extend the city centre boundary to include Kirkstall Road, and to maintain the concerns raised by Members regarding cross-linking bus routes, and to formally invite representations between April 16th and May 28th 2007

42 Date and time of next meeting

Tuesday 24th April 2007 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds

Minutes approved at the meeting
to be held on Tuesday, 27th March, 2007