

Development Plan Panel

Tuesday, 13th January, 2015

PRESENT: Councillor N Walshaw in the Chair

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

24 Chair's opening remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked the large number of public who were in attendance for their interest in the issues to be considered

The Chair stated that no decisions would be taken on site allocations at the meeting, instead, the Panel would make recommendations which would be forwarded to Executive Board for consideration, prior to further, detailed work being undertaken to produce a draft site allocations plan which would then go out to public consultation

25 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

RESOLVED - That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following part of the agenda designated exempt on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as designated as follows:

Supplementary information in respect of site 3376 – Weetwood Avenue Headingley, referred to in minute 28 under Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972 and the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). It is considered that if this information was in the public domain it would be likely to prejudice the affairs of an organisation external of the Council. Whilst there may be a public interest in disclosure, in all the circumstances of the case, maintaining the exemption is considered to outweigh the public interest in disclosing this information at this time

26 Late Items

There were no formal late items, however the Panel was in receipt of supplementary information in respect of:

- housing proposals for Aire Valley Leeds
- addendum to Appendix 4 providing a key to the HMCA numbering on the Site Allocations schedules
- revised schedule for Outer West HMCA to correct formatting errors on the version included with the agenda
- supplementary information in respect of site 3376 Weetwood Lane, including exempt information

- an addendum to Appendix 3 providing outstanding information on sites across the HMCAs
- information relating to a site at Topcliffe Lane Morley
- information relating to a site at Nepshaw Lane Gildersome

27 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable interests

28 Site Allocations Plan - Site Allocation Proposals (Housing and Safeguarded Land)

The Panel considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and the supplementary information which had been submitted which set out proposed site allocations for housing and safeguarded land across the city, which had been divided into 11 HMCAs. Officers from City Development were in attendance to respond to queries and comments and were assisted by colleagues from Highways, Children's Services and for the exempt information – the Chief Economic Development Officer

With reference to minute 13 of the Development Plan Panel meeting held on 16th December 2014, where Panel considered information on site allocation proposals for Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan (AVLAAP), Members were provided with additional information on SHLAA proposals and an explanation of why some of these sites which had been put forward, were not being proposed for housing allocation. Officers advised that further work on this had resulted in two additional sites being identified which would result in the delivery of 58 additional dwellings. In addition, the site capacity of the proposed Skelton Gate housing allocation had been reassessed with an additional 252 dwellings now considered to be deliverable. Members were informed that a further submission had been received from a promoter of a motorway service area on the site. The Officer recommendation remained unchanged that this should not be supported as it was considered incompatible with the development of the larger part of the site for housing. Reference was also made to the likely education provision which would be required in this area, as set out in appendix 2 of the main report

Members discussed the information which had been provided in respect of:

- the level of detail obtained in order to consider site allocations
- the extent of land owners' intent in developing sites and that some sites were constrained by lease agreements in terms of the possible uses
- the possibility of a motorway service station being provided on the site and whether Members had been involved in consideration of this

The Executive Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Personnel, stated that changes had been made in light of Members' comments and that the information within the supplementary report had fulfilled the Panel's requirements on this matter. Following consideration of this matter, there was majority support for the housing site proposals as part of the AVLAAP

The Head of Forward Planning and Implementation then set out the context for the site allocations process in relation to the Core Strategy and its target of 74,000 new homes across the city, as well as identifying sites to accommodate 6600 (10%) as future safeguarded land (PAS) and whilst it was felt this challenge had been met, it was noted that it had not been possible to find PAS land in all areas. It

was emphasised also, that a series of overarching policies within the Core Strategy (CS) provided the planning framework for the site allocations plan and that it was necessary for the SAP to be in conformity with these Policies including, SP1, SP6, SP7 and SP10

Prior to consideration of the site allocations across the city, a general discussion took place on the process, with the key issues being raised relating to:

- the targets within the CS
- the review of Green Belt land
- that important elements such as housing mix and phasing had not been included in the details before Panel
- provision of infrastructure to support the growth of Leeds and the responsibilities of developers in this
- the sustainability of the process and that economic, environmental and social sustainability needed to be addressed prior to commencement of the consultation process
- the need for new homes
- concerns about coalescence, between individual settlements within Leeds and from expansion close to the towns and cities which bordered Leeds
- that some Members would be reserving their positions on the matters being considered

The Panel then considered each of the HMCAs in turn. Large scale plans and photographs of the sites referred to throughout the meeting were displayed

Officers provided for each HMCA the CS target; the residual target; the total of the proposed sites to be allocated and the shortfall or surplus against the CS target

1 Aireborough

It was noted that in respect of the housing target for this HMCA, there was a surplus of 66 dwellings

Further information was provided in the addendum in respect of sites 1199 Moseley Wood Gardens; 4254 Woodlands Drive and 4095 west of Knott Lane

Members were informed of the level of representations which had been received regarding site 3026 Ings Road with particular concerns about sustainability; the boundary of the site and coalescence, Officers were not proposing to change the allocation. In addition, comments had been received on site 1113 supporting the proposed housing allocation on sites around Nether Yeadon proposed Conservation Area

Three new sites had been submitted for consideration – 5145 – rear of Layton Wood, which Officers proposed for a PAS site. The other site 5151 – land north of Holmehurst off Apperley Lane and 5152 north of Cliff Drive off Apperley Lane - Green Belt sites were not being proposed

Representations were also reported from local Members on specific sites

Members discussed the proposals for the Aireborough HMCA, with issues raised including:

- the extent of development which had been seen in Guiseley in recent years and the impact of this

- the impact of site allocations by Bradford MDC on Guiseley and the need to deal robustly with cross boundary issues in this area
- the need for issues raised by those involved in the Neighbourhood Planning process to be made available to the Panel. A discussion took place on the availability of information which had been submitted to help with understanding the decisions reached by Officers. Concerns were raised that late representations from Leeds Rugby Ltd, for example, had been accepted; that some representations had not been published on the Council's website and the need for all of the information submitted to be available to the Panel. Members were advised that statutory representations were published, with the Chair stating that publication should also be extended to neighbourhood forum representations. However further advice was needed on this matter to clarify what should be made available
- the need for major highway mitigation measures. The Panel's highways representatives advised on the survey work which would be needed to consider both the existing levels of congestion and forecasting changing conditions and the cumulative effects of development. In terms of funding for highways improvements, a limited amount of money was available from the West Yorkshire Combined Authority and developer contributions would be required. It was stressed that mitigation measures would need to address the impact from new development, rather than addressing existing problems
- the extent of the work which had already been undertaken on transport issues

Members considered how to proceed and there was majority support for the site allocation proposals for the Aireborough HMCA

2 City Centre

It was noted that in respect of the housing target for this HMCA, there was a surplus of 1113 dwellings

Further information was provided in the addendum in respect of site 1140 Pontefract Lane (land west of) Richmond Hill

The extent of brownfield sites in this HMCA was noted, which Members wished to see being developed first. The scope for windfall sites in this area was raised as was the need for an early decision to be taken on HS2 in view of the extent of land which could be affected by that proposal

Members considered how to proceed and there was majority support for the site allocation proposals for the City Centre HMCA

3 East

It was noted in respect of the housing targets for this HMCA, there was a shortfall of 1043 dwellings

Panel discussed the proposals for the East HMCA, with issues raised including:

- Red Hall; its current status as employment land and the view that the site had been proposed for green space. Members were informed that the site had been proposed for housing throughout the Issues and

Options stage and the retention of the playing pitches on the site would be considered as part of the master planning for the site

- that there were ongoing discussions with other Council departments about possible uses for the site
- if the site was allocated for housing, the provision of playing pitches was regarded as non-negotiable

Members considered how to proceed and there was majority support for the site allocation proposals for the East HMCA

4 Inner Area

Further information was provided in the addendum in relation to several sites within this HMCA

The additional housing allocated in the AVLAAP had increased the surplus in this HMCA now to 1497

Members were informed that sites 2148 – Baileys Lane East Seacroft and 2149 Ramshead Approach Seacroft, whilst proposed to be retained as green space, support for housing had been received from Neighbourhood Planning and that these sites would be reviewed, although they were not currently included in the housing total for this HMCA

Members discussed the proposals for the Inner Area HMCA, with issues raised including:

- that smaller green space sites needed to be given careful consideration in view of the lack of green space in some areas of the HMCA
- concerns about site 3081A – Robin Hood West – as it formed a strategic gap between Leeds and Rothwell
- that part of the site could possibly be used for a school. The representative from Children's Services stated that consideration of the site would need to be re-evaluated as part of the iterative process of assessing housing proposals and school impact and a decision made on whether this was still needed

Members considered how to proceed and there was majority support for the site allocation proposals for the Inner Area HMCA

5 North

Further information was provided in the addendum in respect of sites 1199 Moseley Wood Gardens and 84 Wetherby Road – Braim Wood School and land to the north, Roundhay

At this point, having resolved to exclude the public to consider the exempt information, the public withdrew from the meeting

A discussion took place on the reasons for the exemption: the process and the lateness of the supplementary information. The Panel's legal representative advised that it was a matter for the Panel to reach a view as to whether it was appropriate and necessary to treat the item as exempt. Unusually in this case, the Panel did not have the exempt information before it prior to taking this decision, because it was provided strictly on the basis of its contents remaining out of the public domain. Had the Panel not resolved to consider the information as exempt, it would not have been distributed. The information had been provided as a direct result of discussions at the Development Plan Panel meeting of 6th January 2015,

regarding housing site 3376 – Weetwood Avenue – and enabling development, with a request from Panel for further information (minute 22 refers)

The Panel considered the exempt information, with issues being raised which included:

- concerns about inconsistency of approach towards land owners
- the decision to propose housing on site 3376 despite Members' clear view that it should be retained as green space and where this had emanated from
- the need for the lease to be examined in respect of the loan agreement
- the need to ensure the enabling works did go ahead if a valuable area of green space was to be lost to housing
- the need for further information to be provided about the proposals and that this might not be available prior to consideration of the Site Allocation Proposals by Executive Board in February 2015
- the need for the political group leaders to consider the matters raised in the exempt paper as a matter of urgency

The public were readmitted to the meeting at this point and the Executive Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Personnel, thanked the public for their forbearance and their continued enthusiasm for the process and stated that Members had considered an issue which related to commercial sensitivity in respect of enabling development and that due to insufficient information being available, no decision on this site had been taken but that a further report was requested on this site and a site in Tingley

An error on appendix 6 of the submitted report was corrected, with it being stated that rather than a surplus of 40 dwellings in the North HMCA, this should be a shortfall of 40 dwellings

Members were informed that representations had been received in respect of site 3044A – land north of Pinfold Lane and site 3360A Cookridge Hall Golf Course, however no changes were proposed

A new site for housing had been proposed at Moortown Golf Club, however Officers did not propose to allocate this area of land as the preferred use was to retain this as green space

In respect of site 2058 – Talbot Avenue – Allerton Grange High – it was reported that the Friends of Allerton Grange had requested further text to be provided to support non-allocation, and that this would be considered. Regarding site 2055 – Carr Manor, Meanwood, it was stated that the allotments would be retained and protected

On site 4240 – south of A65 from Horsforth and Rawdon RA to crematorium – Horsforth Ward Members had objected strongly to housing development, with their concerns being summarised. A similar representation had also been received from a local member of the community

Members then discussed the proposals for the North HMCA, with issues raised including:

- sites 2058 and 2055 and that the proposed changes were welcomed
- site 4240 for housing; that the Member workshop had considered the site for possible school use and concerns that Ward Members had not been involved in the discussions to allocate the site for housing. The Panel was informed that Officers had been asked to look at a smaller amount of development at Roundhay, due to similar concerns for the

Horsforth site. It was noted that Horsforth Members' preference for site 4240 was as PAS. Officers had considered the infrastructure; that Children's Services requirement for a new school in Horsforth, arising from this and other new housing, was likely to need to be progressed in the short term, and that the housing site would link into the Clariant housing site. The Deputy Chief Planning Officer provided further information and advised that consideration had been given to the potential for development in Roundhay and Horsforth and that on balance there were good planning reasons to propose the site in Horsforth, which would infill a gap between existing development

- concerns about the allocation of sites where the infrastructure was not known, particularly the highway requirements and the issue of sustainable travel. The Panel's highways representatives provided information on the likely highway improvements which would be needed and the benefits they would bring
- concerns about coalescence with other communities and the need for strong defined barriers
- that the Clariant site had been granted on appeal; the level of development in Guiseley and the extent of the highway works which would be required to deal with all of the additional traffic at Horsforth roundabout

Members then considered how to proceed, with there being majority support for the site allocation proposals for the North HMCA

6 Outer North East

Further information was provided in the addendum in respect of site 1027 Wetherby Road (land to west), south of Bardsey

It was noted that in respect of the housing targets for this HMCA, there was a shortfall of 57 dwellings

Members were informed of a site which was missing from the schedule, this being reference 5168 – Wood Farm Scarcroft which was submitted on time and which had an estimated capacity of 778 dwellings. Members were informed that the site owner wished to split the site between greenfield and brownfield land. However, it was the view of Officers that the site did not fit into the settlement hierarchy, so had not been proposed for allocation

Members discussed the Outer North East HMCA, with issues raised including:

- site 3391 Headley Hall, Bramham - which was proposed for large scale housing development; that 3000 dwellings were shown as the site's capacity(to be delivered within the plan period) when it could accommodate 4200 units. It was noted that some reference to this needed to be included within the supporting text of the Plan
- education provision; that a developer/landowner was offering school places; that it was appropriate for a high school to be provided in this location yet Officers indicated further provision was not required, which was not considered to be acceptable. Officers considered that due to a high degree of surplus in the local schools, additional secondary places were not considered necessary, but that the pattern and location of provision would be reviewed, and it might be appropriate to locate provision within the site

- the level of PAS sites being allocated in this HMCA and that large amount of PAS sites should be returned to Green Belt
- that City Plans Panel had approved a site in outline which on the plan before Members was shown as a greenfield site
- representations which had been made about Green Belt sites
- that the Headley Hall site, which was a Green Belt site, had merit for housing allocation but that alternatives could be considered which took up less Green Belt land. Within this context, reference was made to the potential for housing on a substantial brownfield site at Thorp Arch, within the same HMCA

Members considered how to proceed. A proposal to look again at site 3391, together with sites 1055A and 1055B to see if the level of Green Belt land take on site 3391 could be reduced was proposed, seconded and voted upon with there being majority support for the site allocation proposals for the Outer North East HMCA, with one amendment which related to site 3391 and that this site, together with sites 1055A and 1055B, should be reconsidered and a comparative exercise be undertaken to review the options within the area. This related to the potential for housing at Thorp Arch (as part of a potential mixed use proposal) and the scale of Green Belt release at Headley Hall to be considered before reaching a final view

7 Outer North West

It was noted that in respect of the housing targets for this HMCA, there was a shortfall of 200 units. One new site had been submitted for consideration – site 5155, land east of Moor Road Bramhope – not proposed for allocation

Receipt of a representation on site 1002 – Creskeld Lane Bramhope – land rear of no. 45 – was reported, with concerns being raised about the site assessment. Officers advised that the conclusion reached to allocate the site for housing would round off the existing settlement and that a separate meeting on this had taken place with Councillor Anderson. Further comments on sites 3044A and 3360A had already been covered under North HMCA

Members discussed the proposals for the Outer North West HMCA, with issues being raised including:

- site 2130 – Church Lane Adel and that this should be retained as PAS
- the level of housing development within this area and that infrastructure needs had to be considered
- education provision, which had been deemed to be of moderate risk, when locally there was a serious risk, particularly in view of the additional sites which would be developed, i.e. Eastmoor, Bodington and the former DWP site and that if site 2130 did come forward for development, the provision of a new school would be essential
- disappointment that sites on Pool Road were not considered to be in a sustainable location
- the number of sites having to come forward due to the CS figures which had been adopted
- a survey which had been carried out and showed accommodation in Adel was required for older people, which needed to be taken into consideration
- issues of coalescence

- the A65 and A66 corridors and the impact on residents in Otley, particularly in view of there not being a comprehensive infrastructure plan and the need for more information, with Highways Officers outlining the current situation in terms of traffic modelling

The Panel considered how to proceed and there was majority support for the site allocation proposals for the Outer North West HMCA. Officers were asked to supply Councillor Anderson with the percentage details of housing allocation for this HMCA on Green Belt and greenfield sites

8 Outer South

It was noted that in respect of the housing targets for this HMCA, there was a shortfall of 135 dwellings

Members were informed that one new site had been proposed, site 5153 – land south of Barnsdale Road Methley, although it was not proposed to be allocated

Concerns had been raised by Ward Members in respect of sites 1261A Church Farm Lofthouse and 4220 land south of Brook Farm and it was hoped these sites would not be released too early in the process. Site 3081A (previously discussed under Inner HMCA) was referred to and the concerns of Ward Members over allocation of sites in Rothwell

The Panel considered how to proceed and there was majority support for the site allocation proposals for the Outer South HMCA

9 Outer South East

Further information was provided in the addendum in respect of sites 4200A and 4200B – Newtown Farm Micklegate; 1169 – Hall Farm Road and 1173 Honeysuckle Close

It was noted that in respect of the housing targets for this HMCA, there was a shortfall of 555 dwellings

Members discussed the proposals for the Outer South East HMCA, with issues raised including:

- the extent of the shortfall on this and other sites and whether this had been made up elsewhere. Members were informed that the shortfalls had been made up by the surplus numbers in the Inner and City Centre HMCAs
- the difference in numbers given now compared to in the workshops. Members were advised that only that which could be delivered in the plan period had been included but that if more sites came forward, this would be of benefit
- site 1232B and that the land owners of the nearby Garden Centre be approached with a view to enlarging the site

Members considered how to proceed, with there being majority support for the site allocation proposals for Outer South East HMCA

10 Outer South West

Further information was provided in the addendum in respect of sites 1205 Mill Lane East Ardsley; 1260A and 1260B Batley Road Tingley and 3060B Gelderd Road/M621 Gildersome

It was noted in respect of the housing targets for this HMCA, there was a shortfall of 393 dwellings

A site plan showing the allocations for 1018A and 1018B land off Topcliffe Lane Morley was circulated for Members' information, with Officers advising that site 1018B was proposed for employment and not allocated for housing with site 1018A being proposed to provide the buffer for the development

A new site had been submitted – reference 5165 – land at Moor Knoll Lane East Ardsley - although it was not proposed to allocate this site

The receipt of representations was reported in relation to site 3060A – Gelderd Road/M621 Gildersome supporting housing and that no change to the allocation of housing was proposed. Reference was also made to a letter from Councillor Leadley who had raised issues on specific sites

Officers referred the Panel to the supplementary report regarding employment land on two sites at Nepshaw Lane, following on from the discussions on employment land allocations at the Development Plan Panel meeting held on 6th January 2015 (minute 22 refers). Although Members had favoured housing allocation on at least part of the site, Officers remained of the view this should be allocated for employment and that not pursuing employment allocations would give a deficit and if only part of the site was taken, it would leave the Council vulnerable and therefore it was felt prudent to proceed with a surplus of employment land.

Members were also reminded that in terms of the site coming forward, there was a planning application currently being progressed for employment use. It was felt that the site was suitable for employment use which was its UDP allocation, but also due to its proximity to motorways and potential workforce

Members discussed the proposals for the Outer South West HMCA, with issues raised including:

- sites 1018A and 1018B and serious concerns about encroachment into other areas
- that the sites at Nepshaw Lane had been the subject of proposals and applications for 14 years and had not been progressed and that if the current application for the scheme failed, that further consideration of the allocation for the site should be given. The current developer should be advised that the current application represented the last opportunity to secure approval for an employment scheme on the site
- site 2127 – Tingley Station with concerns that this allocation had been inherited from the UDP process. Officers confirmed that for this site it was to be allocated as PAS but that a school would be required if the site was developed
- the extent of the allocation in the Outer South West HMCA and the related PAS total and that a lower housing target of 50,000 would have been better
- concerns about coalescence both within Leeds and with areas in neighbouring authorities due to the loss of Green Belt

Members considered how to proceed and there was majority support for the proposals for the Outer South West HMCA, subject to the expectation that the developer of the employment sites at Nepshaw Lane would make progress with the current planning application

Following consideration of this matter, Councillor Leadley left the meeting

11 Outer West

It was noted in respect of the housing targets for the HMCA, there was a surplus of 23 units

Members were informed that the previous day, Bradford MDC has suggested two sites – ref 5169 and 5170, which were shown to Panel on the images presented at the meeting. The importance of Ward Members considering the sites ahead of any assessment was stressed

Representations from Councillor A Blackburn on behalf of all of her Ward colleagues had been received in respect of site 3455A – allocated as PAS, as the Ward Members considered this should remain as Green Belt
A suggested amendment to site 3340 – Owlcotes Gardens – had been put forward by Councillor A Carter which had been considered but was not being proposed to be taken forward

Members discussed the proposals for the Outer West HMCA, with issues raised including:

- the extent of land being taken from the Green Belt for site 1201 – Woodhall Road (land adjoining) – Gain Lane Thornbury
- that the proposed sites by Bradford MDC should be investigated and Ward Members be consulted

Members considered how to proceed and there was majority support for the site allocation proposals for the Outer West HMCA

Having considered the report, the appendices; the supplementary information; the presentations by Officers; the comments and views of the Panel, the majority decision of the Panel was

RESOLVED -

- To support the site allocations proposals set out in this report, subject to an amendment to the proposals for the Outer North East HMCA to look again at site 3391, together with sites 1055A and 1055B to carry out a comparative exercise to enable alternative options to be considered before reaching a final view and in relation to the employment land at Nepshaw Lane Gildersome, subject to the developer making progress with the current planning application on this site, and to recommend to Executive Board that these provide a basis to prepare a Publication draft Plan for deposit in 2015
- To note that further refinement to the proposed allocations for housing and safeguarded land may be necessary in the light of the work on plan preparation and further evidence coming forward and that the additional information requested by Panel on specific matters be provided
- To note, as set out in paragraph 2 of the report, that following the completion of more detailed work in relation to the proposals covered in this report, together with work in relation to outstanding matters, further consideration by Development Plan Panel will be needed in the preparation of the emerging plan
- To note that the proposals are not being agreed for public consultation at this stage, but that they will be subject to public consultation later in 2015

29 Date and Time of Next Meeting

To be confirmed

