



DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL

Meeting to be held in Civic Hall, Leeds, LS1 1UR on
Tuesday, 16th January, 2018
at 9.30 am

MEMBERSHIP

Councillors

P Gruen (Chair)	C Campbell	B Anderson	T Leadley
M Coulson		G Latty	
C Gruen			
R Lewis			
J McKenna			
F Venner			
N Walshaw			

Agenda compiled by:
H Gray
Governance Services
Telephone: 37 88657

Head of Strategic Planning:
David Feeney
Tel: 0113 3787660

A G E N D A

Item No	Ward	Item Not Open		Page No
1			<p>APPEALS AGAINST REFUSAL OF INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS</p> <p>To consider any appeals in accordance with Procedure Rule 15.2 of the Access to Information Rules (in the event of an Appeal the press and public will be excluded)</p> <p>(*In accordance with Procedure Rule 15.2, written notice of an appeal must be received by the Head of Governance Services at least 24 hours before the meeting)</p>	
2			<p>EXEMPT INFORMATION - POSSIBLE EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>1 To highlight reports or appendices which officers have identified as containing exempt information, and where officers consider that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, for the reasons outlined in the report.</p> <p>2 To consider whether or not to accept the officers recommendation in respect of the above information.</p> <p>3 If so, to formally pass the following resolution:-</p> <p>RESOLVED – That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated as containing exempt information on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information, as follows:</p>	

Item No	Ward	Item Not Open		Page No
3			<p>LATE ITEMS</p> <p>To identify items which have been admitted to the agenda by the Chair for consideration.</p> <p>(The special circumstance shall be specified in the minutes).</p>	
4			<p>DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS</p> <p>To disclose or draw attention to any disclosable pecuniary interests for the purposes of Section 31 of the Localism Act 2011 and paragraphs 13-16 of the Members' Code of Conduct</p>	
5			<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p>	
6			<p>MINUTES</p> <p>To approve the minutes of the meeting held 19th December 2017 as a correct record.</p> <p>(Copy attached)</p>	1 - 8
7			<p>CORE STRATEGY SELECTIVE REVIEW (PUBLICATION DRAFT)</p> <p>To consider the report of the Director of City Development which seeks Members recommendation to Executive Board on the proposed Publication Draft of the Core Strategy Selective Review. The report reflects upon comments made by the Panel at the meeting held 19th December 2017 and presents further revisions to the proposed policies of the Core Strategy Selective Review based on those comments. The Panel is requested to recommend that Executive Board approve the formal Publication of these Policies for six weeks of public consultation.</p> <p>(Copy attached)</p>	9 - 70

Item No	Ward	Item Not Open		Page No
8			<p data-bbox="676 181 1230 215">DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p data-bbox="676 255 1369 327">To note the date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday 13th February 2018 at 9.30 am</p> <p data-bbox="676 396 959 427"><u>Third Party Recording</u></p> <p data-bbox="676 450 1366 602">Recording of this meeting is allowed to enable those not present to see or hear the proceedings either as they take place (or later) and to enable the reporting of those proceedings. A copy of the recording protocol is available from the contacts named on the front of this agenda.</p> <p data-bbox="676 633 1305 665">Use of Recordings by Third Parties– code of practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="724 696 1390 848">a) Any published recording should be accompanied by a statement of when and where the recording was made, the context of the discussion that took place, and a clear identification of the main speakers and their role or title. <li data-bbox="724 853 1401 1059">b) Those making recordings must not edit the recording in a way that could lead to misinterpretation or misrepresentation of the proceedings or comments made by attendees. In particular there should be no internal editing of published extracts; recordings may start at any point and end at any point but the material between those points must be complete. 	

Development Plan Panel

Tuesday, 19th December, 2017

PRESENT: Councillor P Gruen in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,
M Coulson, C Gruen, T Leadley, R Lewis,
J McKenna, F Venner and N Walshaw

39 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

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

40 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

The agenda contained no exempt information.

41 Late Items

There were no formal late items of business. However, a supplementary pack had been despatched to Members prior to the meeting in respect of agenda item 7 Core Strategy Selective Review (Publication Draft) - Appendix 2. The document was also available on the Council's website. (Minute 46 refers).

42 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

No declarations were made.

43 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor G Latty

44 Minutes

RESOLVED – That, subject to an amendment to minute 36 to record the abstention of Councillor Leadley from voting, the minutes of the Development Plan Panel meeting held on 21st November 2017 be approved.

45 Matters Arising

Viability Assessments – Comments regarding recent media coverage of the bonus structure and profit margins of a national housebuilding company and whether the Council's approach to viability assessments could be included within the Panel's future work programme were noted.

Student Accommodation & the City Centre – Comments regarding the development of a strategic approach (to cover saturation; impact; space and related issues) were noted.

It was noted that both of the matters above were included within the CSSR (Minute 46 refers)

Informal workshop – Recognising the pressures between planning policy and planning development, the Panel agreed to hold an informal workshop in the

New Year (to cover closer working between the two sections, maintaining the Council's policies and developing an approach to viability issues).

Housing Build Out Rates – A housing implementation update to be presented to a future meeting

DCLG consultation – Although it had been anticipated that the March 2018 publication of new Guidance documents would reflect responses to the DCLG consultation, this had altered to spring 2018. Central Government advice was for Councils to continue with their plan making processes.

46 Core Strategy Selective Review (Publication Draft)

The Director of City Development submitted a report setting out the proposed Publication draft policies for the Core Strategy Selective Review (CSSR) for consideration. Following initial public consultation and further technical work, the draft policies covered the housing requirement for a new plan period of 2017 – 2033, updated affordable housing and green space policies, introduced new policies on housing standards (size and accessibility) and updated the sustainable construction Policies EN1 and EN2 to reflect national advice.

Appendix 1 to the report set out the proposed Policy and Paragraph changes to the Adopted Leeds Core Strategy 2014 for Members consideration. Appendix 2 contained the CSSR Review Sustainability Appraisal (SA) - Draft Non-Technical Summary which included the essential scoping components of the SA and summarised the results and significant effects of reasonable alternatives and policy options on the SA objectives in relation to those elements of the CS for review.

The Planning Strategy Team Leader presented the report, highlighting the background to the review, the process undertaken so far, the findings and proposals for public consultation. General discussions covered the following topics:

Viability – The Council's approach to viability should reflect the view that costs associated with an application (such as land costs, reparation works) are not unforeseen and can be calculated prior to application submission – in order to support planning officers in their discussions with applicants over policy commitments and Members' desire to maintain those policies. Members were reminded that a Local Planning Authority (LPA) was under a duty to assess viability during Plan making, however at the time planning applications were considered, each application would need to be considered on a case by case basis.

Dale Robinson of GVA Consultants further explained that the NPPF did not contain formal guidance or define 'a reasonable land value'. Discussion considered whether this issue was a policy matter, or whether it related to considerations "at the point of the determination".

Planning Development and Planning Policy – Members expressed support for round table discussions between Members, Development Management

officers and Planning Policy officers on issues and pressures relating to policy implementation at the point of dealing with planning applications. It was noted that the Head of Policy & Plans was due to meet with Mr Jonathon Carr - the recently appointed Head of Planning Services where this could be discussed.

The Panel then dealt with specific Policy proposals:

Policies SP6 & SP7 Housing Requirement for 2017-33 and distribution

The impact of larger and unidentified sites; should a landowner come forward with a site for 200+ homes, was difficult to predict and evidence. It was anticipated that larger windfall sites were more likely to come forward for development towards the end of the plan period.

The suggestion to establish a 'ready reckoner' to calculate windfall sites throughout the year was supported – to enable monitoring and review of the policy in the future. It was agreed that further research on the number of windfall sites and the amount of housing provided over the last three years would be undertaken.

There was some discussion on the need for the Policy to emphasise the LPA's expectation that Brownfield Land will be released/developed for housing before Green Belt and include reference to large windfall sites – which could be accounted for within the SAP and/or CSSR as part of their continuous review.

Policy SP6 Members suggested that further research be undertaken by officers to review the previous 3 years windfall provision – to include a review of the evidence of how the 500 dwelling windfall allowance had been arrived at, whether it remained justified and to include specific consideration of how unforeseen sites larger than 5 dwellings are counted.

Policy SP7 - No amendments to the proposals were identified.

Policy H5 Affordable Housing Policy

Members noted the SHMA 2017 proposed the delivery of 1,230 Affordable Housing units per annum, the Policy revision suggested a clear and simplified definition of two categories; Social Rented or Intermediate tenures.

There was support for a review to be undertaken of the affordable housing targets as there was concern that these were out of date. The targets had been set during a period of economic downturn. The Panel was advised that setting targets that are not evidence based would weaken the Policy.

Additionally, National Policy suggested that in a Build-to-Rent development, 20% of the units should be at 80% local market rent value. It was recognised that the national Affordable Housing rate of 20% for Build-to-Rent schemes is for affordable dwellings that are not genuinely affordable; however the 20% at 80% housing market value was included within the Government's White Paper as an option which may become National Policy in the future. In readiness, Members suggested that Policy H5 should reflect this.

Calculation of commuted sums was discussed, with the Panel firmly of the view that a commuted sum should be capable of delivering the same number and type of affordable dwellings in the locality as was required on the development site.

A suggestion to make the policy more restrictive toward acceptance of commuted sums was discussed, with concerns expressed that commuted sums were seen as a less expensive option by developers. Members were informed that Clause iii) related specifically to Build-to-Rent development reflecting the agreement of the report to Executive Board of March 2017.

A review of the zones was suggested and received support

Comparison of Leeds Affordable Housing targets with other core cities/delivery was discussed. Members were informed that this varied nationwide – some authorities had higher targets but delivered less. Leeds had chosen to lower the target in recognition of the economic conditions, but in the knowledge that provision delivered would more closely match the target.

(Councillor Campbell withdrew from the meeting at this point)

In response to comments seeking revisions to the proposed Policy, the Chair suggested that he and the three Area Plans Panel Chairs meet to discuss this specific policy with the Executive Member for Planning, Regeneration and Transport. Members were reminded of the tight timescale for submission of the CSSR documents with the Panel's recommendations, to Executive Board in February 2018 for consideration. As it stood, the proposed Policy amendments were deemed to be viable, further revisions would have a wider impact on other issues within the CSSR.

The Chair clarified that Members sought a review where evidence would support a change – such as the Affordable Housing zone boundaries (particularly the city centre) which could be redefined in order to react to the changes that had already taken place. Members were mindful of the impact of the lack of housing on Leeds' communities and sought to change the landscape in order to provide for them, and there was some support for establishing aspirational rather than a realistic targets.

Members were directed to the three alternative actions within the Sustainability Appraisal to consider; maintain the target, halve the target or increase the targets. A fourth option was now proposed – requesting officers further consider the issues raised:

- 1) To request that officers consider the following matters and report to a future Panel meeting:
 - a) To look at how the acceptance of commuted sums can be made more restrictive and the basis for calculating commuted sums to ensure equivalent affordable dwellings are deliverable
 - b) To explore the viability of increasing the 5% target of Zones 3 and 4
 - c) To review the zone boundaries

- 2) That the Chair and the three Area Panel Chairs would meet with the Executive Member for Regeneration, Transport & Planning to discuss revisions to Policy H5 with the outcome of the discussions reported back to the January 2018 meeting with a view to approving the revised policy

(Councillor Campbell re-joined the meeting)

Policies H9 and H 10 Minimum Space Standards

Policy H9 proposed prescribed standards for all new residential dwellings, but did not include Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO's) and student accommodation.

Policy H10 set out proposals to adopt requirements in terms of accessibility:

M (4)2 – a “lifetime home”

M (4)3 – wheelchair accessible

Members noted a suggestion that the Policy should reflect the view that every dwelling should have level access.

Discussion focussed on the usefulness of establishing a specific Supplementary Planning Document to cover issues such as the lack of space provided for students in existing and proposed purpose built accommodation; the amount of personal space and communal space for each student resident; and the length of time it would take to draft and adopt an SPD. Members noted a comment that the actual size of sleep units/personal space had decreased during previous years. Personal space was intended to be nominally offset by provision of communal space (such as a reception area/games room) but this was seen as insufficient.

The role of both planning officers and ward councillors in the pre-application process was considered. Developments were aided by pre-application presentations to Area Plans Panel meetings where applicants had the benefit of informal discussions prior to a formal application being made and Members had the opportunity to identify the positives and negatives of any scheme. Although it was noted that the cost of the pre-application process could be prohibitive for developers of smaller schemes; Members were keen that applicants were asked to do so as this gave officers who had identified areas of significant non-compliance the opportunity to put a pre-application proposal before Panel for discussion.

The Panel was advised that current Government Space Standards were not designed for HMOs/student spaces as these were not residential dwellings. The most robust defence of space requirements would be through the establishment of a specific SPD, with monitoring to be discussed with Development Management officers. Members sought assurance that an SPD would be progressed promptly. It was noted that the Chief Planning Officer had delegated powers to approve and introduce a new SPD; with input from Panel Members to shape the content.

Policy H9 Minimum Space Standards – Members requested that the narrative supporting the policy to be amended as follows:
“Development of student accommodation and Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) should reflect the national standards and further information will be provided within the Supplementary Planning Document”

Policy H10 Accessibility – No amendments were suggested to the proposals

(Councillor Coulson withdrew from the meeting for a sort while)

Policies G4/G5/G6 Greenspace

Members recognised the importance of the usefulness and design, as well as size of green space to a development. Greenspace should positively contribute to the design and character of new development. In respect of new developments, Members requested the Policy narrative be firmed up to emphasise that a Commuted Sum was not the first option for a developer to consider.

Members were keen to ensure the policy applied to all developments and were advised that there were restrictions in line with national guidance that financial contributions “should not be sought from small scale or self-build applications”; noting that small scale was defined as 10 or less.

Policy G4 Green Space improvement & New Green Space Provision

Members suggested the following amendments:

- 1) Delete “new build” from the opening sentence to read “Residential developments of 10 dwellings or more will be expected to provide the ...”
- 2) Third paragraph to be amended to remove “if”
- 3) Add a fourth criterion d) “Green space should be planned to positively contribute to the design and character of new development”

Policy G5 Open space in the city centre – No amendments were suggested

Policy G6 Protection/redevelopment of existing green space – No amendments were suggested

Policy EN1 Climate Change Carbon Dioxide Reduction

In response to a comment seeking carbon dioxide reduction across all developments, officers were tasked with reviewing the original Policy and the approach taken by the West Yorkshire Combined Authority.

Policy EN2 Sustainable Design & Construction - No amendments were suggested.

Policy EN8 Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

The Panel discussed the growing market for electric vehicles and the need to respond through the creation of a network of public charging points. Members were mindful of the challenges of providing infrastructure in densely populated areas but were of the view that infrastructure provision should be requested

as a means to future proof the city. Additionally Members noted comments regarding the capacity of the National Grid to support the new infrastructure and the need to monitor the Policy as the use of the technology grows.

Members suggested that the Policy to be amended to include the following:

- 1) The Policy to be monitored to take technological changes into account
- 2) The impact of vehicle charging infrastructure provision on the National Grid to be monitored
- 3) The final sentence to be amended to read “Petrol Filling Stations: provision of fast charge facilities”

The Panel noted the recommendations in the report to b) recommend to Executive Board that the Board approves for public consultation the Publication Draft of new and revised Policies and supporting paragraphs of the CSSR as set out in Appendix 1, subject to any further changes agreed at the Panel meeting and c) to recommend to Executive Board that the Board approves the supporting documents, including the Sustainability Appraisal and other background evidence. However, based on the discussions outlined above, the Panel supported the Chair’s suggestion to defer determination of the new and revised Policies and to request a further report be presented to the January 2018 Panel meeting reflecting the revisions discussed at this meeting for consideration.

RESOLVED

- a) To note the contents of the Policies and supporting paragraphs of the CSSR as set out in **Appendix 1** of the submitted report
- b) To note the contents of the Core Strategy Selective Review Sustainability Appraisal Draft Non-Technical Summary – as set out in **Appendix 2**
- c) To defer determination of the new and revised Policies and to request a further report be presented to the January 2018 Panel meeting reflecting the revisions discussed at this meeting for consideration.

47 Items for the Work Programme

RESOLVED – To note the following matters were included within a programme of work for future Development Plan Panel meetings:

Negotiated Stopping Sites for Gypsies & Travellers (July 2017 minute 7) - The number of occurrences of stopping on unauthorised sites 2016/17 and the start date for the 24 hour service to respond to negotiated stopping

Housing Land Supply (July 2017 minute 8) -
Feedback from small and medium sized building firms on their view of the market and delivery of the overall housing target
Information on the number of permissions granted/permissions implemented and started on site.

CSSR (September 2017 Minute 18) -
Production of a Frequently Asked Questions companion to the CSSR
A review of the city-wide Community Infrastructure Levy requirements to identify whether the requirements remain appropriate for each area and assess the impact of CIL on redevelopment.

Consider the policy for Commuted Sum use; whether there was any flexibility and support for cross-ward financing; undertake reviews of the calculation mechanism and best practice operated elsewhere.

SAP (November 2017 Minute 32) - A request for information on the trajectory for the delivery of 1&2 bed Affordable Housing

SHLAA (November 2017 Minute 37) -

Outcome of discussions with volume house building industry on volume house building rates and reasons for the fall in the ratio of build out-rate: delivery
5 Year Land Supply – A report on the outcome of a recent Court decision which provided clarity on how Local Planning Authorities take a view on the 5 Year Housing Land Supply and the balance between what is deliverable and what is actually delivered.

Housing Build-out Rates (December 2017 Minute 45) – An implementation update to be presented to a future meeting

CSSR Policies SP6 & SP7 (December 2017 Minute 46) - Establish a 'ready reckoner' to calculate windfall sites throughout the year and undertake further research on the number of windfall sites/amount of housing provided over the last three years.

48 Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED – To note the date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday 16th January 2018 at 9.30 am. It was noted that an informal workshop for Panel Members will be held at the conclusion of the formal meeting.

Report author: Robin Coghlan
Tel: 0113 378 7635

Report of Director of City Development

Report to Development Plan Panel

Date: 16th January 2018

Subject: Core Strategy Selective Review (Publication Draft)

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

1. This report reflects upon comments made by Development Plan Panel of 19th December 2017 and seeks Members recommendation to Executive Board on the proposed Publication Draft of the Core Strategy Selective Review.

Recommendations

2. Development Plan Panel is invited to:
 - i) consider the Policies and supporting paragraphs of the CSSR as set out in **Appendix 1** which includes revisions requested at the Development Plan Panel meeting of 19th December 2017,
 - ii) recommend to Executive Board that it approves for public consultation the Publication Draft of new and revised Policies and supporting paragraphs of the CSSR as set out in **Appendix 1**, subject to any further changes agreed at the Panel meeting.
 - iii) recommend to Executive Board that it approves the supporting documents, including Sustainability Appraisal and other background evidence.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 The focus of this report is for Development Plan Panel to consider further revisions to the proposed policies of the Core Strategy Selective Review requested at the 19th December meeting of Development Plan Panel. Development Plan Panel is requested to recommend that Executive Board approve the formal Publication of these policies (as set out in Appendix 1 to this report with changes illustrating the difference to the text of Appendix 1 presented to Development Plan Panel of 19th December 2017) for six weeks of public consultation. This report should be read in conjunction with the report to Development Plan Panel of 19th December 2017.
- 1.2 For the background explanation supporting the proposed policies (and parts of policies and supporting text) in Appendix 1 to this report that are *not* subject to changes, see the report to Development Plan Panel of 19th December 2017 (Appendix 2).
- 1.3 The policies are supported by a Sustainability Appraisal Report alongside relevant supporting material including:
- Statement of Regulation 18 Consultation
 - Consultation Strategy
 - Duty to Cooperate Table
- 1.4 The Plan is also supported by an evidence base which includes:
- Economic Viability Study 2017 (Executive Summary)
 - Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2017
 - Monitoring information
 - Background Papers

2 Background

- 2.1 The Leeds Core Strategy was adopted in 2014 and sets the strategic planning framework for the Leeds Metropolitan District and is the overarching document within the Leeds Local Plan (which also comprises an Adopted Natural Resources and Waste Plan and an Adopted Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan and Saved UDP policies). The highly advanced Site Allocations Plan will on Adoption also form part of the Local Plan.
- 2.2 As set out in paragraphs 2.2 – 2.5 of the report to Development Plan Panel of 19th December 2017 there have been a series of reports to Panel since November 2016 concerning the preparation of the Core Strategy Selective Review. Development Plan Panel of 19th December 2017 had been asked to consider the proposed policies and recommend Executive Board to approve them for public consultation. However, following considerations, Development Plan Panel agreed that further work and redrafting in a number of targeted areas was necessary. This forms the focus of this report.

3 Main issues

- 3.1 Following the specific issues raised at the 19th December DPP meeting as requested

further work and subsequent amendments are proposed as set out below.

Affordable Housing

- 3.2 At the 19th December DPP meeting, there was understandable debate around Policy H5 Affordable Housing and the key issues of concern can be summarised as follows:
- i) Targets. To explore the viability of increasing the 5% target of Zones 3 and 4 in the context of market upturn
 - ii) Zone boundaries. To review the zone boundaries to reflect changes on the ground since Policy H5 was adopted in 2014
 - iii) Commuted Sums. To look at how the acceptance of commuted sums can be addressed and the basis for calculating commuted sums modified to ensure equivalent affordable dwellings are deliverable.

Targets

- 3.3 Panel raised concerns about the affordable housing targets particularly whether they should be increased for the 5% zones of 3 and 4. However, the Economic Viability Study (EVS) concludes there is no headroom for increasing the targets once the effects of other policies e.g. housing standards, annual indexation of CIL and changes in affordable housing benchmarks are taken into account. According to the EVS any increase in the affordable housing targets would require commensurate reductions in the requirements of other policies.
- 3.4 The EVS provides baseline evidence which has been prepared in accordance with industry and planning guidance and provides an independent assessment of whole plan viability. The report has been prepared in accordance with the RICS Guidance Note – ‘Financial Viability in Planning’ and ‘Viability Testing- Local Plans’ Harman Report. The most important function of the EVS is to bring together and consider the cumulative impact of the proposed changes to the Core Strategy policies in accordance with para 174 of the NPPF. However it should be recognised that this assessment will not provide a precise answer to the viability of every single development likely to take place during the plan period. Instead it will provide high level assurance that the proposed changes to policies within the Core Strategy are set out in a way that will not undermine the viability of the development needed to deliver the plan.
- 3.5 In assessing the cumulative impact on viability of the policies, individual policies were firstly tested and then these were tested in combination to assess appropriate policy ask at a cumulative level. Various options were tested to include a 5% increase in affordable housing targets for all zones, this assumes that the mix of affordable housing should be to reflect local need with 40% of the affordable housing being for those on intermediate housing and 60% being for households on social housing. The EVS concludes that if all other policies are required there is currently no headroom to

increase the targets. Any increase in the targets would result in a dilution of the requirements of other policies set out in the CSSR and adopted Core Strategy. Clearly if there is a Member preference for particular policies over others than policy choices need to be made to reflect priorities.

- 3.6 Whilst there has been some improvement since the “credit crunch” of 2008 in the City Centre many permissions for residential development have been granted but construction is only beginning to get underway. Therefore, it is proposed that the 5% target for Zone 4 (City Centre) be retained. It is proposed that at a future point once the housing market improves particularly in the City Centre and inner areas to increase affordable housing targets. Any changes in affordable housing targets and new policies are required to be tested at examination to include the evidence base which supports this.
- 3.7 The introduction of policies which are not currently in the Core Strategy has an impact on cost and therefore viability. The impact of this is that if in addition to these new policies an increase is made to existing policies, this will make the cumulative impact of policies unviable. The EVS has assessed this impact and there is no further scope to increase affordable housing targets if the new policies are also considered. The only other option to increase affordable housing targets is to not introduce either the minimum space standards or accessible housing requirements. The impact of this would be that the quality of housing would be affected, whilst affordable housing targets and provision are increased.

Zone Boundaries

- 3.8 Members considered that some of the zone boundaries need to be amended including an extension of zone 4 (35% target) into areas of zone 3 (15% target), and to account for the expanding influence of the city centre. The SHMA 2017 did not reconsider the zone boundaries so if zone boundaries were proposed to be amended, further work would have to be commissioned. This would require a delay in the CSSR timetable. Also, it has to be recognised that the affordable housing zone boundaries are coterminous with the CIL boundaries and could not be changed without reviewing the implications for CIL. Any changes to the CIL boundary would require a review of the whole charging schedule to include examination. Given that the government review of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is anticipated shortly it is suggested that a review of boundaries is undertaken after the government publishes its proposals for CIL. If that is before the adoption of the CSSR the findings may be introduced at a later date. This proposal would enable the CSSR timetable to remain on schedule without removing the opportunity in the future to amend the zone boundaries.

Commuted Sums

- 3.9 Members expressed concern that commuted sums are sometimes accepted as an easy option and the money provided is often not sufficient to deliver the required quantity of affordable housing. Whilst these concerns are recognised, it remains the position that whether affordable dwellings are provided on-site or are delivered elsewhere with commuted sums, investment of Registered Providers is still required. Where delivery is on-site the RPs will pay for dwellings at a discount; however in

relation to commuted sum schemes RPs invest with the benefit of the commuted sum subsidy. Given this position, it should not be expected that commuted sums should be capable of covering the full cost of new affordable dwellings, but instead only subsidising the investment of RPs. It should also be recognised that commuted sums can be pragmatic means of delivering affordable dwellings as part of regeneration or other desirable schemes. Hence it is considered that the existing wording of Policy H5 in respect of commuted sums is sufficiently robust to allow Plans Panels to resist unacceptable commuted sum offers. It currently says “*Affordable housing provision should be on site, unless off site provision or a financial contribution can be robustly justified*”. However, in order to respond to Members concerns, it is proposed to amend the opening wording of the policy to better reflect the approach that on-site provision is the preferred expectation with the payment of commuted sums in lieu of on-site delivery being the exception. The proposed rewording is set out in Appendix 1.

- 3.10 On the matter of sufficiency of commuted sums, new wording is proposed to paragraph 5.2.21 of the Core Strategy to place more emphasis on the level of commuted sum being capable of delivering the required quantity and type of affordable housing in the locality.
- 3.11 Regarding build-to-rent schemes, Executive Board (March 2017) endorsed an approach which recognises that the acceptance of commuted sums from Build to Rent schemes may be appropriate and justified in terms of the robust justification required of Policy H5. In the proposed policy of the CSSR the third option for build-to-rent provision – the commuted sum option – is necessary to ensure that commuted sums are calculated on the basis of option ii) rather than option i). Option i) is the emerging government policy for on-site affordable dwellings to be rented at 80% of local market rents and is not intended as the means of setting the level of commuted sums. ii) is the city council’s policy approach which is based on delivering genuinely affordable dwellings to meet the demonstrable needs of the city, which would be most appropriate for calculating affordable housing commuted sums for build-to-rent schemes.

Green Space – Policy G4

- 3.12 Issues relating to the proposed green space policy G4 and supporting text raised by Members are summarised below:
- 3.13 Members proposed that the words “New build” should be deleted from the beginning of the policy because the policy should also apply to developments involving conversions of existing buildings.
- 3.14 At the October Member Workshop it was recognised that Leeds has different green space needs in different localities. In inner areas existing green spaces are under considerable stress and commuted sums for improvements in lieu of on-site provision is considered the most pragmatic solution particularly where housing development on smaller sites is unable to deliver the full quantity of green space required. However, at the 19th December DPP meeting, some concerns were expressed that commuted sums should be discouraged on the basis that new green space is delivered on site. Within this overall context, the proposed policy is structured to favour on-site green space where circumstances are appropriate. In reflecting Panel comments it is therefore proposed to strengthen this approach by rewording the part of the Policy “If

Green space is to be provided on site...” to delete the word “If”. This is part of the proposed re-wording set out in Appendix 1.

- 3.15 Members suggested that the policy needs to ensure that green space provision is positioned and designed to be complementary to the overall design and character of residential development schemes. As such it is now proposed to add a criterion (d) for circumstances where green space is provided on-site, “d) green space should positively contribute to the overall design and character of development.

Space Standards

- 3.16 A number of issues were raised regarding the approach of the policy in relation to purpose built student accommodation (PBSA) and Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO’s). Panel considered that seeking to apply “reasonable standards of general amenity” for PBSA and Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) did not adequately promote the standards the Council sought to secure. It was suggested that this part of the policy needed to be redrafted to say that PBSA and HMO development should reflect the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). Therefore, the following wording, “...should reflect the NDSS with appropriate adjustments to address the particular characteristics of these types of development” is proposed to be inserted in the last paragraph of Policy H9. Members agreed that further guidance should still be provided through a Supplementary Planning Document, but urged that this should be prepared soon as possible with involvement of Development Plan Panel.

Access Standards

- 3.17 In relation to proposed Policy H10 Members were concerned whether it could be extended to require level access to all new dwellings. It was confirmed that this is already a requirement of building regulations. As a consequence, no further changes to this draft policy are therefore necessary.

Policies EN1, EN2 and new policy on Electric Vehicle Charging Points

- 3.18 In relation to Policies EN1 and EN2 the general point was made as to why they only apply to developments of 10 or more dwellings. It was confirmed that this threshold is in the existing adopted Core Strategy policies and has been established on the basis of viability testing. The supporting text of the adopted Core Strategy states “Economies of scale mean that energy efficiency measures are less costly on larger developments, and the policies are therefore only applied to “major development”.
- 3.19 Panel raised the point also that the 10% non-residential requirement proposed in new Policy EN8 for provision of electric vehicle charging points was too low. The requirements came from the Air Quality & Emissions Technical Planning Guidance produced by the West Yorkshire local authorities (which includes evidence, justification and strength of collaboration). A wider point was raised regarding the need for requirements to be responsive to technical innovation and capacity of the national grid. In addressing these issues, it is suggested that the following wording “These requirements will be monitored and the policy may be updated accordingly as

new technologies emerge.” be inserted at the end of paragraph 5.5.64.

- 3.20 It is also proposed to delete the wording “where feasible” from the requirement for fast charging facilities in new petrol filling stations. Any delivery issues will need to be dealt with at planning application stage on a case by case basis..

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1.1 Consultation on the scope of the review was carried out for 6 weeks from 19th June until 31st July 2017. Further details are set out in the report to Development Plan Panel of 19th December 2017.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

- 4.2.1 Equality diversity, cohesion and integration has been an integral part of the formulation of policies of the Core Strategy Selective Review. Equality Impact Assessment screenings will be undertaken at key stages of the process to ensure that policies are embedded in equality considerations.

4.3 Council policies and Best Council Plan

- 4.3.1 It is considered the CSSR will contribute to the Best Council Plan 2017-18 in terms of its priorities for Good Growth, Health & Wellbeing, Resilient Communities, Better Lives for People with Care & Support Needs and Low Carbon. Further details are set out in the report to Development Plan Panel of 19th December 2017

4.4 Resources and value for money

- 4.4.1 The cost of preparation of the CSSR will be met from existing budgets.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- 4.5.1 The preparation of the CSSR as a development plan document is in compliance with the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 (as amended).
- 4.5.2 As a development plan document the CSSR falls within the Council’s budget and policy framework and as such, will be referred by Executive Board to the relevant Scrutiny Board for consultation. .

4.6 Risk Management

- 4.6.1 The Government is currently in the process of reviewing national planning policy concerning housing matters. A Housing White Paper was published in February 2017 followed by a consultation paper in September 2017(‘planning for the right homes in the right places’) which included proposals on how local housing requirements should be calculated. Consequent, national planning policy in respect of housing issues is in the process of a dynamic period of change. There is a risk that changes to national policy expected to be confirmed in April 2018 could make the CSSR Publication Draft

proposals out of line with national policy. To reduce this risk officers have tried to anticipate the direction of travel as closely as possible, as a basis to 'future proof the document'. If this does happen, the Council will have a further opportunity to bring the CSSR back to accord with national policy in the Submission Draft of the Plan which is anticipated to be prepared in Summer 2018.

5 Conclusions

5.1 The issues raised by 19th December 2017 DPP have been addressed with the outcome that further changes are proposed concerning policies on affordable housing (H5), minimum space standards (H9), green space (G4) and electric vehicle charging infrastructure (EN8). The changes are set out in Appendix 1.

6 Recommendations

6.1 Development Plan Panel is invited to:

- i) consider the Policies and supporting paragraphs of the CSSR as set out in Appendix 1 which includes revisions requested at the Development Plan Panel meeting of 19th December 2017,
- ii) recommend to Executive Board that it approves for public consultation the Publication Draft of new and revised Policies and supporting paragraphs of the CSSR as set out in Appendix 1, subject to any further changes agreed at the Panel meeting.
- iii) recommend to Executive Board that it approves the supporting documents, including Sustainability Appraisal and other background evidence

7 Appendices

Appendix 1 – Proposed Publication Draft Policies with Revisions
Appendix 2 – Report to Development Plan Panel of 19th December 2017

8 Background Papers¹

(2017) Draft Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy, Leeds City Council

¹ All documents available from <http://www.leeds.gov.uk/council/Pages/Core-Strategy-Review.aspx>

Appendix 1

Core Strategy Selective Review Publication Draft

Proposed Policy and Paragraph Changes to the Adopted Leeds Core Strategy 2014

[Revisions from Development Plan Panel 19/12/17 shown as additions in text with grey background and deletions as strikethrough text]

Policy SP6: Review of Leeds' Housing Requirement

[The following text will replace section 4.6 of the Core Strategy 2014]

4.6. Housing Development

- 4.6.1. It is anticipated that the population of Leeds will rise from 755,136 in 2010 to 860,618 in 2028. This raises major challenges for Leeds in seeking to meet the complex demographic needs of the existing population, together with the implications of an ageing and growing population over the Plan period. It is important that planning for such growth forms part of an overall strategy, which gives emphasis not only to a sufficient housing land supply in appropriate locations but also the quality, type and affordability of homes in meeting local needs. This needs to be achieved within an overall framework, which gives priority to delivering sustainable development, promoting regeneration and job growth, whilst maintaining local character, distinctiveness and environmental quality.
- 4.6.2. Within this context, the following Housing growth principles are established.
- i. Ensure housing growth is linked to the creation of sustainable neighbourhoods throughout the City (see Spatial Policy SP1),
 - ii. Set a realistic target for the delivery of new homes (see Spatial Policy SP6),
 - iii. Ensure housing growth targets reflect local housing needs, now and in the future, in terms of tenure, type and size, (see Spatial Policy SP6 and Policy H4),
 - iv. Enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities through the design and standard of new homes (see Policies H9, H10, P10 and EN2),
 - v. Facilitate the development of brownfield and regeneration sites, (see Spatial Policies 1, 3 and 6),
 - vi. Agree a range of mechanisms to deliver additional affordable homes, (see Policy H5),
 - vii. Work in partnership to find ways to facilitate housing growth (see Section 6 Implementation and Delivery)
- 4.6.3. Spatial Policy 6 sets out the housing requirement for Leeds over the period 2017 – 2033. The requirement draws upon evidence of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2017 and Government consultation paper “Building the Right Homes in the Right Places”. The policy will be implemented through the identification of land supply in the Site Allocations Plan and a Housing Implementation Strategy.
- 4.6.4. The net requirement of 51,952 dwellings is converted to a gross requirement by taking account of the anticipated loss of dwellings over the plan period, estimated as 150 dwellings per annum based on recent trends of demolition in Leeds. To account for demolitions and other dwelling losses of 150 dwellings per annum (2,400 over the plan period) the gross housing requirement for the plan period of 2017 – 2033 is 53,856 dwellings.
- 4.6.5. As a large post-industrial city Leeds will continue to experience continual urban regeneration and renaissance involving the recycling of previously developed land (PDL) for windfall housing and other uses. Leeds has a long and well

recorded history of windfall housing being delivered as a source of land for development. This has been continuously monitored by the City Council since the 1980s. There is no evidence to change the allowance of 500 dwellings per annum set out in the original Core Strategy; the equivalent of 8,000 dwellings over the plan-period. This stock of supply reduces the level of land to identify from 53,856 dwellings (gross) to 45,856 dwellings (gross).

SPATIAL POLICY 6: THE HOUSING REQUIREMENT AND ALLOCATION OF HOUSING LAND

The provision of 51,952 (net) new dwellings will be accommodated between 2017 and 2033, with a target that 3,247 dwellings per year should be delivered.

Delivery of 500 dwellings per annum (8,000 over the plan period) is anticipated on small and unidentified sites.

Guided by the Settlement Hierarchy, the Council will identify 45,856 dwellings (gross) to support the distribution in Spatial Policy 7, using the following considerations:

- i. Sustainable locations (which meet standards of public transport accessibility – see the Well Connected City chapter), supported by existing or access to new local facilities and services, (including Educational and Health Infrastructure),
- ii. Preference for brownfield and regeneration sites,
- iii. The least impact on Green Belt purposes,
- iv. Opportunities to reinforce or enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities through the design and standard of new homes,
- v. The need for realistic lead-in-times and build-out-rates for housing construction,
- vi. The least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, green space and nature conservation,
- vii. Generally avoiding or mitigating areas of flood risk.

Distribution of Housing Land

4.6.6. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2017 shows there are unmet housing needs for affordable housing and for a range of types and sizes of market dwellings in all parts of Leeds. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2017 shows that Leeds has a large stock of brownfield housing sites within the Main Urban Area. However, in providing a choice and competition in the market for land and to meet local needs throughout the District the delivery of the spatial strategy of the Core Strategy will depend upon having a wide portfolio of sites in different housing markets.

4.6.7. Policy SP7 provides an indication of the overall scale and distribution of development that will need to be planned for (combining information from the

SHMA and SHLAA) in different Housing Market Characteristic Areas. The percentage figures in the second column, are intended as a guide rather than rigid targets. These areas were agreed through the SHMA 2011 and reflect functional submarkets. The distribution reflects the quantum of housing growth that accord with the housing growth principles and overall spatial strategy (the focus upon opportunities within the Settlement Hierarchy) and the potential availability of suitable sites (derived from the SHLAA). Areas with the highest potential include the City Centre, Inner Areas, North Leeds and East Leeds where opportunities for development of previously developed land and regeneration are greatest. Major growth can also be accommodated in the outer areas of Outer South East and Outer South West including a combination of previously developed land opportunities in the Major Settlements but urban extensions too. These provide sustainable locations in terms of public transport connections, proximity to jobs and avoidance of special landscape. The other areas provide opportunity for modest growth, including urban extensions where appropriate.

SPATIAL POLICY 7: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING LAND AND ALLOCATIONS

The distribution of housing (excluding windfall) will be planned based on Housing Market Characteristic Areas as follows:

Housing Market Characteristic Area	Percentage
Aireborough	3%
City Centre	15.5%
East Leeds	17%
Inner Area	15%
North Leeds	9%
Outer North East	8%
Outer North West	3%
Outer South	4%
Outer South East	7%
Outer South West	11%
Outer West	7%

Policy H5: Review of Affordable Housing Policy

[The following text will replace paragraphs 5.2.12 – 5.2.17 of the Core Strategy 2014]

H5 Affordable Housing

5.2.12 In conformity with national planning guidance, affordable housing will be required to meet local needs informed by the Leeds Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA 2017) and the Economic Viability Study 2017.

5.2.13 The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2017) identifies an annual need of 1230 affordable housing dwellings across Leeds. It also suggests that 67.2% of affordable dwellings are needed for affordable or social rent (as defined in the NPPF), and 32.8% are needed for intermediate tenures as defined in the NPPF. Policy H5 translates this need into requirements for affordable housing that have been viability tested. Targets are set for provision of affordable housing in the 4 affordable zones with a mix of affordable types relating to low earnings of households.

5.2.14 The 40% and 60% requirement for a mix of Intermediate and Social Rented affordable to include affordable) dwellings (as defined by the NPPF), means that developers are expected to provide a mix of affordable dwellings that will be affordable to households on low and very low earnings or income. Social Rented (as defined by the NPPF) is the label for types of affordable housing typically rented by registered providers which is affordable to very low earning and low income households. Intermediate affordable housing sits between the price of market housing and the price of social rented affordable housing. Typically intermediate affordable housing will include shared ownership and other discounted sale products. The City Council calculates benchmark prices to establish the price at which Social Rented and Intermediate dwellings should be made available by developers. In practice this means that dwellings should be made available by developers to Registered Providers at prices which are affordable enough for households on these earnings: households on lower quartile earnings for Intermediate affordable housing; households on lower decile earnings for Social Rented affordable housing. Registered Providers are then expected to make the affordable dwellings available for the tenures expected.

5.2.15 For affordable dwellings to be suitably integrated throughout the development this means that the affordable dwellings ought to be mixed in with the corresponding size and type of market dwellings on a site. For example, in a development with a mix of houses and flats, the affordable provision should be partly mixed in with the houses and partly with the flats.

5.2.16 Build to rent developments in Leeds can either provide affordable housing on-site as advised in national guidance or in line with the first paragraphs of Policy H5. If developers prefer to pay a commuted sum in lieu of on-site provision, this should be calculated on the basis of paragraph 5.2.21. Regarding requirements in national guidance, consultation currently suggests 20% of total dwellings as “Affordable Private Rent” dwellings with rents to be 20% lower than market rents in the local area and agreement of eligibility criteria with secure arrangements that continue in perpetuity.

5.2.17 For development schemes led by Registered Providers for social housing the Council will take a flexible approach to determining the appropriate quantity and type of affordable housing taking into account the needs of the area and the wider benefits of development.

5.2.18 Purpose built student accommodation will not be required to provide affordable housing.

5.2.19 Secure arrangements in the form of S106 agreements, must be agreed to ensure delivery and that affordability embodied within affordable housing is maintained for future people of Leeds in housing need in perpetuity.

5.2.20 Applicants may choose to submit individual viability appraisals to verify that the affordable housing target cannot be met. In such cases, affordable housing provision may be reduced accordingly.

5.2.21 As a general principle, commuted sums should be calculated to ensure that the required quantity and type of affordable dwellings can be delivered in the locality of the development, assuming involvement of Registered Providers. This will be equivalent to the differential between affordable price and market price (free of restrictions) with adjustment for any locality delivery costs. Provision that results in 4 or less affordable dwellings may be converted into an equivalent financial contribution.

POLICY H5: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

~~The Council will seek affordable housing, either on-site, off-site or by financial contributions in lieu of on-site provision from~~

On developments of 10 or more new dwellings, affordable housing provision **should be provided** ~~will normally be expected~~ on-site at the target levels specified for developments in the following zones:

Zone	Target
1	35%
2	15%
3	5%
4	5%

The mix of affordable housing should be designed to meet the identified needs of households as follows;

- 40% affordable housing for Intermediate or equivalent affordable tenures
- 60% affordable housing for Social Rented or equivalent affordable tenures

The affordable units should be a pro-rata mix in terms of sizes and house types of the total housing provision, unless there are specific needs which indicate otherwise, and they should be suitably integrated throughout a development site.

Affordable housing provision should be on site, unless off site provision or a financial contribution can be robustly justified

Build-to-rent developments shall provide either:

- i) on-site, according to national policy advice, currently 20% Affordable Private Rent dwellings at 80% of local market rents administered by a management company with appropriate arrangements for identifying households in need, including city council nomination rights, which apply in perpetuity,
- ii) on-site, the percentage of affordable housing specified for zones 1-4 and mix of Intermediate and Social Rented types of affordable housing set out in the first paragraphs of the Policy above or
- iii) a commuted sum in lieu of on-site provision of affordable housing of option ii).

Policy H9: New Policy on Minimum Space Standards-Nationally Described Space Standard

[The text below should be inserted after Policy H8 of the Core Strategy 2014; paragraphs 5.2.41 – 5.2.60 under the heading “b Supporting Employment Opportunities” should be re-numbered to follow the paragraphs of Policy H10]

H9 Minimum Space standards for new dwellings

5.2.41 There has been growing concern that the internal space of new dwellings is getting smaller with implications for accessibility, for sustainability and for quality of life including health. This section seeks to improve the quality housing provided in Leeds to create a healthy and sustainable living environment for current and future generations.

5.2.42 Policy H9 covers internal space within new dwellings setting requirements for the Gross Internal (floor) Area of new dwellings at a defined level of occupancy as well as floor areas and dimensions for key parts of the home, notably bedrooms, storage and floor to ceiling height. These reflect exactly the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) of 2015.

5.2.43 The standard Gross Internal Areas set out in Policy H9 are organised by storey height to take account of the extra circulation space needed for stairs to upper floors, and deal separately with one storey dwellings (typically flats) and two and three storey dwellings (typically houses). These are set out in the table below.

5.2.44 Individual dwelling types are expressed with reference to the number of bedrooms (denoted as ‘b’) and the number of bedspaces (or people) that can be accommodated within these bedrooms (denoted as ‘p’). A three bedroom (3b) home with one double bedroom (providing two bed spaces) and two single bedrooms (each providing one bed space) is therefore described as 3b4p.

5.2.45 This allows for different combinations of single and double/twin bedrooms to be reflected in the minimum Gross Internal Area standards. The breakdown of the minimum Gross Internal Area therefore allows not only for the different combinations of bedroom size, but also for varying amounts of additional living, dining, kitchen and storage space; all of which are related to the potential occupancy.

5.2.46 Regarding development of Purpose Built Student Accommodation, the NDSS were not designed with student housing in mind. There are clear differences between student and general housing in that students live in student accommodation for only a fixed period of time, other accommodation (communal rooms) is often provided and there are no standards for dwellings with 7 or more bedrooms. Provision of reasonable space standards is still important for student accommodation, and this will need to be judged on a case by case basis, and via the application of any national standards that might be created in the future. Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) are not dwellings (class C3 of the use class order), so the space standards of Policy H9 will not apply to proposals for new HMOs. Nevertheless, it is reasonable for HMOs to provide adequate levels of amenity for residents in terms of space, light and ventilation. Further guidance will be provided through supplementary planning guidance.

POLICY H9 – MINIMUM SPACE STANDARDS

All new dwellings should comply with the following standards:

The standard requires that:

- a. the dwelling provides at least the gross internal floor area and built-in storage area set out in Table 1 below
- b. a dwelling with two or more bedspaces has at least one double (or twin) bedroom
- c. in order to provide one bedspace, a single bedroom has a floor area of at least 7.5m² and is at least 2.15m wide
- d. in order to provide two bedspaces, a double (or twin bedroom) has a floor area of at least 11.5m²
- e. one double (or twin bedroom) is at least 2.75m wide and every other double (or twin) bedroom is at least 2.55m wide
- f. any area with a headroom of less than 1.5m is not counted within the Gross Internal Area unless used solely for storage (if the area under the stairs is to be used for storage, assume a general floor area of 1m² within the Gross Internal Area)
- g. any other area that is used solely for storage and has a headroom of 900-1500mm (such as under eaves) is counted at 50% of its floor area, and any area lower than 900mm is not counted at all
- h. a built-in wardrobe counts towards the Gross Internal Area and bedroom floor area requirements, but should not reduce the effective width of the room below the minimum widths set out above. The built-in area in excess of 0.72m² in a double bedroom and 0.36m² in a single bedroom counts towards the built-in storage requirement
- i. the minimum floor to ceiling height is 2.3m for at least 75% of the Gross Internal Area

Minimum gross internal floor areas and storage (m²)

Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces	1 storey dwellings	2 storey dwellings	3 storey dwellings	Built-in storage
1b	1p	39 (37)2			1.0
	2p	50	58		1.5
2b	3p	61	70		2.0
	4p	70	79		
3b	4p	74	84	90	2.5
	5p	86	93	99	
	6p	95	102	108	
4b	5p	90	97	103	3.0
	6p	99	106	112	
	7p	108	115	121	
	8p	117	124	130	
5b	6p	103	110	116	3.5
	7p	112	119	125	
	8p	121	128	134	
6b	7p	116	123	129	4.0
	8p	125	132	138	

Development of student accommodation and houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) will not be subject to the space standards as set out in the Table above. Instead such development should reflect the NDSS with appropriate adjustments to address the particular characteristics of these types of development. They should also meet reasonable standards of general amenity for occupiers to include adequate space, light and ventilation. Further guidance will be provided through a Supplementary Planning Document.

Notes

- i. The Gross Internal Area of a dwelling is defined as the total floor space measured between the internal faces of perimeter walls that enclose the dwelling. This includes partitions, structural elements, cupboards, ducts, flights of stairs and voids above stairs. The Gross Internal Area should be measured and denoted in square metres (m²).
- ii. If the area under the stairs is to be used for storage, assume a general floor area of 1m² within the Gross Internal Area
- iii. Any other area that is used solely for storage and has a headroom of 900-1500mm (such as under eaves) is counted at 50% of its floor area, and any area lower than 900mm is not counted at all
- iv. Built-in wardrobes and en-suite bathrooms count towards the Gross Internal Area and bedroom floor area requirements, but should not reduce the effective width of the room below the minimum widths set out above. The built-in area in excess of 0.72m² in a double bedroom and 0.36m² in a single bedroom counts towards the built-in storage requirement
- v. The standards are organised by numbers of storeys to take account of extra circulation space needed for stairs between floors.

Policy H10: New Policy on Accessible Housing Standards

Accessible housing

5.2.48 Changes to national planning policy and the Building Regulations in 2015 enable Local Authorities to require the provision of accessible dwellings as part of new residential developments to meet the needs of residents. In Leeds there is an evidenced need for accessible housing, to provide housing suitable for disabled people, older people and families with young children. This need can be met by the provision of dwellings which meet the optional accessible housing standards provided in Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations.

5.2.49 The optional accessible housing standard M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' provides a higher level of accessibility and adaptability than standard dwellings (standard dwellings' are those which meet the requirements of M4(1)) of Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations). The optional accessible housing standard M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings' provides a standard for dwellings which are to be adaptable or accessible for wheelchair users.

5.2.50 15.8% of households in Leeds contain 1 or 2 members with a disability, 23.2% contain a member aged 65 years or over and 11.8% contain a child aged 4 years or younger, 3.3% of households contain a wheelchair user who requires adaptations to their home to ensure it is more accessible for them now or anticipate they will need adaptations in the next 5 years (SHMA Household Survey 2017). All of these residents could benefit from the design features of M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings, or M4(3) wheelchair user dwellings.

5.2.51 Under the Building Regulations the housing standards contained within Part M volume 1 only apply generally to new-build dwellings. The Building Regulations define student accommodation as hotel accommodation in relation to Part M, with accessible hotel accommodation being covered by Part M volume 2 of the Building Regulations. For this reason, planning policy requirements for accessible housing do not apply to propose built student accommodation.

5.2.52 M4(3) of Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations 'wheelchair user dwellings' provides 2 standards:

- wheelchair accessible dwellings, and
- wheelchair adaptable' dwellings.

Wheelchair accessible dwellings are homes which are readily usable by wheelchair users at the point of completion, and 'fully kitted out' with necessary fixtures and fittings. Wheelchair adaptable dwellings are homes that can be easily adapted to meet the needs of wheelchair users. National policy states that planning policy requirements for wheelchair accessible homes should only be applied to those dwellings where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling. Unless the Local Authority has this responsibility, wheelchair user dwellings required by this policy should be M4(3) wheelchair *adaptable* dwellings.

5.2.53 Where M4(2) and M4(3) dwellings are to be provided within the same block or share the same approach route, the approach route and block communal arrangements from the highest category of dwelling should be provided.

5.2.54 Where the size of development means that the percentage requirements for M4(2) or M4(3) dwellings generate less than 1 dwelling, if the figure generated is 0.5

of a dwelling or more this should be rounded up to 1 dwelling, if it is below 0.5 then the dwelling does not need to be provide.

5.2.55 To provide choice for people who require accessible housing, the breakdown of size, type and tenure of dwellings should reflect the breakdown of housing proposed overall as closely as possible, unless there is evidenced need for additional accessible housing in one particular tenure.

5.2.56 Whilst dwellings in accordance with the optional accessible housing standards should be agreed in terms of their size and form on submitted drawings, accessible housing should be secured via planning condition. This allows a building control body to check dwellings compliance against the provisions of the applicable optional building regulations standards.

5.2.57 Planning conditions should specify:

- Which and/ or how many dwellings/ plots within the development are required to satisfy M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings standards
- Which and/ or how many dwellings/ plots within the development are required to satisfy M4(3) wheelchair adaptable dwellings standards
- Which and/ or how many dwellings/ plots within the development are required to satisfy M4(3) wheelchair accessible dwellings standards

H10. ACCESSIBLE HOUSING STANDARDS

New build residential developments should include the following proportions of accessible dwellings:

- 30% of dwellings meet the requirements of M4(2) volume 1 of Part M of the Building Regulations 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'.
- 2 % dwellings meet the requirement of M4(3) of Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations 'wheelchair user dwellings', wheelchair adaptable or accessible dwellings.

Any requirement above 0.5 would require a single dwelling for both M4(2) and M4(3)

Where the scale of development would generate more than one accessible dwelling, the mix of sizes, types and tenures of accessible housing should reflect the mix of sizes, types and tenures of the development as a whole as closely as possible (unless there is evidenced need for additional accessible housing in one particular tenure).

The required number and mix of accessible dwellings should be clearly illustrated on drawings and via planning condition.

Policy G4: Review of Green Space in Residential Development Policy

[The text below should replace paragraphs 5.5.9 – 5.5.20 of the Core Strategy 2014. Policy G3 is retained; Policy G4 is being replaced with a new version; Policy G5 is amended for clarification only.]

Green Space

Introduction and Aims

5.5.9 The overall aim of the Core Strategy green space policies is to use the development process through the Local Plan to strategically deliver the best type and the best quality of green space to where it is most needed in Leeds.

Standards (Surplus and Deficiencies)

5.5.10 Leeds is a City which benefits from good overall provision of green space. However, this is not distributed evenly across the City and as a result, some areas have very little local green space and some of it is of a poor quality. Policy G3 sets standards for the quantity, accessibility and quality of green space to be expected in Leeds derived from evidence of Leeds' Open Space and Recreation Assessment. Whilst it is recognised that the existing urban form of Leeds offer limited scope to achieve all of the standards, particularly in the inner areas, the most needs to be made of the development opportunities that do arise to optimise quantity, accessibility and quality as appropriate.

[Nb Policy G3 is not part of the Selective Review. It is shown here to help understanding.]

POLICY G3: STANDARDS FOR OPEN SPACE, SPORT AND RECREATION

The following open space standards will be used to determine the adequacy of existing supply and appropriate provision of new open space:

Type	Quantity (per thousand people)	Accessibility	Quality*
Parks and gardens	1 hectare	720 metres	Good (7)
Outdoor sports provision	1.2 hectares (excludes education provision)	Tennis court 720 metres, bowling greens and grass playing pitches 3.2 km, athletics tracks, synthetic pitches 6.4 km	Good (7)
Amenity Green Space	0.45 hectares	480 metres	Good (7)
Children and Young People's equipped play facilities	2 facilities	720 metres	Good (7)
Allotments	0.24 hectares	960 metres	Good (7)
Natural green space	0.7 hectares main urban area and major settlements, 2 hectares other areas	720 metres and 2 km from site of 20 hectares	Good (7)
City Centre open space provision all types (including civic space)	0.41 hectares	720 metres	Good (7)

* Sites were scored out of 10. See the Leeds Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment for information about quality standards.

New Housing Development

5.5.11 People moving into in an area or general increases in population place a greater burden on existing green space. Therefore it is appropriate that new housing development makes provision to address this burden by

- providing green space on-site,
- providing green space off-site,
- providing commuted sums in lieu of on-site provision. Sums can be used to provide green space, to enhance existing green space or to improve connections to existing green space or
- a combination of these options.

The calculation of green space provision in Policy G4 is based upon a green space requirement for different sizes of dwellings. Where it is agreed that only part of this requirement is provided as new green space (on or off-site) the remainder should normally be provided as a commuted sum (see below for calculation).

Eligible Development

5.5.12 Green space will be sought from developments of 10 or more dwellings (class C3 of the Use Class Order). Residential institutions (Class C2 of the Use Class Order) will not be expected to provide green space. Any hybrid developments (sui generis mix of C2 and C3 use classes) will need to be judged on their merits.

Determining if on-site or off-site provision (including contributions) will be appropriate

5.5.13 Different parts of Leeds have different needs and opportunities for greenspace provision. Inner city areas often have the highest needs and the least opportunities for new provision. There will also be a number of individual site circumstances that will need to be considered in deciding when greenspace ought to be provided on-site or not.

5.5.14 Factors favouring on-site provision include:

- i) Local deficits of existing green space
- ii) Sufficiently large, suitably shaped and reasonably level sites to accommodate green space.
- iii) Distances from existing green spaces exceeding the standards of Policy G3. The quality of existing green space will also need to be taken into account.
- iv) Lack of other residential development sites nearby that could deliver green space
- v) The development generating a need for play facilities that does not currently exist in the locality
- vi) Potential to combine green space provision with requirements for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems

Provision of Green Space

5.5.15 Provision of new greenspace needs to be appropriate to the needs of the development and locality. The key consideration will be the surpluses and/or deficiencies of different types of green space in the local area. The standards of Policy G3 including accessibility distances can be used identify particular deficiencies applicable to each development site and this can help determine what types of green space ought to be provided.

5.5.16 Determining the appropriate location of green space within a development will be a matter for discussion depending on the circumstances of the locality, site and development proposed. Aggregated, fragmented spaces, scattered across development sites will not be acceptable due to their limited functionality. However, it is recognised that there is a role for smaller areas of green space like 'pocket parks' in densely developed areas, subject to suitable management arrangements being in place.

5.5.17 It is important that any new green space of any typology is planned, situated and designed to make a positive contribution to the overall design concept and character of development.

5.5.18 As the green space requirement is expressed as an amount of green space per dwelling, high density developments (65dph (net)) usually found in or on the edge of town centres may generate requirements for greenspace that cannot be delivered on-site. For such schemes an expected level of 20% of green space should be provided on-site with the residual being provided off-site or in the form of a commuted sum. However, it is accepted that there may be particular site circumstances to justify a higher or lower quantity than 20% on-site.

5.5.19 Any provision of new green space will need to be accompanied by appropriate arrangements to secure the on-going maintenance of the space. Where the City Council is asked to adopt spaces, a financial contribution will be required to cover maintenance. Where independent or private arrangements are to be used the Council will need to be satisfied that these are robust, efficacious and legally enforceable. In particular the Council will need to be satisfied as to the quality of the maintenance and that any legacy arrangements associated with the private company passing on their obligations or becoming insolvent do not result in the Council accepting the extra maintenance cost burden.

5.5.20 Where new green space is provided it should be openly accessible to the public. Exceptions may be for operational reasons such as security of allotments or membership of sports clubs.

5.5.21 Where a need for play facilities is identified careful consideration should be given to safety and security issues. If security cannot be ensured through appropriate

siting of play facilities, it may be appropriate to seek a different type of greenspace irrespective of need.

5.5.22 Some forms of green space suffer in terms of usability due to poor drainage (for example sports pitches). Any new green space should have acceptable and appropriate levels of sustainable drainage.

5.5.23 Where green space provision is to be accepted off-site it needs to be reasonably related to the development. In most cases this should mean within the accessibility distances specified in Policy G3, but exceptions could include sites connected by high frequency public transport corridors or green space additions to City Parks or strategic facilities that would be used by residents of the development.

Financial Contributions

5.5.24 As an alternative to provision of green space, financial contributions may (where appropriate and in compliance with the policy) help meet the demands of new residents on existing green spaces. Leeds has calculated green space contributions in the same way for many years based on the costs of laying out space, maintenance and a factor for the expected number of children in a development:

- Agreeing the quantity of the green space requirement that will be converted into a commuted sum, ie the remainder not delivered on-site or off-site.
- Laying out costs. Standard laying out costs for Green Space.
- The established practice is to add a per-child contribution factor, of which ten percent will be required for flats and 62% for houses (thus 10%/62% of number of flats/houses multiplied by per-child contribution amount).
- A 10 year maintenance sum for the relevant quantity of green space.
- A maintenance cost for on-site play space if other arrangements are not made.
- All of the above will be adjusted annually using a SPONS index figure.

The Council will provide a detailed calculation on its website updated annually with the latest SPONS figures. If green space is to be laid out by the developer for adoption by the city council, a 10 year maintenance sum should be calculated.

5.5.25 As long as national planning policy specifies that not more than 5 S106 contributions can be pooled toward particular projects, it will be necessary for planning obligations to be specific about the greenspace improvement that is to be made. Leeds City Council, having regard to local need and opinion, will advise developers what greenspace improvement (including improving access to greenspace) projects require funding. Schemes must be reasonably related to the development site; in most cases this should mean within the accessibility distances specified in Policy G3, but exceptions could include schemes connected by high frequency public transport corridors or improvements to City Parks or strategic facilities that would be used by residents of the development.

POLICY G4: GREEN SPACE IMPROVEMENT AND NEW GREEN SPACE PROVISION

New-build Residential developments of 10 dwellings or more will be expected to provide the following quantities of on site green space per residential unit or where this quantity of green space is unachievable or inappropriate on-site, equivalent off-site provision, financial contribution or combinations thereof should be sought:

1 bedroom dwelling	23sqm
2 bedroom dwelling	33sqm
3 bedroom dwelling	44sqm
4 bedroom dwelling	54sqm
5 or more bedroom dwelling	66sqm
Student bedspaces	18sqm

In determining whether this quantity of provision should be delivered on-site, off-site or as a commuted sum, consideration of the circumstances set out in paragraph 5.5.14 will indicate whether green space should be provided on-site.

~~If~~ Where the factors of paragraph 5.5.4 expect green space is to be provided on site.

- a) The *type* of green space provided should be decided taking account of the following factors:
 - i) Calculations of local surplus and deficiency
 - ii) Mix of dwellings and need for play facilities
 - iii) Practicality of on-site delivery
 - iv) Policy & proposals of an applicable Neighbourhood Plan
- b) Arrangements for on-going maintenance must be agreed
- c) Green space should be accessible to members of the public
- d) Green space should positively contribute to the overall design and character of development (see para. 5.5.17)

If off-site financial contributions are to be accepted the core components of the calculation are as follows:

- The costs of laying out space
- Maintenance (general and play facilities) and
- A per-child factor
(see paragraph 5.5.23 above)

Financial contributions will be used effectively to meet local needs for greenspace.

Policy G5; OPEN SPACE PROVISION IN THE CITY CENTRE

[A minor amendment in italics is proposed to G5 regarding on-site commuted sums in lieu. This amendment creates greater flexibility in the allocation of contributions to priority open space City Centre schemes.]

POLICY G5: OPEN SPACE PROVISION IN THE CITY CENTRE

...

In areas of adequate open space supply or where it can be demonstrated that not all the required on site delivery of open space can be achieved due to site specific issues, *contributions in lieu of provision will be required towards identified open space and public realm projects.*

**Policy G6 PROTECTION AND REDEVELOPMENT OF
EXISTING GREEN SPACE**

[A minor amendment in italics is proposed to G6 to continue the protection of pedestrian corridors in the City Centre protected in the UDP.]

POLICY G6: PROTECTION AND REDEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING GREEN SPACE

Green space (including open space *and pedestrian corridors* in the City Centre) will be protected from development unless one of the following criteria is met:

- (i) There is an adequate supply of accessible green space/open space within the analysis area and the development site offers no potential for use as an alternative deficient open space type, as illustrated in the Leeds Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment, or,
- (ii) The green space/open space is replaced by an area of at least equal size, accessibility and quality in the same locality; or
- (iii) Where supported by evidence and in the delivery of wider planning benefits, redevelopment proposals demonstrate a clear relationship to improvements of existing green space quality in the same locality.

**Policy EN1 Review of Policy to reflect Written
Ministerial Statement of 25th March 2015**

[The text below will replace paragraphs 5.5.31 – 5.5.38 of the Core Strategy 2014]

Energy and Natural Resources

Climate Change

5.5.31 The Climate Change Act 2008 established a new approach to managing and responding to climate change in the UK. The Act created a legally binding target to reduce the UK's emissions of greenhouse gases to at least 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. This is delivered through a series of five year 'carbon budgets', designed to ensure that the Council make steady progress towards this long term target. A carbon budget is a cap on the total quantity of greenhouse gas emissions emitted in the UK over a specified time. Under a system of carbon budgets, every tonne of greenhouse gas emitted between now and 2050 will count. Where emissions rise in one sector, corresponding falls in another sector will have to be achieved.

5.5.32 In May 2009, the Government introduced legislation creating the first three legally binding carbon budgets. The budgets are 2008-2012 (22% reduction in CO₂ emissions below 1990 levels), 2013-2017 (28% reduction) and 2018-2022 (34% reduction).

5.5.33 These carbon budgets, whilst owned and delivered at a national level, will have a profound effect on all activities at a local level. Policy tools and financial incentives have been put in place to drive down emissions from transport, housing and business across the country. As Leeds is forecast to grow both in terms of housing numbers and new business premises, it is particularly important to ensure that these are as close to zero emission as possible, as soon as possible, to avoid the need for deeper cuts in other sectors.

5.5.34 The Leeds Climate Change Strategy (2009) was developed through the Leeds Initiative in partnership with the public, private and third sector. This contains a target to reduce emissions from Leeds by 80% between 1990 and 2050. In 2016 the Council adopted a further target to reduce emissions by 60% between 2005 and 2030. In 2015 the City reduced emissions by 32.4%. Leeds is a growing City and all new development that is not carbon neutral adds to total emissions from Leeds (both on site emissions and emissions associated with transport). Therefore, there is a strong policy imperative to constrain emissions from all development as soon as possible.

5.5.35 The Core Strategy climate change policies are designed so that new development contributes to our ambitious carbon reduction targets. However, the Council aim to do this in a flexible way that supports developers to achieve carbon reductions at lowest cost and in a way that benefits future building occupants. Building Regulations set a minimum energy efficiency standard applicable to all buildings, and in order to keep on track to achieve the 2050 target, the Government have indicated that they will increase this standard over the next decade. Developers currently have to demonstrate that proposed developments are within the Target Emissions Rate,

however the Government policy is on emphasis on consistent, national building regulations as the mechanism for promoting low and zero carbon homes. Local planning authorities should balance the need for national consistency with the spirit of the localism agenda to reflect local socio-economic and environmental factors. Therefore the Council is seeking 10% of the energy needs of new development to come from renewable or low carbon energy sources. This will also help to reduce fuel bills, improve business competitiveness and create jobs in the energy service sectors.

5.5.36 For non-residential development, the Council is seeking a 20% improvement in carbon emissions beyond the building regulations standard. Economies of scale mean that energy efficiency measures are less costly on larger developments so the policies are only applied to 'major development.' Policy EN1 is highly flexible, allowing developers to choose the most appropriate and cost effective carbon reduction solution for their site. Developers are however, encouraged to take a 'fabric first' approach and, over time, supplement this with increasing use of heat networks and low/zero carbon technologies. The cost implications of installing carbon reduction measures are much lower when included in a new building than when they are retrofitted. Ambitions for an energy efficiency policy for residential development are set out in the Planning and Energy Act 2008 and Building Regulations.

5.5.37 The term in the policy "where feasible" means that where it is not technically possible to include low carbon or renewable energy measures, or if the measures would be harmful to heritage objectives, then the policy requirements will not be sought.

POLICY EN1: CLIMATE CHANGE – CARBON DIOXIDE REDUCTION

All developments of 10 dwellings or more, or over 1,000 square metres of floorspace, (including conversion) where feasible, will be required to provide a minimum of 10% of the predicted energy needs of the development from low carbon or renewable energy.

All non-residential developments of over 1,000 square metres of floorspace, (including conversion) where feasible, will be required to reduce total predicted carbon dioxide emissions to achieve 20% less than the Building Regulations Target Emission Rate.

If it can be demonstrated that renewable or low carbon energy generation is not practical, it may be acceptable to provide in lieu of provision, a contribution equivalent to the cost of providing the 10%, which the council will use towards off-site low carbon schemes. Wherever possible, the low carbon projects would be linked with local projects that would bring local benefits.

Applicants will be required to submit an Energy Assessment (EA) with their application based on expected end user requirements to demonstrate compliance with this Policy. Where end user requirements change significantly, an updated EA should be submitted prior to construction.

**Policy EN2 Review of Policy to reflect Written
Ministerial Statement of 25th March 2015**

Sustainable Design and Construction

5.5.37 The Vision for Leeds (2011–2030), City Priority Plan (2011–2015) and Council Business Plan (2011-2015), commit the City as a whole and the Council specifically, to make Leeds a lower carbon City. City carbon reduction targets are to reduce CO₂ emissions by 40% between 2005 and 2020. At the same time climate change adaptation needs to be addressed systematically and progressively in regard to the built environment and development across the City. To ensure there is a consistent approach to development improvements the Building Research Establishment's (BRE) approach has been identified as an independent and systematic methodology based on a robust environmental weighting system that covers a wide range of sustainable construction issues yet allows flexibility in relation to site and developer options for non-residential development. For residential development, requirements for energy efficiency are contained within the Building Regulations.

5.5.38 The Council will require developers to apply the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM), to major non-residential development in the District. As the additional costs of attaining improved sustainable construction outcomes are best met by economies of scale, this requirement applies only to major development of over 1,000 square metres. In cases involving conversions, refitting, refurbishment, and historic buildings, a pragmatic approach will be taken with the expectation that the BRE methodology will still be applied, with agreed areas of lower achievement if shown to be appropriate. The BRE methodology allows for flexibility across a wide range of environmental areas, and consistently improves key environmental issues, covering improvements to; energy and CO₂ emissions, water use, materials, surface water run-off, waste, pollution, health and well-being, management and ecological value. For residential development, requirements for energy efficiency are contained within the Building Regulations.

5.5.39 The term in the policy “where feasible” means that where it is not technically possible to meet the standard or if it would be harmful to heritage objectives then the policy requirements will not be sought.

POLICY EN2: SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

Non-residential developments of 1,000 or more square metres (including conversion) where feasible are required to meet the BREEAM standard of 'excellent'.

Residential developments of 10 or more dwellings (including conversion) where feasible are required to meet a water standard of 110 litres per person per day.

Policy EN8: New Policy on Electric Vehicle Charging

[The text below will be inserted after Policy EN7: Minerals of the Core Strategy 2014]

Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

5.5.63 Air quality has become a major area of concern in Leeds. The 2008 Ambient Air Quality Directive (Directive 2008/50/EC) sets legally binding limits for concentrations in outdoor air of major air pollutants that impact public health such as particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) and nitrogen dioxide (NO2). This is also transposed into the UK Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010. Leeds was identified in December 2015 by DEFRA as one of six locations in England that is not expected to meet air quality standards by 2020.

5.5.64 Air quality problems in the district are mainly attributable to transport and this means that it is necessary for Leeds to implement measures to ensure a reduction in transport emissions. Planning policy has a key role to play in this through a number of policies and mechanisms that interact together, including the appropriate location of development according to a settlement hierarchy. This includes the inclusion of a choice of sustainable means of travel, so that people are encouraged to choose other means of travel than the private car and through the provision of a network of green infrastructure that can help to mitigate poor air quality. However, given the need for action now to prevent air pollution becoming worse, it is necessary to increase provision of EVCPs in new homes and all other premises. **These requirements will be monitored and the policy may be updated accordingly as new technologies emerge.**

EN8: ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE

All applications for new development which include provision of parking spaces will be required to meet the minimum standard of provision of electric vehicle charging points. This requires:

Residential: 1 charging point per dedicated parking space and where parking spaces are unallocated (for example visitor parking) 1 charging point per 10 spaces

In addition:

Office/Retail/Industrial/Education: charging points for 10% of parking spaces ensuring that electricity infrastructure is sufficient to enable further points to be added at a later stage.

Motorway Service Stations: charging points for 10% of parking spaces

Petrol Filling Stations: provision of fast charge facilities where feasible.

This page is intentionally left blank



Report authors: Robin Coghlan /
Martin Elliot

Tel: 0113 378 7635

Report of Director of City Development

Report to Development Plan Panel

Date: 19th December 2017

Subject: Core Strategy Selective Review (Publication Draft)

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

1. This report sets out the proposed policies for the Core Strategy Selective Review (CSSR) covering the housing requirement for a new plan period of 2017 – 2033, updating affordable and green space policies, introducing new policies on housing standards (size and accessibility) and updating the sustainable construction Policies EN1 and EN2 to reflect national advice.
2. Public consultation took place June-July 2017 on the scope of the CSSR. As a result of that, the scope has been extended to cover related areas, namely housing distribution, City Centre green space and electric vehicle charging points.
3. Issues raised at the workshop for Members of Development Plan Panel held on 4th October have been helpful in framing the policies and the supporting text.

Recommendations

4. Development Plan Panel is invited to:
 - i) consider the Policies and supporting paragraphs of the CSSR as set out in **Appendix 1**,
 - ii) recommend to Executive Board that it approves for public consultation the Publication Draft of new and revised Policies and supporting paragraphs of the

CSSR as set out in **Appendix 1**, subject to any further changes agreed at the panel meeting.

- iii) recommend to Executive Board that it approves the supporting documents, including Sustainability Appraisal and other background evidence.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 Following initial public consultation and further technical work, the focus of this report is for the Development Plan Panel to consider the Publication draft policies for the Core Strategy Selective Review (CSSR) and request that Development Plan Panel recommends that Executive Board approve the formal Publication of these policies for six weeks of public consultation.
- 1.2 The policies are supported by a Sustainability Appraisal Report alongside relevant supporting material including:
- Statement of Regulation 18 Consultation
 - Consultation Strategy
 - Duty to Cooperate Table
- 1.3 The Plan is also supported by an evidence base which includes:
- Economic Viability Study 2017 (Executive Summary)
 - Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2017
 - Monitoring information
 - Background Papers

2 Background

- 2.1 The Leeds Core Strategy was Adopted in 2014 and sets the strategic planning framework for the Leeds Metropolitan District and is the overarching document within the Leeds Local Plan (which also comprises an Adopted Natural Resources and Waste Plan and an Adopted Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan). The highly advanced Site Allocations Plan will on Adoption also form part of the Local Plan. The planning system in England and Wales is “plan-led” which means that an up to date and Adopted Plan is necessary to promote good growth and investment whilst ensuring that speculative and inappropriate development can be resisted.

Development Plan Panel Resolutions

- 2.2 In November 2016 Panel resolved to recommend to Executive Board to commence a Selective Review of the Core Strategy and agreed the targeted scope of the Review focussing on: updating the housing requirement for a revised plan period of 2017 – 2033, updating affordable and green space policies, introducing new policies on housing standards (size and accessibility) and updating the sustainable construction Policies EN1 and EN2 to reflect national advice. Executive Board resolved to undertake a selective review of the Core Strategy in February 2017.
- 2.3 In September 2016 Panel resolved to note the consultation responses on the initial consultation, the findings of the SHMA (2017), the need for viability testing of alternative policies and to hold a workshop with Panel Members on policy development.
- 2.4 A workshop with Development Plan Panel Members was held on 4th October which considered issues and options relating to the new and revised CSSR Policies. Members resolved to note the outcomes of the workshop at the Panel meeting on 3rd

November 2016.

- 2.5 At its meeting on 21st November 2016 Panel Members resolved to support a housing requirement target figure of 3,247 (annual) / 51,952 (Plan period figure) as the recommended approach.
- 2.6 As a result of feedback from public consultation on the scope of the CSSR, Government priorities and in response to policy implementation issues, the review is proposed to be broadened to include consideration of Policy SP7 (distribution of housing allocations), and a new policy to require provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Points in new development. In addition a minor amendment is proposed to policy G5 on City Centre open space and policy G6
- 2.7 The indicative timetable set out in the Local Development Scheme and agreed by Executive Board in February 2017 envisaged that formal consultation on a Publication Draft would take place between December 2017 and January 2018. This has now been deferred to February to March 2018 and has the benefit of avoiding the Christmas and New Year holiday period.

Site Allocations Plan

- 2.8 Members will be well aware that the Site Allocations Plan (SAP) is currently being examined by Government appointed Inspectors, with Stage 1 Hearing sessions held in October. The SAP has been in preparation since 2013 and subject of four periods of public consultation. The SAP Inspectors have clarified that they are assessing the Plan against the Adopted Core Strategy (CS). However, previous reports to Development Plan Panel have set out that the SAP remains at Examination whilst undergoing specific amendments to Green Belt land release, which will be subject to public consultation between January and March 2018. This is because the context around lower housing needs, than those set out in the Adopted CS, has changed to such an extent (brought into focus by the recent Government consultation “Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places”, September 2017) that further technical work was considered necessary. As a result of the amendments the SAP will be complementary to the CSSR.

3 Main issues

- 3.1 The purpose of the Leeds Core Strategy Selective Review (CSSR) is to introduce revised policies, considered to be necessary, to respond to changes in the evidence base, shifts in National Policy and guidance and/or which raise implementation issues. As was made clear through consultation on the scope of the CSSR, it is not the purpose of the review to re-open discussion about other parts of the Leeds Adopted Core Strategy (CS), which remain in place as part of the statutory plan for Leeds.
- 3.2 The individual policy areas are set out in turn below, with a brief introduction explaining the reasons for the revised approach, the consultation responses received from scoping stage, options for policy development and the proposed revised approach. The proposed Policies are set out in **Appendix 1**.

The Housing Requirement for 2017 - 2033

- 3.3 The Adopted CS was prepared between 2008 and 2013 with Examination by a Government Inspector in 2013 and Adoption in 2014. The CS housing requirement of 70,000 (net) homes between 2012 and 2028 was established through a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2011), which was based on the Office of National Statistics (ONS) 2008-based sub-national population and household projections. At the time of submission the housing requirement was at the lower end of scenarios, reflecting a balance between homes and jobs that, as a result of this balance, was lower than the baseline household projections of 90,428 homes. The national statistics changed at a late stage of CS preparation. The CS Inspector invited further consideration of the housing requirement in light of new partial Government household projections released post-submission. Having considered the up to date evidence from all sides on this, he concluded that the Adopted Core Strategy housing requirement of 70,000 (net) homes was sound and in line with the government ambitions to significantly boost the delivery of housing in paragraph 47 of the NPPF. The Inspector considered that the requirement was likely to be achieved once the economy picked up, but accepted that, in light of new demographics, it was now set at the upper end of likely scenarios.
- 3.4 The CS Inspector's hopes that the national and local economy would swiftly recover from recession and support delivery of 70,000 (net) new homes and a return to the demographic drivers, which supported the projections at the time, have not happened and the CS annual targets have not been met since 2012 with average delivery of 2,765 homes per annum. Global and national macro-economic factors have been key drivers of the delivery rates in Leeds: the slow recovery from recession (shared with other Core Cities outside of the south east), the impacts of the uncertainties around the mortgage market review in 2015, uncertainties of Greece's position in the Eurozone and the Brexit referendum in 2016, have all had an impact on housebuilding activity.
- 3.5 It is noted that throughout this period the supply of land, which is in the control of the local authority, has not been constrained. The Council's monitoring reveals that outstanding planning permissions have remained at a ratio of 7 permissions for every house built. In 2016/17 6,792 new homes were approved which is more than any year since 2007/08. Moreover, the Council took steps to improve the greenfield mix in the land supply in Leeds through proactive releases of greenfield land to maintain choice and competition in the market for land and seek to boost the supply of housing.
- 3.6 Since the CS was adopted Office of National Statistics (ONS) projections in every release since have shown lower and slower growth when compared to the 2008-based projections upon which the CS was based. This has been reflected in an up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 158 & 159). The SHMA shows that the supply side messages of lower and slower growth are matched by demand side evidence. The Government's 2017 consultation on housing needs ("*Planning for the right homes in the right places*") has also been considered by the Council. The SHMA may be updated to reflect this.
- 3.7 Policy SP6 and supporting paragraphs 4.6.1 – 4.6.12 are proposed to be replaced with the text set out in **Appendix 1**. The main changes to the policy arise from new

evidence. The section of the policy which addresses criteria for land release is considered to remain in line with the Adopted CS and national guidance and is therefore unchanged. The evidence for setting the housing requirement comes from the SHMA 2017 which makes a thorough analysis of Leeds' housing needs, starting with the official ONS projections and making adjustments to reflect local evidence on population and employment growth as well as affordable housing needs, commuting and local household size assumptions.

3.8 Four scenarios are considered to form reasonable alternatives within a range of between 2,648 to 3,783 dwellings per annum / 42,384 to 60,528 dwellings over the plan period:

- A balance between jobs and homes which reflects the economic ambitions of the authority (as supported by evidence in the Regional Econometric Model (REM)¹¹ 2017) and the specific needs for affordable housing. Known as the “REM 2017” alternative in the SHMA, it has an annual dwelling need of 3,478 dwellings per annum (55,648 (net) dwellings over the plan period)
- A balance between jobs and homes which reflects the economic ambitions of the authority (as supported by evidence in the Regional Econometric Model 2017) and the specific needs for affordable housing but does not account for pre-recession rates of household formation. Known as the “SHMA adjustment” scenario, it has an annual dwelling need of 3,247 dwellings per annum (51,952 (net) dwellings over the plan period)
- A balance between jobs and homes which reflects optimistic high performing economic ambitions (as suggested by evidence in the Regional Econometric Model 2017 and higher level scenarios in the Leeds Growth Strategy) and the specific needs for affordable housing and as well as an uplift to account for pre-recession rates of household formation. Known as the “REM High Growth” alternative in the SHMA, it has an annual dwelling need of 3,783 dwellings per annum (60,528 (net) dwellings over the plan period).
- A reflection of the latest population and household projections plus an uplift for affordable housing, but not accounting for a balance between homes and jobs. Known as the “DCLG consultation” scenario it has an annual dwelling figure of 2,649 dwellings per annum (42,384 (net) dwellings over the plan period).

3.9 At its meeting on 21st November 2016 Panel Members resolved to support the “SHMA adjustment” scenario as the recommended approach.

3.10 Responses to the scoping consultation were overwhelming of the view that a review of the housing requirement is necessary given changes to the underlying evidence base. The development industry pointed out that the housing requirement should match economic ambition and that the SHMA should consider household formation

¹¹ A key intelligence resource which monitors and estimates future performance in 30 economic sectors in Leeds on the basis of local and national indicators. The REM is maintained by the Regional Economic Intelligence Unit and ensures a co-ordinated approach to the use of economic information across the West Yorkshire Combined Authority. It estimates the level of job growth that will be required to support the local economy in the long term, which in turn helps determine the homes needed to accommodate economic in-migrants.

rates, market sensitivities and affordable housing. The SHMA does this and the SHMA scenarios above are clearly linked to job growth and evidence on household formation. Consultants have also carried out their own analyses pointing to higher numbers on the basis of factors such as longer term migration patterns. These are not considered to be a reasonable alternatives because they are not in line with the on-line PPG nor the consultation draft DCLG consultation. Nonetheless a higher economic growth scenario ("REM High Growth") has been considered as an alternative (see the Sustainability Appraisal in **Appendix 2**). There are concerns that too optimistic a view of economic growth or similarly, of migration patterns, which then fail to materialise could lead to more land release for housing than is necessary. This in turn would lead to more pressure on greenfield sites and Green Belt release in the outer areas of Leeds, which would harm the spatial strategy of the CS and the NPPF.

- 3.11 At the Member workshop some Members felt the housing requirement should be as low as possible, i.e. 2,649 (42,384). It was suggested that this would be an easily achievable minimum with potential to exceed provision. Other Members felt 42,384 would be too low and could be damaging to Leeds's economic growth prospects and ability to meet housing needs, especially for affordable housing. There was also concern expressed that a long term housing requirement needs to take into account the quality of the existing stock of housing and the need for local people to have options to move to new housing. Members were concerned that too high a housing requirement would see a repeat of the past 5 years whereby there has been a loss of control over the release of land in the right places, chiefly as a result of the operation of the five year housing land supply.
- 3.12 Members views are that the five year housing land supply punishes the authority despite the efforts made on planning permissions, greenfield release and promotion and stimulation of brownfield land. This issue is compounded by the attitudes of some agents in the local development industry who argue for strong and optimistic growth drivers to be considered at the plan making stage and then subsequently argue that sites are undeliverable at the implementation stage; thus creating a target that is impossible to reach and a "planning by appeal" culture which uses the five year land supply as a tool for inappropriate development. This is not the manner in which the City Council wishes to responsibly plan for its housing needs.
- 3.13 The Best Council Plan sets an objective for good growth in the right place and the right type. There is a need to move forward in the CSSR with a managed approach to housing delivery which is rightly ambitious (given the position of Leeds within the sub-regional economy) but is deliverable and meets the needs of all local people and local communities. The recommended policies are considered to provide this.
- 3.14 Taking all this into account, at its meeting on 21st November Development Plan Panel specifically considered the housing requirement figure and endorsed the "SHMA adjustment" scenario. **Appendix 1** therefore sets out a revised CSSR policy for an annual dwelling need of 3,247 dwellings per annum (51,952 (net) dwellings over the plan period).
- 3.15 It should be noted that a further adjustment to take account of future demolitions is required to convert the figure to a gross housing requirement. Officers suggest this should be 150 dwellings p.a. which is lower than the 250 dwellings p.a. in the adopted Core Strategy. A reduction is justified given the reduced rate of public money for

significant demolition programmes and is in line with monitoring since 2012.

- 3.16 To identify and allocate sites for the supply of housing national guidance suggests that an evidenced windfall allowance can be deducted from the housing requirement. A windfall allowance of 500 dwellings p.a. was agreed in the adopted Core Strategy and on the basis of continued monitoring this figure remains supported and is not subject to revisions in this CSSR. Therefore, 8,000 dwellings which will be delivered on smaller sites (below 0.4ha or 5 dwellings) can be counted towards the requirement for the plan period and thus lower the amount of land required to be allocated.
- 3.17 At the meeting on 21st November the issue was raised as to whether the windfall allowance should be increased to account for land over 0.4ha, which arises throughout the plan-period. Inevitably given the nature of Leeds as a Metropolitan Authority such land will come forward, especially from former employment sites and via permitted development rights allowing changes of use to residential uses from a range of employment and commercial uses. However the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) carried out on an annual basis is a comprehensive stock of all sites with potential for housing; therefore the potential for sites to come forward outside this assessment is minimal. Moreover, sites which are unidentified at the current time and come forward through permitted development do not provide a conclusive forward projection over a plan period (particularly due to the limited timeframes for permitted developments).
- 3.18 The Housing Background Paper provides further explanation of how the housing requirement has been proposed.

Housing Distribution

- 3.19 Policy SP7 of the Adopted CS divides the previous total dwelling supply for allocation (66,000 dwellings) into different geographical areas. It sets out the strategic distribution of the overall housing requirement based on the attributes of places, local character, housing needs, land supply and investment in infrastructure. To that end, the policy sets out the number and percentages of dwellings that should be allocated in different parts of the Settlement Hierarchy (City Centre, Main Urban Area, Major Settlements and Smaller Settlements) and in the different Housing Market Characteristic Areas (HMCAs).
- 3.20 Paragraphs 4.6.13 – 4.6.17 of the Core Strategy 2014 are proposed to be replaced with paragraph 4.6.6 and 4.6.7 set out in **Appendix 1**. Parts of Policy SP7 are proposed for deletion, leaving only the percentage targets for the HMCAs.
- 3.21 If Policy SP7 were not amended as part of the CSSR, the numbers of dwellings for the different geographical areas would not reflect the new housing requirement. Keeping the percentages alone would work with the new housing requirement. However, the percentages for the Settlement Hierarchy including percentages for infill and urban extensions will no longer be achievable with the lower housing requirement and may not serve any beneficial planning purpose. In contrast, the percentages for the HMCAs will largely be achievable with the lower housing requirement. Keeping the HMCA percentage targets of SP7 would concur with the wider spatial strategy of the Core Strategy as expressed in the Vision and Policy SP1. This can be summarised as a balanced provision of brownfield and greenfield (Vision paragraph

3.2), sustainable growth related to the Settlement Hierarchy with the scale of growth reflecting the size, function and sustainability of the settlement (Spatial Policy 1) and selective use of Green Belt land where this provides the most sustainable option. A balanced mix of sites including green field and brownfield is part of that strategy. A good geographic spread of sites associated with settlements of the Settlement Hierarchy will help secure delivery of housing to meet the varied needs of Leeds residents. Keeping the HMCA percentage targets would also concur with the conclusion of the Member workshop that it would be appropriate to keep the HMCAs as a means for securing a balanced distribution of the housing supply.

- 3.22 At the 4th October workshop a request was made for HMCA boundaries to be ironed out. It was highlighted that there are instances where a detailed boundary bears no relationship to actual residential areas and the natural understanding of community areas. Officer advice is that whilst there may be anomalies on the ground these HMCAs were set independently by the SHMA 2011 taking into account views on housing markets not local community areas or feelings of local identity. They are strategic and their boundaries based on super output areas² so as to help data collection. It is therefore perhaps inevitable that local people may consider that they are better placed within a neighbouring HMCA. It is proposed that a review of the boundaries does not form a part of the CSSR. The benefits of boundary changes to reflect local perceptions will need to be balanced against the benefit of the current HMCAs conforming entirely to the boundaries of census output areas which enables more robust statistical evaluation and evidence gathering. It is also a concern of officers that it will not be possible to constrain a review of HMCA boundaries to focus on minor “anomalies”. There would be calls for more fundamental changes to the HMCA boundaries which would slow the process down for little strategic gain. It should also be noted that the HMCA boundaries have been used to set the context for allocations in the SAP, however any re-drawing of boundaries would not remove a need to identify specific parcels of land for housing, which have been assessed through the SAP process as being developable or deliverable – it would simply add to neighbouring HMCA requirements.

Viability Assessment

- 3.23 As discussed at the Member workshop there are choices which need to be made in terms of the policies. The viability of individual policies must be considered at a single policy level and also at a cumulative level. There are choices in terms of the policy ask, for example an increase in affordable housing targets would have a knock on impact of a reduction in other policies, for example for the Housing Standards which are proposed as part of this Core Strategy Selective Review. The EVS has provided an evidence base in informing these policy choices. The results show that the cumulative effect of all of the policies set out in the CSSR are viable at a strategic level. To seek an increase in any policy targets or requirements would have an impact in terms of viability which would in turn likely impact on the delivery of that or another policy requirement. The results of the Economic Viability Study (EVS) were not available for the Member workshop although it was reported that there has been a slight uplift in the overall strength of the housing market in Leeds this overlays some

² Super output areas are small scale geographies for the purposes of census gathering that seek to have a consistent population in each; therefore rural output areas can often be anomalous to real world features and geographies.

local disparities. However there have also been increases in CIL rates as a result of indexation which is applied on an annual basis and changes to affordable housing benchmarks which have absorbed some of this uplift.

Affordable Housing

- 3.24 Policy H5 and supporting paragraphs 5.2.12 to 5.2.17, is proposed to be updated with paragraphs 5.2.12 – 5.2.21 set out in **Appendix 1**. A map of affordable housing zones is included in **Appendix 3**. The evidence base for affordable housing is the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2017, and the Economic Viability Study (EVS) update (November 2017). The reason for the update to the policy is to reflect changes in national policy since the adoption of the Core Strategy and to also update the policy in terms of evidence presented in the SHMA 2017, and the EVS update (November 2017).
- 3.25 Results of the SHMA show that there is a need for 1,230 affordable dwellings per annum in Leeds. These are needed in all four Affordable Housing Zones (See **Appendix 3**). The annual need for affordable dwellings is as follows: Outer North Zone 1: 120, Outer South Zone 2: 794, Inner Zone 3: 168, City Centre Zone 4: 148. Based on the anticipated housing supply annualised in these zones, percentages targets for affordable housing in excess of 35% can be justified on the grounds of need, but viability testing including other planning requirements means that lower targets are set. It indicates that approximately two thirds of the affordable dwellings required need to be of Social Rented tenure and one third Intermediate Tenure. The SHMA 2017 has evidence of sizes and types of affordable housing needed including in different zones. Therefore the established practice of seeking a pro-rata mix of affordable dwellings to match the overall mix of dwellings is recommended to continue.
- 3.26 The EVS Update (2017) has also tested affordable housing targets in combination with the other Core Strategy policies and their cumulative impact. As such it is proposed to retain affordable housing targets as they are.
- 3.27 Established practice is not to apply affordable housing policy to development of student accommodation and it is proposed to continue this approach. Since the adoption of the Core Strategy national guidance has introduced changes in relation to the threshold for affordable housing and the vacant building credit. The Core Strategy was adopted on 12th November 2014. Since that time on 28th November 2014, DCLG published the outcome of its consultation paper 'Planning Performance and Planning Obligations' this introduced a national threshold for affordable housing and developer contributions. This set out that contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floor space of 1,000 square metres.. In effect this means the existing thresholds set out in the policy cannot be applied and it is proposed to delete the requirement for contributions in such circumstances, from the policy as it cannot be applied.
- 3.28 At the workshop some Members requested simple definitions be included which can be understood by a layperson; hence the policy is proposed to be reworded to make it more legible. It is proposed to elevate the use of the following simple terms:

- Social Rented to represent the type of affordable housing typically rented by registered providers which is affordable to low income households
- Intermediate to represent types of affordable housing that sits between the price of market housing and the price of social rented affordable housing. Typically intermediate affordable housing will include shared ownership and other discounted sale products.

3.29 These two headline types of affordable housing will still relate to the income standards established in the Core Strategy adopted 2014. These are standards of dwellings being affordable to actual household earnings cohorts in Leeds: Social Rented represents dwellings affordable for households on lower decile earnings; Intermediate represents dwellings affordable for households on lower quartile earnings.

3.30 The Housing White Paper (Feb 2017) anticipates national planning policy insisting upon at least 10% of housing development dwellings to be for home ownership, including “Starter Homes, but no mandatory requirement for starter homes (paragraphs 4.17 & A124). Starter Homes are defined as dwellings sold at 80% of market value with a salary cap of £80,000 for eligible households. However, current indications from Government consultation on planning policy suggest there will not be a requirement for local authorities to accept provision of Starter Homes as a type of affordable housing, only a requirement for home ownership types of affordable housing. Home ownership types of affordable housing would fall within the “Intermediate” category of affordable housing that forms part of the proposed H5 policy.

3.31 The SHMA 2017 gives strong evidence for two thirds of affordable dwellings to be for Social Rented or equivalent affordable tenures. This provides the basis for requiring 60% of affordable dwellings to be this tenure, which is more genuinely affordable for households in need in Leeds.

3.32 Regarding build-to-rent developments the Government consulted on ideas to support build-to-rent developments between February and May 2017. It suggested “Affordable Private Rent” as a new category of affordable housing which would be appropriate provision in build-for-rent schemes; rents should be 20% lower than market rents in the local area and eligibility criteria should apply to include nomination rights. Affordable private rent arrangements should continue in perpetuity. Therefore, build to rent developments in Leeds will be treated differently from build for sale.

3.33 The AMR monitors affordable housing provision on an annual basis to include provision secured via S106 planning obligations and will continue to monitor affordable housing provision.

Green Space – Policy G4

3.34 An analysis of planning permissions given since adoption of the Core Strategy in November 2014 found that green space is not being delivered on-site as expected by Policy G4. The findings of the EVS suggest that no more than 40sqm of green space per dwelling should be sought across the District. This means that high, medium and

low density schemes will be able to meet the requirement and remain viable. Whilst it might be expected that large low density schemes might be able to provide more green space particularly in the higher value areas, the EVS concludes this is unachievable at the current time given the other policy requirements including a 35% requirement for affordable housing. The proposed green space policy has also been tested by number of bedrooms; such an approach would be more equitable whereby schemes with a larger number of bedrooms would provide more green space and those with fewer bedrooms would provide less green space.

- 3.35 A conclusion of the Member workshop was that different parts of Leeds require different green space solutions and that policy needs to be responsive: on-site provision in some cases; money to improve existing spaces in others.
- 3.36 As part of the update of the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 123 List, it is proposed that Green Space be removed from the list (although the possibility to retain "Strategic Green Space" will be investigated), in order to make S106 contributions for green space a completely legitimate option free from potential challenges of "double dipping". It is on this basis that the new Policy G4 is reworded, which will allow the Council to be more responsive to local circumstances in determining the green space requirements of individual developments.
- 3.37 The Member workshop emphasised the importance of securing the future maintenance of any green space that is provided by third parties. The new supporting text of the new Policy draws attention to the need for the Council to be satisfied with the robustness and enforceability of private arrangements and avoid situations where maintenance mechanisms / funding is not secured such that the City Council is forced undertake the maintenance and associated costs of it.

City Centre Green Space - Policy G5

- 3.38 A minor amendment is proposed to Policy G5, regarding on-site contributions in lieu. This amendment supports flexibility in the delivery of open space in the city centre by not limiting contributions solely to the delivery of the City Park or pedestrian enhancements, but rather recognises that open space may be delivered in other areas and in other ways subject to priorities.

Green space Policy G6

- 3.39 It has become apparent that some of the City Centre pedestrian corridors protected under Policy N1 of the UDP as shown on UDP Inset Map II have not been carried over into the civic and open space identified in the Site Allocations Plan. Many of these omitted pedestrian corridor designations have important roles in connecting civic and open spaces and providing local amenity. Therefore, it is considered that they need to be protected just like the civic and open spaces themselves and it is proposed to insert the wording "pedestrian corridors" into the opening sentence of Policy G6: "Green space (including open space *and pedestrian corridors* in the City Centre) will be protected from development unless...." They can then be shown on the Policies Map alongside the civic and open spaces identified in the Site Allocations Plan.

Space Standards

- 3.40 Government policy allows local authorities to adopt the space standards as nationally defined (Nationally Described Space Standards – NDSS) provided it can be shown there is a need for them, provided they would not make residential development unviable and provided they would not undermine housing supply. Leeds has shown through a measuring exercise of dwellings permitted over recent years there is a need for the standards. The Royal Institute of British Architects provide a useful study of the need for better sized dwellings in England as a whole “The Case for Space, RIBA 2011”. In terms of impact on housing supply as a result of adopting the NDSS, research by DCLG ‘The Housing Standards Review’ by EC Harris concludes that on average 4 to 8 sqm floorspace per dwelling will be required to apply the NDSS.
- 3.41 The effect of the NDSS has been included in the Economic Viability Study with the conclusion that most residential development in Leeds will remain viable subject to the proposals for policy on affordable housing, green space and accessible housing standards set out in this report being applied.
- 3.42 The Member workshop discussed whether any types of development should be exempt from NDSS. It is proposed that Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) should be exempt from NDSS because the NDSS are not designed to cover student accommodation. It is proposed that Supplementary Planning Guidance will be prepared to advise upon amenity standards for purpose built student accommodation.
- 3.43 Work on developing the policy on space standards has revealed a vacuum with regard to standards for HMOs. Whilst it is not appropriate to apply the NDSS to HMOs, it is proposed that Policy H9 includes a requirement for the development of HMOs to provide sufficient amenity for occupiers in terms of space, natural light and ventilation. Further guidance on what this means can be included in a Supplementary Planning Document at a later date. All other residential development should meet the standards.

Access Standards

- 3.44 The new policy requires new residential development to provide two types of accessible accommodation defined in Building Regulations: M4(2) a general level of accessibility roughly equivalent to the old “lifetime homes” standard and M4(3) wheelchair accessible dwellings (that can be “accessible” or “adaptable”). Different percentages of accessible accommodation were viability tested with the conclusion that developments should make 30% of all dwellings accessible to M4(2) standards and 2% of dwellings accessible to M4(3) adaptable standards. A need for at least this level of accessible accommodation has been demonstrated by evidence of the SHMA 2017, including the household survey and by the CSSR Accessible Housing background paper.
- 3.45 All types of new build development providing dwellings should provide the accessible dwellings with the exception of Purpose Built Student Accommodation which has standards set under a different part of the Building Regulations.

Policies EN1, EN2 and new policy on Electric Vehicle Charging Points

- 3.46 When originally included in the adopted Core Strategy in 2014, Policies EN1 and EN2 expected development to be designed to exceed sustainable construction and CO2 reduction standards set in Building Regulations. However, a written ministerial statement (WMS) released by the Government in 2015 reduced the role of town planning in setting these standards and placed reliance upon Building Regulations. At the same time the Code for Sustainable Development (which applied to residential development) was replaced by a new set of Building Regulation standards. However, the WMS made special provision for local authorities who already had policies such as EN1 and EN2 prior to the changes. This allowed planning policy concerning residential development to continue to seek higher standards for renewable energy and water consumption. After publication of the WMS, Leeds set out revised policy for EN1 and EN2 as a separate downloadable document on the LCC webpage for the Core Strategy. The aim of this was to reflect the up to date position as a result of national changes. The CSSR provides opportunity to incorporate these changes into the Core Strategy itself. The requirements for non-residential development of Policies EN1 and EN2 remain unchanged.
- 3.47 Some consultation responses suggested that the scope of the CSSR should be extended to address air quality. The issue of air quality has also become one of national importance over the last year, with a number of cities, including Leeds, experiencing air quality below European standards. Planning policy on air quality is already provided in the Natural Resources and Waste Local Plan and it is not therefore necessary to include it in the CSSR. The Parking SPD adopted January 2016, encourages developers to provide electric vehicle charging points in new developments. However, including a new policy in the CSSR will enable clear policy requirements for provision of points to be set out. The cost of electric vehicle charging points for residential development as proposed in new Policy EN8 has been assessed in the EVS and found viable.

Public Consultation Suggestions for Policy Review not included

- 3.48 As reported to Development Plan Panel of 5th September 2017, the main representations relating to additional matters for review, but which are not being included in the Publication Draft include the following:
- Review the need for employment land up to 2033.
 - Review strategic Green Belt
 - Review green, social and community infrastructure to support communities where housing growth is proposed
 - Review transport infrastructure and transport priorities
 - Review of housing site release policy H1 and housing mix policy H4.
- 3.49 This is a selective review of the Core Strategy and focuses on specific policy areas which are in need of review at this time. However it is also recognised that a more comprehensive review will be required in the future which addresses all wider policy areas given the Core Strategy was adopted in November 2014. A subsequent further review of the Core Strategy could update employment land policy.
- 3.50 A strategic review of the Green Belt is considered unnecessary because Policy SP10

of the Core Strategy limited the focus of a Green Belt review to that only being necessary to accommodate housing and employment growth to land associated with the Settlement Hierarchy.

- 3.51 A review of infrastructure necessary to support housing and employment allocations is already taking place as part of the Site Allocations Plan. The CSSR is not proposing any policy that would increase the demands on infrastructure; the proposed reduction in the housing requirement will reduce the demand on infrastructure.
- 3.52 Policy H1 concerns the phased release of housing allocations and gives priority to certain locations and types of land in preference to others. Whilst the CSSR is proposing a lower housing requirement, it is considered that there is still a need to phase the release of housing land in order to promote regeneration and use of previously developed land.
- 3.53 Policy H4 advises on the mix of dwelling sizes (by numbers of bedrooms) and dwelling types (by houses and apartments) in new development. The policy requires that developments should provide an appropriate mix of dwellings to address needs measured over the long term and taking account of local circumstances. The SHMA 2017 provides helpful new detailed evidence which can be used to apply the existing policy. Hence it is not considered necessary to review Policy H4, although further guidance, such as a Supplementary Planning Document, could be explored in the future.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 3.54 The aim of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to assess the potential environmental, economic and social impact of the revised policies of the CSSR. The appraisal should ensure that the CSSR, contributes towards achieving sustainable development and highlight any mitigation which is necessary to ensure that policies are sustainable. The Council uses an SA framework for its Local Plan documents, which is updated at the individual plan-making stage to take account of shifts in baseline information, relevant plans, programmes and policies and monitoring information.
- 3.55 At the initial stage of plan preparation which involved public consultation in June-July 2017, a SA Scoping Report for the CSSR was prepared and sent to the three statutory consultees – Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England for comment. They have been supportive of proposals to revise the SA framework, which includes recasting the sustainability objectives and drafting a clearer set of decision making criteria. In turn this has enabled use of a systematic scoring process within a database framework. The suggestions of the consultees have been incorporated into the SA process and report.
- 3.56 The SA framework has been updated and all the policy proposals in **Appendix 1** have been appraised, along with reasonable policy alternatives (which includes a “do nothing” option or responds to suggestions by consultees e.g. for higher or lower options). The results of the sustainability appraisal are set out in the SA Report, which is available as an on-line background document. A non-technical summary of this report is available at **Appendix 2** to this report and includes a summary of the framework alongside details of the appraisals undertaken and associated

commentary. Given the scale and complexity of the SA Report it is not available at agenda dispatch but will be made available prior to the Panel meeting.

Public Consultation Strategy for the Publication Draft

- 3.57 Broadly in line with the timetable agreed for the CSSR by Executive Board in February 2017 it is proposed that, subject to Executive Board approval in February 2018, the period of consultation be from February 9th to March 23rd 2018.
- 3.58 The proposed consultation activities in line with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement, will comprise of the following:
- Website with all documents available to download
 - E-mail notifications to the same list of people and organisations used for the Regulation 18 consultation plus any additional respondents.
 - Press release
 - Statutory Notice in the local newspaper
 - Social media campaign
 - One drop-in-session aimed at community groups to be advertised to be held in the City Centre
 - One drop-in-session aimed at the development industry

Duty to Cooperate

- 3.59 The preparation of development plan documents is subject to the statutory duty to cooperate in order to assess impacts of proposed plan policies on neighbouring local authorities and other prescribed bodies such as Highways England. The Council services a regular meeting of the Leeds City Region Strategic Planning Duty to Cooperate (LCRSPDtC) Group which forms part of the framework of groups under the Combined Authority Portfolio Holders board. At the LCRSPDtC meeting of 25th July 2017, Leeds City Council reported the proposals for the Core Strategy Selective Review, including presentation of the DtC Table of Issues and Impacts, the formal Regulation 18 consultation period for comments, the results of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment in framing a new housing requirement for Leeds and evidence of need for Gypsy and Traveller site provision. No particular concerns about impacts on other local authorities were raised, although there is a general interest in the proposed change to the housing requirement.
- 3.60 It is proposed to re-circulate the DtC Table of Issues and Impacts updated according to the Publication Plan proposals in order to thoroughly appraise any issues raised by the proposed policy changes to the CSSR. This accords with the standard process for raising Duty to Co-operate issues. The Dtc Table will be circulated to the next LCRSPDtC group meeting for comment. Based on feedback from the meeting of 25th July it is not anticipated that any serious concerns will be raised about impacts from the proposed CSSR policy changes.

Next Steps / Timetable

- 3.61 Following consideration of consultation representations arising from the Publication Draft consultation it remains the intention to submit the Plan to the Secretary of State in Summer 2018 subject to further consideration by Panel, Executive Board and

Council. This would then enable, subject to the availability of the Inspectorate, an Examination before the end of the year and Adoption late 2018 / early 2019.

Relationship with the Site Allocations Plan

- 3.62 The NPPF states in paragraph 216 that *“From the day of publication, decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to: the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given); the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).”* This means that from February 2018 the housing requirement will be a material consideration to be used in the determination of planning applications.
- 3.63 This will chiefly have the effect of enabling the Council to more robustly defend speculative development proposals outside of the adopted or emerging Plan by virtue of an improved five year housing land supply picture. The adopted Core Strategy, CSSR and the SAP are complementary. To that end, a lower housing trajectory has been reflected as part of the Council’s technical work on the SAP.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1.1 Preparation of development plan documents, including the selective review of the Core Strategy is subject to the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 which require a minimum level of public consultation as well as compliance with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement. The consultation on the scope of the review was carried out for 6 weeks from 19th June until 31st July 2017. It involved notifying statutory consultees, neighbouring local authorities and people / organisations who had commented on the original Core Strategy. A consultation statement set out the proposed scope of the selective review and invited representations on the topics proposed and on whether other parts of the Core Strategy should be reviewed and why. Details were provided on the Council website and in Libraries and One Stop Shops were notified.
- 4.1.2 An explanation of the proposed consultation for the Publication Draft is set out at section 3.56 above.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

- 4.2.1 Equality diversity, cohesion and integration has been an integral part of the formulation of policies of the Core Strategy Selective Review. Equality Impact Assessment screenings will be undertaken at key stages of the process to ensure that policies are embedded in equality considerations.

4.3 Council policies and Best Council Plan

- 4.3.1 The Best Council Plan 2017-18 is relevant in terms of its priorities for Good Growth, Health & Wellbeing, Resilient Communities, Better Lives for People with Care &

Support Needs and Low Carbon. The quantity of homes that Leeds plans for will have ramifications for economic growth, but also meeting needs of a growing population. The CSSR will also provide the ability to improve the range and quality of dwellings delivered to ensure the needs of particular groups such as the elderly are met, and that health and wellbeing of residents is improved. Proposed Policy H10 (Accessible Housing Standards) should be of particular benefit to households with mobility issues including the elderly. In terms of public health and wellbeing, there are important linkages between the proposed revised and new Policies set out in the CSSR and the Council's priorities. Improved Space and Access Standards, the provision of Affordable Housing (in meeting housing needs), together with the protection and provision of green space make an important contribution to local amenity and quality of life across the District. It should be noted also, in terms of facilitation the delivery of the Local Plan, infrastructure Delivery Plans (IDPs) are in place to provide a framework to capture planned and proposed infrastructure to support the District's ambitions and a framework to engage with a wide range of infrastructure and service providers (Health, Public Transport and Education).

4.4 Resources and value for money

4.4.1 The cost of preparation of the CSSR will be met from existing budgets.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

4.5.1 The preparation of the CSSR as a development plan document is in compliance with the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 (as amended).

4.5.2 As a development plan document the CSSR falls within the Council's budget and policy framework and as such, will be referred by Executive Board to the relevant Scrutiny Board for consultation. .

4.6 Risk Management

4.6.1 The Government is currently in the process of reviewing national planning policy concerning housing matters. A Housing White Paper was published in February 2017 followed by a consultation paper in September 2017('planning for the right homes in the right places') which included proposals on how local housing requirements should be calculated. Consequent, national planning policy in respect of housing issues is in the process of a dynamic period of change. There is a risk that changes to national policy expected to be confirmed in April 2018 could make the CSSR Publication Draft proposals out of line with national policy. To reduce this risk officers have tried to anticipate the direction of travel as closely as possible, as a basis to 'future proof the document'. If this does happen, , the Council will have a further opportunity to bring the CSSR back to accord with national policy in the Submission Draft of the Plan which is anticipated to be prepared in Summer 2018.

5 Conclusions

5.1 The proposed new housing requirement is considerably lower than the requirement adopted in the Core Strategy 2014 but is nevertheless appropriately pitched in

response to up to date evidence to address the population and economic growth forecast in the SHMA 2017.

- 5.2 It is considered that the proposed policies and supporting text set out in **Appendix 1** would optimise the policy requirements which have a cumulative impact on viability of residential development. The Economic Viability Study shows that there is sufficient cumulative viability to support the proposed policies to incorporate new housing space and accessibility standards, but no capacity to increase affordable housing targets, it further concludes that the current green space requirement needs to be reduced as was anticipated. The CSSR also provides the opportunity to clarify the policies to make them more effective and easier to use.

6 Recommendations

- i) consider the Policies and supporting paragraphs of the CSSR as set out in **Appendix 1**,
- ii) recommend to Executive Board that it approves for public consultation the Publication Draft of new and revised Policies and supporting paragraphs of the CSSR as set out in **Appendix 1**, subject to any further changes agreed at the panel meeting
- iii) recommend to Executive Board that it approves the supporting documents, including Sustainability Appraisal and other background evidence.

7 Appendices

Appendix 1 – Proposed Publication Draft Policies

Appendix 2 – Draft Sustainability Appraisal Non-Technical Summary (**to follow**)

Appendix 3 – Map of Affordable Housing Zones

8 Background Papers³

(2017) Draft Economic Viability Study, GVA

(2017) Draft Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Edge Analytics and ARC4

(2017) Draft Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy, Leeds City Council (**to follow**)

³ All documents available from <http://www.leeds.gov.uk/council/Pages/Core-Strategy-Review.aspx>

This page is intentionally left blank