

Development Plan Panel

Tuesday, 12th July, 2011

PRESENT: Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,
C Fox, M Hamilton, T Leadley, R Lewis,
K Mitchell, E Nash and N Walshaw

1 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed all in attendance to the first Development Plan Panel meeting of the new municipal year.

2 Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

3 Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was submitted by Councillor James Lewis.

4 Minutes - 8th March 2011

An amendment to Minute No. 48 to replace 'Holbeck' with 'Hunslet' was agreed as follows:

'Regarding wharves and rail sidings, Officers reported an objection from British Waterways in respect of the Old Mill Lane site at Hunslet ...'

RESOLVED – That subject to the above amendment, the minutes of the meeting held on 8th March 2011 be approved as a correct record.

5 Leeds' Needs and Opportunities Assessment for Open Space, Sport and Recreation

The Director of City Development submitted a report which briefed Members on the outcomes of the key findings of the PPG17 Assessment of Needs and Opportunities.

The Chair welcomed to the meeting, David Feeney, Head of Planning and Economic Policy and Chris Bolam, Principal Planner, City Development, to present the report and respond to Members' questions and comments.

A PowerPoint presentation was provided focusing on the following key areas:

- Comparing PPG17 and UDP Green Space Standards
- Existing provision ratio based on 2008 population
- Application of Quantity Standards to highlight deficits by analysis area
- PPG17 Green Space Standards applied to an example development
- PPG17 Green Space Standards applied to the locality of a development site
- Other key issues, particularly introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in 2014

- Next Steps, with particular emphasis on feedback to stakeholders and LDF policy preparation.

The Chair then invited questions and comments and in brief summary, the key areas of discussion were:

- Clarification that the Harewood Estate was included in the study.
- Concern in relation to applying accessibility standards, particularly in relation to crossover of boundaries into neighbouring authorities.
- Clarification whether cleared sites were safeguarded as open, e.g. Bandstead Park, Harehills. It was advised that Members had protected this land from development.
- Confirmation that cemeteries, particularly, St George's Field at the university and Beckett Street cemetery were not counted in amenity standard.
- Issues in relation to bowling greens counting towards outdoor sports provision, especially as they were not always readily accessible to members of the public.
- Issues in relation to evaluation and consideration of Ralph Thoresby and other education recreation provision and their availability to the public. The Chair agreed to raise this issue with Councillor Blake, Executive Member (Children's Services).
- Concern about perceived over-provision of pools, especially since some pools were primarily for education use.
- Confirmation that some allotments were controlled by the local authority and some by the parish council. Where there was a parish or town council, they were the allotment authority. It was advised that statutory allotments were already protected through legislation, but that private, non-statutory allotments also required protection through the planning system. In relation to on site provision of allotments, it was reported that this could also be achieved through CIL.
- Concern about the quantity standard for equipped play areas and recognition of the need to apply quantitative, accessibility and qualitative green space standards together.
- Concern that the imbalance of play provision was development led. It was advised that it had also been demographically led – historically facilities had been provided in areas with a high proportion of children, but the families had stayed there resulting in older populations with facilities that they no longer used.
- Concern that accessibility standards did not take account of differences in public transport provision.
- The need to ensure processes were in place to develop existing play provision as opposed to over-reliance of new developments.
- Access to amenity space in outer areas, particularly footpaths, etc. It was advised that footpaths were not a suitable alternative to amenity space and it was the function of the space that was most important.
- The need for Members to be provided with a definitive list of footpaths in Leeds. The Chair agreed to raise this issue with Councillor Ogilvie, Executive Member (Leisure Services).

RESOLVED –

- (a) Notes the completion of the Leeds PPG17 Assessment of Needs and Opportunities study
- (b) Notes the implications of the proposed standards on new development proposals
- (c) Supports the delivery of a feedback exercise to update stakeholders on the preparation of the study and its content with the specific aim of gathering key partner understanding and support for the action points, identification of additional resources and implementation of the stuffy recommendations outlined in Chapter 13 of the draft document.

(Councillor Richard Lewis joined the meeting at 1.43 pm.)

(Councillor Leadley left the meeting at 2.48 pm and Councillor Hamilton at 2.52 pm during the consideration of this item.)

6 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Tuesday, 9th August 2011 at 1.30 pm.

(The meeting concluded at 3.10 pm.)