

## Development Plan Panel

Tuesday, 27th September, 2016

**PRESENT:** Councillor F Venner in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,  
T Leadley, R Lewis, J McKenna,  
S McKenna, K Ritchie and N Walshaw

### **25 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

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

### **26 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

No exempt information was contained within the agenda.

### **27 Late Items**

No formal late items of business were added to the agenda. Additionally, the Chair reported the withdrawal of item No. 9 – Affordable Housing Benchmarks update – from the agenda.

### **28 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

### **29 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Coulson, C Gruen; Heselwood and J Procter. Councillors Ritchie and S McKenna attended the meeting as substitutes for Councillors C Gruen and Heselwood.

### **30 Minutes**

Amendments were reported to Minute 24 Site Allocations Plan Consultation Outcomes & Proposed Changes as follows:

HG2 – 227 - Delete the sentence which begins “The Chair noted that during the earlier site visits....”

HG7 – 2 - insert ‘the Council,’ so the sentence reads ‘The support of the Council, as landowner, was also reported.’

HG7-2 – amend the last sentence to read ‘It was agreed that officers would measure the site to ensure that a 5 pitch site could be feasibly accommodated’

HG6 -1 – remove “however these new proposals would not raise the same issues”

HG2- 41 – replace references to ‘Historical England’ with “Historic England”

MX1-26 – remove “broadly” so that the sentence reads “The Panel supported an amendment to remove the green belt element of the proposals”

**RESOLVED-** That, subject to the amendments above being included; the minutes of the Development Plan Panel meeting held on 19th July 2016 be approved as a correct record.

### **31 Matters Arising**

**Minute 24** – In response to a query regarding HG2-230 LCC Depot Henshaw Lane, Yeadon, the Group Manager, Policy & Plans reported that discussions over the future use and allocation of the site had been held with Asset Management. It was

confirmed that if the site were to come forward at a future date, it would be as a “windfall site” and was not currently available for allocation.

### **32 Bradford Core Strategy Inspector's Report**

The Director of City Development submitted a report on the implications for Leeds of Bradford’s Core Strategy (BCS) Inspector’s report which was released in August 2016. The Inspector concluded that the Bradford Core Strategy with the proposed modifications was sound.

A copy of the non-technical summary produced by the Inspector on all the issues covered in the examination of the Plan was included as Appendix 1 to the report. Appendix 2 contained Bradford’s Duty to Co-operate schedule which showed a range of cross boundary planning matters identified as affecting Leeds.

The Head of Strategic Planning reported that some of these matters would be non-contentious, however he highlighted the key issues which had been raised by the Council as concerns during the preparation of the BCS through the Duty to Co-operate arrangements. These issues had been considered in the Inspector’s examination of the Plan:

- a) Increased traffic on Leeds’ roads
- b) Incursion into the Green Belt gap between Leeds and Bradford
- c) Planning for the combination of growth in Bradford and Leeds

It was reported that further engagement between Bradford and Leeds Councils will be necessary to deal with site specific proposals (in relation to the Leeds Site Allocations Plan and the future Bradford Site Allocations Plan) and would seek to ensure that Green Belt, traffic and any other impacts are appropriately mitigated. The Panel noted that Bradford anticipated 66% increase in urban growth with 6,000 homes suggested on the south east Bradford Boundary.

The Head of Strategic Planning set out the reasoning behind the re-designation of Menston and Burley-in-Wharfedale as “Local Growth Areas” and the subsequent increase in the number of dwellings proposed

Members considered the following matters during discussions:

- Gypsy & Traveller sites – The need for cross-authority discussions on provision, including the approach taken to permissions for public and privately owned sites. It was noted that a regular item on the Duty to Co-operate agenda for the West Yorkshire authorities was “taking a common approach”.
- Wharfe Valley development proposals – The need for early sight of detailed proposed housing development figures, noting the total figures provided (Ilkley – 1000, Menston – 600, Burley-in-Wharfedale – 700). This would allow consideration of transport implications, particularly in terms of the A65/A660 which were identified as being under pressure already. Members queried how Leeds, through the Duty to Co-operate group, could influence what infrastructure Bradford might provide. Members noted the overall housing target had reduced by 13%.
- Transport infrastructure – Members noted a comment that the proposed housing figures for the Wharfe Valley could generate 3,500 to 4000 additional vehicle movements. Members noted the response that the cumulative effect

of development in other authorities was being factored into re-modelling the Leeds Transport Strategy. A request for the completed revised Transport modelling to be reported to the Panel was noted.

- Member involvement – Assurance was sought that the relevant Executive Members were involved in discussions with their colleagues from neighbouring authorities, and that regular ward member briefings would be held.
- The role of the newly constituted West Yorkshire Combined Authority
- The development proposals for the Holmewood area

Additionally, Members voiced concern over the following matters:

- Loss of green areas through infill development
- Loss of natural boundary between authorities
- Impact on Leeds schools
- Impact on Leeds city centre, noting that as Bradford sought to develop eastwards to the Leeds Boundary, Leeds also proposed development at its western boundary

Finally, a request for future similar reports to include a map showing authority boundaries was noted

**RESOLVED** – To note the contents of the report and the comments made

### **33 Planning Policy for Hot Food Take-aways**

Further to minute 30 of the Council meeting held 29<sup>th</sup> June 2016, the Director of City Development submitted a report on planning for health through a review of the implementation and effectiveness of current planning policies and other Council activities as they relate to the number of new Hot Food Take-aways (HFTA) throughout the City. The report also considered the changes that could be made to the Local Development Framework to better address the issue.

Council supported the White Paper that proposed the adoption of a coherent Planning Policy to control the siting and concentration of HFTA in Leeds, in the interests of public health and well-being. The Director had been required to prepare and present the subsequent draft HFTA planning policy to Development Plan Panel with a view to adding an appropriate document to the Leeds Local Development Framework as quickly as the statutory consultation and adoption process will allow.

Councillor Leadley provided information on the background to his submission of the White Paper to Council. The Principal Planner, Strategic Planning, presented the report and clarified that current planning policies which control permission/development of HFTA, such as Policy H5, did not determine between a 'healthy' hot food take-away and an "unhealthy" hot food take-away. UDP Policy GP5 which is currently used most generally as it refers to lack of amenity could be reframed to emphasise health matters.

It was noted that "Public Health" on this matter, in itself, was not a reason to refuse planning permission. The link between evidence and development was emphasised as key to lending weight to planning policies, with Leeds' health evidence outlined in paragraph 2.16 of the report. Future progress to control the proliferation of HFTA premises would require a joint approach with Public Health, LCC Licensing; and LCC Environmental Protection Team.

The Panel recognised that a Supplementary Planning Document would allow the Authority more opportunity to control the number of premises, taking into account the character of an area. Members commented that many traditional HFTA employed shutters across windows/doors during closing hours which presented an unattractive daytime frontage on the high street. Some thought was given as to how an SPD could encourage a different approach to HFTA shop frontages and also day-time usage to address vitality and vibrancy concerns. The Panel also sought clarification on whether there was a policy in place regarding the use of shutters.

Members also acknowledged the importance of the employment and economic offer that hot food take-aways brought to a community.

**RESOLVED** – To agree to the preparation of a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as set out in the submitted report in order to address links between health issues and planning policy, with a specific focus on tackling the location and/or concentration of Hot Food Takeaways in areas where health issues arising from unhealthy food choices are prevalent.

### **34 Affordable Housing Benchmarks update**

With the agreement of Panel, this item was withdrawn at the meeting by the Chair. It was noted that further work was required and consultation with the Executive Member for Regeneration, Transport and Planning before the matter was presented to a future meeting.

### **35 Any Other Business**

**RESOLVED** – To note the following information:

Site Allocations Revised Publication draft Outer North East HMCA – The consultation period commenced on 26<sup>th</sup> September, closing on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2016 and included two drop-in consultation sessions within the area.

Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan – The Plan was submitted for independent examination on 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2016 (following approval by Council on 14<sup>th</sup> September) and it was anticipated that the Public Inquiry would commence in December 2016. Ann Napier had been appointed as Inquiry Inspector.

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

**RESOLVED** – To note the date and time of the next meeting as 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2016