

## **Development Plan Panel**

**Tuesday, 6th 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, J Procter  
and C Towler

### **18 Chair's opening remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, particularly Tim Hill, the new Chief Planning Officer and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves for the benefit of the public in attendance

### **19 Late Items**

There were no formal late items, however the Panel was in receipt of supplementary information which had been published and circulated prior to the meeting. Members also received an addendum in respect of the employment sites which set out minor corrections to a number of comments within the papers before Panel (minute 22 refers)

### **20 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests

### **21 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Mitchell who was substituted for by Councillor Towler

### **22 Site Allocations Plan - Site Allocation Proposals (Employment, Green Space and Retail)**

The Panel considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer seeking consideration and agreement of the site allocations in respect of employment, green space and retail uses as a basis to prepare a Publication Draft Site Allocations Plan for formal consultation in 2015

The Head of Forward Planning and Implementation introduced the report and set out the context of the proposals in relation to the Core Strategy which had been adopted in November 2014. He stressed that at this stage, the proposals for site allocations would not form a plan but were the next step to preparing a draft plan which would then go out for public consultation, following consideration by the Council's Executive Board

The Panel firstly considered the proposals for employment site allocations, including those in the Aire Valley. Large scale plans were provided and graphics and photographs of particular sites were displayed

Members were informed of the level of employment sites with planning permission and the level of proposed allocations including mixed use, which would

exceed the targets set out in the Core Strategy. However there was the possibility that some of these sites would be lost, through further detailed work and the need for housing land and that the 24 hectares of surplus sites for general employment, above the District wide target, was a relatively small margin

The Panel discussed the proposed site allocations for employment use, with the main issues relating to:

- Thorp Arch which was considered to be a suitable site for employment uses and was previously developed land but was being considered for housing use, if used for housing this would result in the potential for Green Belt land being needed elsewhere to provide employment sites
- the need to consider carefully the impact of any proposals at the Thorp Arch site in view of its proximity to two village communities
- that some brownfield sites allocated for employment use would be better allocated for housing use
- the figure for employment within the Core Strategy and that a lesser figure would have resulted in a lower figure for housing delivery
- that an oversupply of employment sites at this stage was better than under provision
- Nepshaw Lane Gildersome, which remained as an employment site allocation; concerns about the numerous attempts to bring the site forward for development; the views of Ward Members and Gildersome Parish Council that housing use was preferred and the possibility of Development Plan Panel changing the allocation of the site. The Executive Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Personnel suggested that the most appropriate way would be for Officers to consider this particular site further and provide more information to a future meeting
- the need for a pragmatic approach to site allocation, particularly in view of some sites which had been allocated 20 years ago and had still not come forward for development
- a lack of connectivity within City Development leading to sites being allocated for employment use and then applications being brought to Plans Panels for different uses and the need to afford some protection to existing sites
- Leeds Bradford International Airport (LBIA); the need to clarify the position in respect of this so residents could have an understanding of any proposed alterations; concerns that LBIA had not adhered to the timetable and that some leeway was being afforded to the operators and whether this would apply to all land owners
- site allocations in the Aire Valley and that issues relating to employment sites and housing sites would be raised at the meeting considering housing and PAS site allocations

Arising out of the discussions, additional information was provided, which included:

- Nepshaw Lane – that for the whole site to be given over to housing would lead to a shortfall of 6 hectares of employment land; that the oversupply of employment land was not generous and equated to less than one year's worth of employment land and that an enclave of

housing adjacent to a large industrial estate and main roads might not be the most suitable place for a residential development

- regarding sites allocated for employment being used for housing, due to the way in which national planning guidance was structured meant that it would be difficult to hold on to employment land when it was required for housing. However through policies within the Core Strategy, employment sites would be afforded a level of protection as there was the need to supply employment requirements for the City and within the Core Strategy there was also a policy on protecting local employment
- that in terms of additions and deletions, it was important to have a balanced portfolio
- that discussions were ongoing with LBIA about possible future growth; there were no definitive proposals for further employment land at the site and that the draft SAP would provide greater clarity
- that there were gaps in the proposals as this was an evolving process and that by the time the draft SAP was produced, there would be a requirement to have tied up all of the loose ends which currently existed

Prior to concluding discussion on the proposed employment site allocations, the Deputy Chief Planning Officer stated that Officers wished to give further consideration to the site at Topcliffe Lane Morley (ref CFSM010) in respect of the boundary of that site

The Panel then considered the proposals for green space allocations, with larger scale maps being provided

The Head of Forward Planning and Implementation informed Members of correspondence which had been received from the Friends of Allerton Grange Fields which whilst generally supporting the proposals had raised issues in respect of the mapping. Members were informed that Officers would meet with the organisation to discuss their concerns. Officers were also asked to check the Yorkshire Bank sports ground and the green space which would remain after an approved residential development had been completed

Members were informed that many but not all of the UDP green space sites remained protected; that some sites had been reviewed in light of comments which had been received and that some typologies had also changed. If all of the sites shown as protected remained, there would be a 50% increase in green space. Once the housing allocated sites had been considered, the green space typologies for all 33 Wards would be carried out

It was stated that although it had been agreed that private golf courses would not be included on the plans, three had been put on in error, but these had subsequently been removed from the latest plans

In respect of site 635 – land rear of this site should have been deleted as its use was agricultural

Regarding land at Weetwood Avenue – housing site 3376 – this site had previously identified as green space but was considered to have potential for housing, with scope for development to help fund improvements at Headingley cricket and rugby ground. Members were informed that representations had been received on this, with Councillor S Bentley expressing surprise at this allocation and objecting to housing use, and Councillor Campbell having queried the allocation

The Panel discussed the proposed site allocations for employment use, with the main issues relating to:

- land at Weetwood Lane; that during the workshops, Members had undertaken a site visit and had been clear that the site should be retained as green space and that no rationale had been provided to support the allocation for housing; that Panel was being asked to agree to development on a vague promise of some benefit to sporting venues and that Headingley Stadium was in a different ownership and there could be no guarantee of such a link being forged, or adhered to
- clarification on why the decision to allocate the site for housing had been taken, with concerns being expressed about the approach being taken in this case

The Executive Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Personnel stated that the site was included in the schedule of housing sites to be considered at the Development Plan Panel meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> January, that context would be provided and that the appropriate Ward Members had been consulted on site 3376 and were aware of this change

An amendment seeking designation of housing site 3376 as green space was made and seconded but did not find majority support

Members then considered the proposals for retail use and were informed of late, minor alterations to the proposals for Cardigan Road, which had arisen from discussions with Headingley Neighbourhood Forum, with these being outlined to Panel

Discussion on the proposed amendments took place with concerns being raised about the extension of the primary frontage boundary to take in a former residential dwelling which had been converted to an estate agents. Officers advised that the change was permissible in the NPPF if that was required but the view was that commercial was the most appropriate use for that particular unit

The Panel considered how to proceed

The Chair noted that some opposition Members had chosen to reserve their position in respect of the matters under consideration

**RESOLVED** – To note the comments now made and:

- i) to agree the site allocations proposals set out in the report, and the proposed amendments to the retail allocation proposals for Cardigan Road and subject to further consideration of the employment site at Nepshaw Lane and reconsideration of the boundary of the site at Topcliffe Lane and recommend to Executive Board that these provide a basis to prepare a Publication draft Plan for deposit in 2015
- ii) to note, as set out in paragraph 2 of the submitted report, that following completion of more detailed work in relation to the proposals outlined, together with work in relation to outstanding matters, further consideration by Development Plan Panel will be needed in the preparation of the emerging Plan
- iii) 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

## **23 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Minutes approved at the meeting held on  
Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> May 2015

Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> January 2015 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall

Minutes approved at the meeting held on  
Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> May 2015