

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

EAST & SOUTH EAST LEEDS AREA ACTION PLAN

LCC RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE “ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS” CONSULTATION

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The EASEL AAP "Alternative Options – Looking to the Future" went out for public consultation in summer 2006. A report setting out details of the programme of consultation and the responses received was published and placed on the City Council's website www.leeds.gov.uk/ldf.
- 1.2 This report provides the City Council's responses to some of the key issues raised. Many of the comments received from the letters, questionnaires and drop-in events/galas duplicated one another, comments from local residents have therefore been collated and condensed in the following tables. Comments from statutory, key consultees and developers have been identified separately.
- 1.3 The condensed comments in the tables below have been divided into the following themes:
- Housing
 - Remodelling
 - Employment/ Training/ Education
 - Mixed Use
 - Retail/ Health/ Community Uses
 - Leisure & Recreation
 - Openspace
 - Transport
 - Design and Sustainability
 - Delivery and Implementation
 - General issues
 - Boundary issues
- 1.4 The Council has aimed to respond to the comments and has, where appropriate, indicated where the Preferred Options pick up particular issues. Where this is the case, no further explanations have been given in the tables below as further detail is covered in the Preferred Options document. In some instances, the Council's response is simply an acknowledgement that the issues raised will be picked up in the process of drawing up the "Preferred Options" into the Area Action Plan.

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

Housing

| Representor (where relevant) | Comments | LCC Response |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Local residents Healthy Living | Residents want the opportunity to buy houses at realistic prices. | AAP will give guidance on the need for a full range of market housing including the provision of low cost housing. |
| Local residents Healthy Living | Concern about rent costs – Housing Association rent costs considered to be too high. The rent levels should not be significantly higher/increased. | Social housing provided by registered social landlords which contributes to the degree of quantity and choice within the market. Housing Association rents are set nationally by the Housing Corporation. |
| Local residents | Questions raised on the rights to be re-housed. | One of the most sensitive issues within EASEL is the potential demolition of properties. Leeds City Council is committed to meeting the re-housing needs of all residents whose homes are to be demolished and assisting them in moving elsewhere within EASEL or the Leeds district and ensuring that they receive an appropriate level of financial compensation. A range of options will be available to residents whose homes may be demolished. A specific team will help and support residents who are required to move to alternative accommodation. |
| Local residents | Should smaller windfall sites, such as the Fforde Green pub and Harehills Middle School be shown on the Option plans? | The AAP adopts a minimum size criteria of 0.2ha – below this size sites are too small to be easily identified in plan form. However, all sites contribute towards overall housing and employment supply figures. |
| Local residents | The plans needs to set out a strategy for terrace properties. The Victorian terraces in Harehills are part of the area's charm – should not knock down too many | Priority Areas for Improvement are identified in the Preferred Option. Area appraisals will be carried out within these areas. |
| Local residents | Waterloo Sidings housing allocation is currently a wildlife haven and should not be developed. | The principle of development was established through the Unitary Development Plan (UDP).The site is a Leeds Nature Area and development would need to take account of this status. |
| Local residents | Naseby Grange tower block is presently | Naseby Grange lies in M25 mixed use site. Detailed masterplanning will be |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| | undergoing a programme of investment/refurbishment i.e. new kitchens and bathrooms and therefore should not be considered for redevelopment. | required to establish which properties are proposed to be demolished based upon assessment of sustainability, viability and comprehensive development considerations. |
| Local residents | How many demolitions will there be under each option? | Only broad indications can be provided for each option. Actual figures can only be established through detailed masterplanning. |
| Local residents | What is meant by affordable housing? | A definition of affordable housing will be provided in the glossary of the Preferred Options. |
| Local residents | We need more rented secure accommodation for the elderly. | This will be addressed through the Regeneration Initiative. |
| Local residents | What provision will there be for private housing for young people? | Developers are expected to make provision for a full range of housing types and needs, including the provision of low cost housing to enable people to enter the housing market. This will be informed by a Housing Market Assessment (HMA). |
| Local residents | Why is site H72 being proposed for housing- it's greenspace and it's the only place our children have to play. | Osmondthorpe Rec. Has been deleted from "potential housing areas" in recognition of amenity value and potential for further facilities. |
| Local residents | More controls needed over private landlords in terms of maintaining properties and gardens | The Council has introduced measures to control landlords in Harehills. |
| Local residents | Where are people who need council housing supposed to go when the council houses are sold/cleared? It is not reasonable to expect all of them to go into part ownership schemes etc. Some people will always require support | The Council is committed to rehousing residents who require social housing. Affordable housing will form part of redevelopment and be informed by a HMA. |
| Local residents | Existing housing to the west of Ironwood Approach, Seacroft is not included in an area of potential new housing even though it is probably in a worse condition than the adjacent housing area which is (Option 3). | This housing is more sustainable than adjacent properties. |
| Local residents | How can shared ownership be affordable – you have to pay both a mortgage and rent? | The AAP will give guidance on the need for a full range of housing including the provision of market housing, equity shared and shared |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | ownership. Shared Ownership is one option to increase the degree of affordability and choice within the market. |
| Local residents | When will the first sites be developed? We need some new housing in the area and better facilities, especially a new doctor's surgery. | The first sites will be developed in autumn 2007 and built over a 5 year programme. Discussion is taking place with PCT with regard to provision of a surgery in Gipton. |
| Local residents | People should not be displaced away from their communities and should be provided with good quality homes | The Council is committed to assisting people to remain within their community and ensuring properties meet decency standards. |
| Local residents | The redevelopment of Lincoln Green is crucial. This area has a large proportion of asylum seekers and they deserve good housing just as much as local people | Policies to address the needs of the whole community will be addressed in the AAP and EASEL Initiative. |
| Local residents | There is nothing in the proposals which will benefit residents in and around Hovingham Avenue | The AAP and EASEL Initiative has to concentrate on areas of greatest need in terms of neighbourhood characteristics and housing condition, however, Neighbourhood Plans will identify detailed issues within each of the communities. |
| Local residents | New houses need to be on good public transport routes | See transport section |
| Local residents | New housing should not be "mixed". This doesn't work. New housing should provide either affordable homes or private homes or pockets of more expensive homes. | The Government has outlined objectives to create mixed and inclusive communities that offer a wide range of housing and promote social inclusion. The aim is to increase the amount of affordable housing consistent with the delivery of overall housing numbers whilst achieving an appropriate mix of housing. In relation to affordable housing, it is proposed that planning for an appropriate mix of housing should continue to be based on size and type. However, in terms of market housing, recognising the need to take account of market considerations and providing a degree of choice, local planning authorities should plan for the range of different households likely to require housing rather than the size and type of housing. |
| Government Office for Yorkshire and the | The Preferred options will need to conform with the RSS in terms of type and scale of | This is to be addressed in the Preferred Options. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Humber (GOYH) | development. In the absence of a Core Strategy clear linkages should be made with the UDP, the City Centre and AVL AAPS. | |
| East Leeds Extension Developers Consortium | Substantial net housing growth has not been tested against committed proposals or Options. There is no reference to the RSS or LDF housing provision or how the options fit within wider development strategies. | This is to be addressed as the AAP evolves. |
| GOYH | Consideration should be given to including details on how options will contribute to overall housing and affordable housing provision for Leeds and what the net impact will be on the population of the area. Evidence and in-depth consideration will be required to support the scale of land likely to be needed and must demonstrate genuine need. | Same as above. The Easel Delivery Plan will inform the scale of development needed to ensure delivery of the Plan and emerging RSS will inform city wide housing requirements. |
| Alliance for Green Socialism | The consultation document provides overall figures for new housing but does not provide information on the loss of housing and affordable housing, and the number of new: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council houses • Housing Association properties and • Private housing for rent and sale | Detailed policies in the AAP will specify the % of affordable required. Policies will not distinguish between Council and Registered Social Landlord provision. Detailed Neighbourhood Plans will determine the number of demolitions required. |
| Bellway PLC (Via GVA Grimley) | H62 – the frontage of site should be designated as mixed use - potentially prestigious location for employment - and heavy traffic on York Road is less favourable for residential | This is a greenfield site with significant public objection to development. This part of the site to be removed at Preferred Options stage. |
| Bellway PLC (Via GVA Grimley) & Leeds LIFT Ltd (via GVA Grimley) | Part of H61 should be designated as a local centre - focus of which could be a primary school and medical centre | Option 3 has shown this area as having the potential to locate a replacement primary school. However a new local centre would perhaps be better located around the existing parade on South Parkway. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| Connect Housing | Indicative affordable housing targets need reviewing periodically, since house prices are likely to rise as the area uplifts itself. | The Annual Monitoring Report will review strategic housing demand and supply. An EASEL Housing Market Assessment will inform the proportion of affordable housing and this will be reviewed over the life time of the AAP. |
| Connect Housing | H53/H54 - Connect has control of the adjacent site which is designated as a housing commitment. Connect intend to bring the site forward when plans for the area have been agreed. H11 - Osmondthorpe One Stop Centre should be re-provided if demolished as part of this site. As this area lacks community facilities. H29-32 - More radical intervention required in this area. Its location could be very attractive to private market housing. | The aspects have all been considered and included in the Preferred Options. |
| Leeds HMO Lobby | The EASEL AAP should consider the promotion of student housing development - revised UDP policy H15a should inform the plan. Cross Gates should be considered for the encouragement of student accommodation in the private rented sector. | The location of student housing should be considered on a district wide basis. Student housing should be considered as part of a mix of house types and sizes to create sustainable and mixed communities. |
| English Heritage | Demolition should be informed by an assessment of the contribution which these houses make to the character of the locality. Potential upgrading, improvement or reconfiguration must be fully explored first. | Character Appraisals will be considered as part of the neighbourhood plans. |
| Alliance for Green Socialism | The area should be conserved and housing improved rather than demolished and rebuilt at great cost and displacement to residents. | Detailed feasibility is required to identify options as part of neighbourhood planning. |
| GOYH | In line with consultation draft PPS3, Annex C it may be appropriate that higher average densities should be considered. Is the proportion | Noted. The proportion of affordable housing will be informed by the emerging |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| | of affordable housing for each option sufficient? Consideration should be given to expanding on the type of affordable housing that might be provided i.e. intermediate, social rented (draft PPS3 para 23,25 and Annex A) | EASEL Regeneration Initiative and the Housing Market Assessment. A full range of affordable housing options will be considered. |
| GOYH | Has consideration been given to the provision of land for gypsies and travellers? Should be considered when developing options for housing and community facilities. | This will be considered on a district wide basis.. |
| Leeds Tenants Federation | Under Option 3 over 5000 dwellings would be demolished and under Option 2 this is likely to be 1700 - demolition on this scale (given that 40% of the EASEL area is social rented housing) will have catastrophic effects on the housing chances of residents in Leeds. Over 31,000 are waiting for a council or Housing Association home - each month 6,000 people "bid" for only 500 empty properties. Currently the lowest house prices in Leeds are still more than 4x the average salary. | The Preferred Option sets out approximate figures for demolitions. The Housing Needs Assessment will assist in informing the Affordable Housing Policy within the EASEL AAP. The Preferred Options propose at least 20% affordable housing in new developments up to 2010, rising to 25% for 2010 to 2015. The percentage will be subject to further review based on ongoing monitoring and housing needs assessments. Housing is likely to be redeveloped at higher densities, in addition land not currently developed for housing is proposed for development and this will increase the overall level of affordable housing. |
| Ramblers Association | H53, H54,H55 Increase housing density in an area where no public transport routes are proposed and include greenfield land. Site layouts should be adopted which minimise loss of greenspace. H72,H74, H75: Site layouts should be adopted which minimise loss of greenspace. | A public transport route is proposed in the Preferred Options adjacent to these sites. The Plan also promotes the efficient use of land and identifies the proportion of new greenspace to be provided on site. H72 removed as a housing site in Preferred Options Plan. Detailed masterplanning for housing sites would incorporate provision of greenspace. |
| Environment Agency | There is a possibility of contaminated land being present within the area. The proposals would encourage its remediation and action in accordance with PPS23 and CLR11. H54 – non active landfill site | Contamination in the EASEL area has been mapped as part of the base line report. Development of any contaminated sites and appropriate mitigation measures will be examined in further detail at the Masterplanning or planning application stage. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>H41 – Close to or within Flood Zone 2 and 3</p> <p>H69 – eastern edge is in flood zone 2</p> <p>H75 – flood zone 2 & 3</p> | <p>These sites will be examined in further detail as part of a Flood Risk Assessment.</p> |
| <p>Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS trust</p> | <p>Seacroft Hospital - it is likely that part of the hospital will become surplus to requirements and can be defined as a housing opportunity in successive versions of the AAP.</p> | <p>Any redevelopment opportunities that come forward through the release of surplus land within the hospital boundary will be considered brownfield and subject to detailed planning and highway considerations will be considered for inclusion in the AAP.</p> |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

Remodelling

| Representor (where relevant) | Comments | LCC Response |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Local residents | What is meant by remodelling? What rights do I have if you CPO my home? | The term "remodelling" has been replaced by "Priority Improvement Areas". These areas are explained in the Preferred Options. The CPO route is to be pursued as a last resort. If put in place, CPO rights will be fully explained to those individuals directly effected. The Council will offer compensation based on market value and will include other entitlements and additional payments which will be payable in accordance with the Compensation Code governing compulsory purchase acquisitions. |
| Local residents | Concern over remodelling areas in Richmond Hill – some of the streets are well kept and attractive. Although there is support for selective clearance to create greenspace and gardens (similar to what has been undertaken at the bottom of the Bayswaters) | Area appraisals within the Priority Improvement Areas prepared in association with residents will consider the level of change needed. |
| Local residents | The Plan needs to consider environmental improvements like tree planting and home zone concepts in older terraced areas. Could the space between terrace properties be made more secure i.e. gates/walls built up. Traffic calming and safe places for children to play are essential. | The Preferred Options considers a range of measures to address the physical problems of properties within Priority Improvement Areas which include tree planting, new greenspace, traffic calming, homezones, alleygating. |
| Local residents | Has anyone looked at demolishing properties on the northern edge of Banstead Park? | Any proposed demolition of properties within a Priority Improvement Area identified in the Preferred Options would be subject to further analysis through the preparation of area appraisals and detailed consultation with the local community. |
| Local residents | There should be no demolition of properties on Elford Grove and Elford Place | Proposals for demolition of properties south of Banstead Park to facilitate expansion of park have been removed and included within a Priority One Improvement Area. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|-----------------|--|---|
| Local residents | The area south of Banstead Park which is highlighted for remodelling should be extended south to incorporate the Gledhows and Keplers. | Priority Improvement Areas are concentrated on the areas of greatest priority and need. In the longer term it may be possible to include further areas. |
| Local residents | Back to backs should be retained – they are ideal first properties | Sustainability of the back to backs will be considered through the Priority Improvement Area appraisals. A number will be refurbished as part of demonstration projects which will show the scope for improvement of properties. |
| Local residents | Blocks of 8 back to backs should be taken out to provide greenspace in the Bayswaters | The area appraisals will need to consider all possibilities for creating better neighbourhoods. |
| Local residents | The remodelling areas should be more targeted | The areas requiring improvement are reasonably extensive and priorities can only be determined within them through more detailed appraisals. |
| Local residents | Concern that the areas of remodelling are large (particularly in Option 3) – How realistic and viable is this? | Halton Moor has been identified as potential change area and will be considered as part of a neighbourhood plan which will be drawn up in consultation with residents. The process will consider which areas will benefit from future investment and which should be considered as further redevelopment areas. |

Employment/ Training/ Education

| Representor (where relevant) | Comments | LCC Response |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| Local residents | Employment in the local area does not necessarily result in jobs for local people (apart from local shops which do employ local people). There is a large teaching hospital in the area which does not employ many people in Harehills | The AAP can formulate policies to ensure that local people are able to access jobs created in EASEL. This can be done through the use of local labour agreements being a condition of planning permission. |
| Local residents | The idea of generating local employment in the community is good but a) benefit dependency in the area is very high; b) local people can't access these opportunities due to lack of basic skills; c) there is no space where education of the local people can take place through | The regeneration initiative through partnership between public, private and voluntary sector bodies and Section 106 Agreements will be used to improve employment levels and address training and skills provision. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| | partnership with local colleges | |
| Local residents | There is no mention of provision for education which is a key point for the BME community | Extensions to both Bankside and Harehills Primary Schools are proposed in the Preferred Options. |
| Local residents | How will jobs be guaranteed to local people and can it be ensured that they are given the necessary training/skills for the job. | This can be achieved through the use of S106 Agreements and planning conditions. |
| Local residents | Meadowfields School is too small to cope with the current intake – if further new housing is proposed, another new school will be needed. | Meadowfields school could be expanded if needed to accommodate the demand arising from the new housing proposed. |
| Local residents | Is it wise to close schools (Agnes Stewart)– might we not need them in the future? | As part of an ambitious programme of new school developments the new school on Beckett Street has been built to accommodate pupils from Primrose High School which has now closed. The new David Young Academy accommodates students from Agnes Stewart and Braimwood High which have now both closed. |
| Local residents | Bankside Primary is overcrowded – it should be extended. | The Preferred Options propose an extension of the school which is a key priority for Education Leeds. |
| Local residents | There is a lack of ambition in the objectives re training, skills and employment. The Plan does not set out the need for a comprehensive scheme linked to provision for 14-18 year olds. | The EASEL Initiative will address these issues through the Regeneration Plan. |
| Local residents | Much greater emphasis is required on skills and training. Estimates of the number and type of jobs which could be generated under each scenario would be useful. | Skills and training will be covered thoroughly by the regeneration initiative and is not a spatial issue except in terms of provision of any new training accommodation required. In the Preferred Options it is estimated that the mixed use sites will provide approximately 48 hectares for employment uses and create over 2,000 new jobs |
| Local residents | All Options could emphasise support for workspace/small units to encourage local employment and start up businesses. | The Preferred Options outline the types of employment uses which might be suitable within the mixed use proposals. |
| Connect Housing | No indication given to the requirement to expand Hilltop (Bankside) Primary in Harehills. | The Preferred Options considers an extension to Bankside Primary School. |
| GOYH | Consideration should be given to including | An Employment Land Review has been undertaken across the district |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|-------------------|---|---|
| | details on how the employment proposals will affect the local and broader economy and what the net impact will be on the population of the area. Evidence and in-depth consideration will be required to support the scale of land likely to be needed and genuine need demonstrated. | and Officers are currently looking at existing supply. This will inform a locational strategy for the Leeds district. |
| Yorkshire Forward | AAP needs to address physical access and skills/training. | Physical access to employment opportunities will be addressed through the Preferred Options for transport. Skills and training is not a spatial issue (EASEL Initiative Regeneration Plan) and will only be addressed in the AAP in terms of provision through legal agreements as part of planning applications. |

Mixed Use

| Representor (where relevant) | Comments | LCC Response |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Local residents | What is meant by Mixed Use | The term mixed use refers to a mixture of compatible land uses, which might include housing, employment and local facilities (such as shops, doctors surgeries and community centres). |
| Local residents | Why have Torre Close and Torre Place been omitted from the mixed use allocation which covers Arcadia and the Torres? | They are separated from the rest of the Torres housing stock and have a high level of private ownership and redevelopment would be unlikely to be viable. |
| Local residents | What is proposed for the mixed use development site (M28) | This site is proposed for employment uses and would be compatible with the adjacent Aire Valley AAP proposals. |
| Local residents | Are you going to develop the waste ground area next to Arcadia? | This site is already included within the mixed use designation at Arcadia and will be carried forward in the Preferred Options. |
| Bellway PLC (Via GVA Grimley) | M18 – would be more appropriate as an employment designation. It gives the an opportunity to create a major commercial landmark at a gateway and to integrate with existing employment uses at Seacroft Industrial estate with a frontage of prestigious offices with light industrial uses to the rear | Detailed masterplanning will be required to establish the mix of uses on individual sites. M18 – In order for offices to be accommodated on this site, the town centre would have to be extended. By providing the site with a town centre allocation, the site would then be opened up to a wider range of town-centre compatible uses. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>M19 & 20 - These sites are better suited to residential uses due to their small scale and location. Proximity of proposed large commercial sites would detract from their success as non-residential sites.</p> <p>M23 – could be used for large 4/5 bed townhouses specifically designed to meet the housing needs of the Asian community. This would assist in decant process from terraced housing and fulfil a much needed housing requirement.</p> <p>M24 – The site is not well suited to large scale commercial and office use. An urban village would be more appropriate with clusters of uses such as creative industries, arts and crafts, light manufacture. This could provide low cost business space to support new and small businesses.</p> <p>M25 - a new local centre at Lincoln Green adjacent to Hospital could provide office, research and development space, a GP walk in centre, health and fitness operation, health care facility, ambulance station, key worker accommodation, multi storey carpark and public space. Elsewhere across the site medium rise apartments, high density townhouses and landmark high rise apartments could be developed.</p> <p>M26 – offices would be appropriate on the frontage with low cost residential on remainder of the site.</p> <p>M28 – The site should not include residential due to the proximity to the railway line and isolated</p> | <p>M19 & M20 – these sites are within the existing town centre boundary of Seacroft and could in principle be used for a range of uses.</p> <p>M23 – Whilst larger houses are required in Harehills for the Asian community, this is not necessarily the most suitable site. This is a highly sustainable location, close to the proposed public transport route and part of the site lies within Harehills Corner town centre. High density uses would be appropriate on this site.</p> <p>M24 –The site is not necessarily suitable for offices – it is not located in a prominent location (i.e. not on a main road) and it is out of centre, so therefore not appropriate for large scale office development.</p> <p>A new local centre at Lincoln Green should be considered as part of the redevelopment of site M25.</p> <p>M26 – The mix of uses requires further consideration.</p> <p>M28 – Detailed masterplanning will be required to determine uses on this site.</p> |
|--|---|--|

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| | location. Workshop type employment uses would be appropriate. | |
| Connect Housing | No potential is identified for the Killingbeck Bridge area - mixed use/district centre development could work well. | An additional site has been identified in the Preferred Options. |
| Leeds LIFT Ltd (via GVA Grimley) | M25 has potential for a GP walk in centre, health and fitness operation, intermediate health care facility, ambulance station, mixed uses including offices, R&D space, key worker accommodation, multi storey car park and public space. | The types of uses would be considered compatible on this mixed use site. |
| Leeds HMO Lobby | M25 - this site offers the opportunity for student housing due to its close proximity to the City Centre. This ties in with the City Centre AAP residential options which includes provision for purpose built student housing in peripheral city centre locations. M23 - This site is located in one of the community areas identified by Unipol Student Homes as suitable for student housing, due to proximity to Hospital, diverse population, type of housing and range of shopping and eating facilities. Development of student housing on this site should be considered. | The location of student housing should be considered on a district wide basis. Student housing should be considered as part of a mix of house types and sizes to create sustainable and mixed communities. Both M23 and M25 are in sustainable locations (good transport links, edge of City Centre etc.) and could in principle be appropriate for student housing. |
| Environment Agency | There is a possibility of contaminated land being present within the area development would encourage its remediation and action in accordance with PPS23 and CLR11. M11 – Within flood zone 2 & 3 M22 – flood zone 2 & 3 | As background work we are currently undertaking a contaminated land desk top study on the following sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Sites identified by the Environment Agency as having potential problems ❖ Sites with a historical likelihood of contamination ❖ Sites located on active and non-active landfills This work will help to inform the contents of the Preferred Options. Furthermore, these areas will be considered as part of the District's |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Sites identified as being potentially at risk of flooding will be considered through the Preferred Options, and in discussion with the Environment Agency.</p> |
|--|--|---|

Retail Health and Community uses

| Representor (where relevant) | Comments | LCC Response |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Local residents | Coldcotes Community Centre is almost derelict and should be demolished. | Plans are currently under discussion to demolish this building and replace it with either an arts centre/Early Years Centre. To be resolved as part of EASEL Regeneration Plan. |
| Local residents | What is proposed for Seacroft centre. | A broad range of uses may be acceptable in principle including housing. A retail needs assessment is to be carried out to inform the future uses within the area. |
| Local residents | It is not necessary to extend the Archway facility | There is scope to either extend the existing facility, subject to developer requirements or provide alternative uses. |
| Local residents | Is Osmondthorpe One Stop Centre going to close – its shown as housing on the plans? If it closes where will the existing facilities go – Park Lane College hold classes there which provide tremendous learning opportunities for local residents. | The future of the One Stop Centre is under review. It could be either retained on site or relocated and the site developed for housing. The Preferred Option allows for both possibilities. |
| Local residents | Tradex site is a good site for a new supermarket | The Tradex site lies on the edge the district centre boundary and proposals for a supermarket would have to satisfy the sequential test in PPS6 |
| Local residents | There are not enough food shopping facilities within Harehills Corner – Kwik Save offers a poor | We are exploring the possibility of improving provision within the Harehills Lane centre nearby and there is current developer interest. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | choice | |
| Local residents | What's happening to St Agnes Stewart school? Could it be retained for community type uses? | The school is scheduled for demolition. Community related uses would be acceptable in principle as part of a mixed use development. |
| Local residents | The shopping area, South Parkway, Seacroft. Should be improved and needs more parking spaces. | There may be potential to improve the shopping environment and create more car parking spaces through redevelopment/regeneration of the adjacent housing areas. |
| Rushbond PLC | Richmond Hill – the opportunity for a new district heart should be explored. | The site has potential as a new local centre. |
| Leeds teaching Hospitals NHS Trust (via Turley Assts) | Support proposals to locate the shopping centre at Lincoln Green closer to St. James. Both the centre and the hospital would benefit from closer physical association and the trust is keen to encourage better linkages between the hospital and the surrounding communities. | The longer term aspiration to relocate the local centre closer to St James Hospital will be reviewed as part of the neighbourhoods plan for the area. |
| Local resident | I am disappointed that the area of shops on York Road by the flyover are not considered in these proposals. As they are at the gateway to the city from the East. They form a very bad impression, run down and with no chance of improvement Children in portacabins for many years at Mount St Mary's is also not acceptable. | The Council share this view but it has no control over these properties. The future of Mount St. Mary's Primary School is currently uncertain. Two alternative sites have been identified to meet education needs. One or both sites could be used to provide either combined facilities or maintain separate provision at: 1. East Park Road, Richmond Hill or 2. Richmond Hill Primary |
| Leeds LIFT Ltd (via GVA Grimley) | There is a lack of specific consideration of the inclusion of health centres as part of specific site allocations. | This will need to be part of ongoing discussions with the PCT to establish the wider health needs of the area. |
| Threadneedle Property Investments Ltd | The boundary of EASEL is based on road lines - this is not the best approach - it's arbitrary and cuts through Cross Gates town centre. Similarly Halton town centre is directly adjacent but not included. The AAP should focus on established centres and reflect sustainable patterns. | The Boundaries were established by Easel Initiative were based on Ward boundaries. It was considered appropriate that the AAP followed the Easel regeneration Initiative boundary to avoid confusion and assist in future monitoring. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Leeds LIFT Ltd (via GVA Grimley) General | Vision and objectives - there needs to be a greater emphasis on the provision of physical infrastructure to enable people to live healthier lives. There is a lack of holistic strategy to actively promote healthy living through the environmental and open space strategy as well as through the provision of new sports and leisure facilities. | A theme running through the EASEL AAP and reflected in one of the key objectives is to provide greater opportunities for healthier lifestyles. |
|--|---|--|

Leisure & Recreation

| Representor (where relevant) | Comments | LCC Response |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Local residents | Harehills requires a leisure facility. Tradex is an ideal location | There would be viability issues in providing a site in Harehills given the geographical location of existing centres i.e Scott hall and Fearnville which serve a wider catchment area. |
| Local residents | Change the Agnes Stewart site into a sport centre/gym | The site is not in Council ownership and currently being marketed. |
| Local residents | What's going to happen to Fearnville Sports Centre? | The council are drawing up proposals for extensive improvements to the existing facilities. Details will be included when they are available |
| Local residents | There is a need for a play area within the Brander housing area – children congregate here and won't necessarily go to Harehills Park or Wykebeck. | This will be reviewed as part of the detailed development of the site. |
| Local residents | What is the justification for developing areas of Seacroft that are green. | To replace underutilised and poorly functioning greenspace with greenspace of a scale and location that would better fulfil the communities needs. |
| Local residents | Wyke Beck is an important area and should be promoted as greenspace. | Wykebeck is a key strategic corridor which is to be maintained and enhanced. |
| Local residents | Proper play facilities should be provided. | Play facilities will be considered within redevelopment areas. |
| Local residents | Will all the parks get improved? | The major parks are all proposed to be enhanced. |
| Local residents | There is an under provision of allotments in Osmondthorpe area which will be further exacerbated if 4,000 dwellings are built in the Aire | Preparation of an allotment strategy by Learning and Leisure will inform the need for additional allotments in the Osmondthorpe area. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | Valley. | |
| Charity of Thomas Wade and others | Bow Street Recreation Ground – due to proposals for housing being erected surrounding the site and it's use by local schools an allowance should be made for the replacement and repair of equipment. Raincliffe Recreation Ground, Everleigh Street should be upgraded. King George's garden, Seacroft require renovation. Forms part of Seacroft history as it was constructed in memory of the late King George V in 1937. | The new housing areas proposed would be expected to contribute through S106 or equivalent to enhancement of local greenspace/play facilities. |
| Connect Housing | Any extension to Banstead Park should make more of an impact into the surrounding high density housing – rather than simply adding acreage to the same layout. | No extension is proposed to Banstead Park in the Preferred Option due to the level of opposition received to the demolition of properties to make way for an extension. Investment will be directed towards the enhancement of the existing Park. |
| Local resident | Harehills Park does not include enough equipment for young children compared to Banstead Park and Ashton Road. | There is potential to direct S106 funds derived from new development to Harehills Park to address deficiencies. |
| Local resident | On Rookwood Road there is a former play area this needs restoring. | This greenspace area is too small to reinstate a play area and there are safety concerns given the configuration of the greenspace and noise considerations. |
| Local resident | Sports centre needs to be kept local. Site M24 should be considered instead of Greenfield land. | The provision of a new sports centre for EASEL is under review. |
| Sport England | It will be very important to ensure that if options 2 or 3 go ahead, that sufficient attention is paid to the provision of open space including sports provision and opportunities for active recreation through footpath and cycle routes as well as suitable indoor provision. Only through assessment to work out future needs for the area can this happen effectively. Without this than current problems may well be exacerbated. | The AAP will be informed by national guidance and a PPG17 Assessment of greenspace in the Leeds district. This assessment will be undertaken in 2007-8 and will provide a comprehensive and robust assessment of the existing and future needs of the community, for open space and sports facilities. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

Openspace

| Representor (where relevant) | Comments | LCC Response |
|--|---|--|
| Local resident | What are the proposals for Wyke Beck Valley? | Detailed proposals will emerge from the preparation of a Wykebeck Strategy which will be prepared by the Wykebeck Forum in conjunction with the City Council. |
| Local resident | There should be a path through Beckett St Cemetery to Shakespeare flats | Linkages will be considered as part of Beckett St Cemetery Feasibility Study |
| Local resident | The waste land on Hovingham Grove (to the west of allotments) needs improvements – there is too much litter and fly tipping. Trees and well kept landscaping are required | The overgrown site is subject to fly tipping. There may be potential for site to be incorporated in to the existing allotment. |
| Local resident | A park is required near the Luxors or Conways | Unless housing is cleared to create a park this is not likely to be realistic. Banstead Park is relatively close to these areas of housing. |
| Local resident | There should be tree planting schemes involving local groups, businesses, individuals and schools to make the area greener | Within the Priority Improvement Areas environmental improvements, such as tree planting, new boundary treatments and the creation of new greenspace will be considered. |
| Scholes Community Forum | Land behind Seacroft hospital, former landfill site should be used for forestry planting. | The site is already allocated for housing and therefore forestry planting is unrealistic. There is a likelihood that tree planting will form an important part of development of this site to act as a buffer to railway line. |
| East Leeds Extension Developers Consortium | The proposals have not been evaluated in terms of their wider impact on the use and availability of open space. | Accessibility work has been undertaken and a PPG17 study is programmed. |

Transport

| Representor | Comments | LCC Response |
|-------------|----------|--------------|
|-------------|----------|--------------|

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| (where relevant) | | |
|---|--|---|
| Local residents | Bus services are inadequate in the area and the area has seen withdrawal of services. | The responsibility for delivering bus services within the EASEL area lies with Metro. However, the AAP intends to explore new public transport enhancements within the EASEL area, these are identified in the Preferred Options. |
| Local residents | Safer pedestrian and cycle routes should be provided in the area especially to schools. There is a need for more cycling routes and in particular to improve accessibility by cycle between Richmond Hill and the City Centre | A network of pedestrian and cycle routes is proposed to improve accessibility within Easel and beyond. |
| Local residents | There should be improved connectivity across York Road as the road is unsafe to cross, underpasses are no-go areas and there are a lack of bridges across the road. | Opportunities to improve connectivity across York Road will be explored as part of the redevelopment of all adjacent sites. |
| Local residents | The BRT link should be in all districts as the current public transport situation is poor | Public transport improvements (which could include BRT) are crucial to the EASEL area. Public transport proposals in the Preferred Options will assist in improving connections and accessibility to employment, education, retail and community facilities within and beyond the EASEL boundary. |
| METRO | A high quality segregated direct rapid transit link is required to link EASEL with the City Centre. | A proposed rapid transit route is included in the Preferred Options and will be subject to further discussion with Metro. |
| Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust (via Turley Assts) | If Beckett Street continues to act as a main public transport corridor, then the trust advocates the use of Gledhow Road/Dolly Lane as the main car access route. The trust would also like to explore the potential for improving linkages back to the City Centre. | The potential for the use of Gledhow Road/Dolly Lane as the main car access route will be investigated through the AAP and the Regeneration Initiative. |
| Bellway PLC (Via GVA Grimley) | There is a need to consider linkages between AVL and EASEL, in particularly the impact on Halton Moor (designation of Skelton Moor Farm and Thornes Farm) and Richmond Hill (designation of Armouries site) | Public transport linkages will be explored in further detail as the AAP evolves. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Bellway PLC (Via GVA Grimley) | A new rail station must be looked at in context of the transport interchange proposed in the regeneration initiative at York Road. | A railway station/transport interchange search area has been identified between Neville Hill sidings and Halton Dial, York Road. |
| Highways Agency | Option 1 is the preferred option in traffic generation terms given it causes the least potential impact on the Strategic Highway Network (SHN). Option 2 is the intermediate option in terms of traffic generation and impact on SHN. Option 3 is the least preferred option in traffic generation terms. However, further investigation of particular locations would need to be undertaken once the preferred option is finalised and identified, including the possible need for mitigation and travel planning. Many links on the strategic highway network in the area are operating at levels approaching or over capacity and there is therefore likely to be a significant impact. It is suggested that a detailed assessment of the precise potential impact on the SHN and indeed other transport infrastructure should be undertaken at the Preferred Option stage | Detailed assessments will be carried out when there is more clarity regarding the scale of development. |
| METRO | Option 3 provides the biggest scope for improvement to the area and therefore the ability to accommodate and develop improved public transport in the area. Strong support is given to Option 3 although the scale of development proposed will only be sustainable if a step change in the scale and quality of public transport is provided. The RSS should be referenced in part 3 of the Options. EASEL combined with AVL is an identified growth area in the RSS. | Further discussions will take place with Metro. LPT2 recognises that Park and Ride sites offer viable solutions and has |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| | <p>A high quality segregated direct rapid transit link is required to link EASEL with the City Centre. The potential for providing a Park & Ride site should be considered during drawing up a Preferred Option.</p> <p>A funding bid is being prepared for the wider BRT network in Leeds and is currently being prepared by Metro for submission to the DfT before the end of 2006. Metro and LCC are working in partnership to identify an appropriate route across East Leeds and this should be reflected in the emerging AAP.</p> <p>BRT route should be complemented by good quality public transport interchanges in particular any EASEL/AVL link. Town centres should have high quality public transport interchanges and Cross Gates should have a public transport interchange centred around the station.</p> <p>Denser development should be provided around BRT stops.</p> | <p>undertaken a study to review the development of park and ride provision in West Yorkshire, to assess provision for residents and visitors. The study has been used to identify sites with the greatest potential that could be taken forward for development. The Preferred Option identifies transport enhancements to the York Road Quality Bus initiative scheme, which could include provision of a P& R at Swarcliffe.</p> |
| Network Rail | <p>There is need to be realistic i.e. a new station in the Marsh Lane/Killingbeck corridor would require substantial capacity enhancement to be operationally successful.</p> <p>It would be advisable to amend the boundary where it applies to Neville Hill. At present it goes through the middle of the lease area and should be redrawn to follow the railway line, leaving the depot in the AAP area, or conversely take it out as the Neville Hill south sidings are in the AVL AAP.</p> | <p>There is no need to amend boundaries as the EASEL and Aire Valley Leeds AAPs are consistent with one another.</p> |
| GOYH | <p>The possible need for public sector investment in</p> | <p>The Council are currently progressing work on Supplementary Planning</p> |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|----------------------|---|---|
| | transport should be shown to have been considered and should be shown as an integral part of the decision making process and not an "add on" after options are chosen. | Guidance (SPG) on Public Transport Improvements and Developer Contributions. As this work emerges it will be fed into the emerging AAP. |
| Ramblers Association | A pedestrian/cycle link between the proposed enhanced green spaces of East End Park and Halton Moor should be provided. Furthermore a pedestrian link between the green spaces in the north east corner of the EASEL area and Roundhay Park would be welcome. | Further linkages, as part of the pedestrian/cycle network, will be considered as part of detailed investigations at the neighbourhood level. |
| SUSTRANS | The following investments are required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Safe routes to school, across EASEL car free routes, cycle lane/storage * New mixed use and retail development should be fitted with cycle storage and safe pedestrian access points * New road links should be designed with cycle lanes and pavements * Homezones should be implemented around schools, hospitals, neighbourhoods and potentially around large new commercial complexes * Application of individualised travel planning. | AAP to consider all these issues in detail. |
| Yorkshire Forward | Physical access to employment opportunities is crucial as is the reduction in reliance on the private car. Innovative forms of transport provision should be considered including car clubs, community transport etc. | As above. |
| Local residents | A number of detailed highway issues have been raised relating to individual streets, existing transport control systems and other traffic related issues. | The comments received relating to highways have been forwarded onto colleagues in Highways as well as to Metro for information. Detailed consideration of highways and transportation issues will be considered as part of the neighbourhood plans. |
| Local residents | Traffic claming in the Bayswaters and Bexleys is | Traffic calming is one of the measures to be considered as part of the |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|--|------------------|--|
| | grossly overdue. | Priority Improvement Areas in the Preferred Options. |
|--|------------------|--|

Design & Sustainability

| Representor (where relevant) | Comments | LCC Response |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| Local residents | Access for disabled people needs to be thought out at every stage of the proposal. Improve wheelchair access in the area e.g. dropped kerbs | DDA requirements will be considered throughout the emerging AAP, particularly at neighbourhood planning and planning application stages. |
| English Heritage | An assessment of the areas is needed to determine which buildings contribute to a sense of place. Key elements of the environment (listed buildings etc.) should be used positively in regeneration. | Neighbourhood plans and design guidance along with ongoing consultation with relevant LCC and external conservation interest will assist in identifying and protecting positive buildings. |
| Ramblers Association | Improved, more energy-efficient and sustainable housing stock is needed | The AAP will build upon existing guidance provided in the City Council's "Neighbourhoods for Living" guide for residential design in Leeds and address the principles of sustainability in design which are outlined in the City Council's emerging Sustainable Design and Construction guide. |
| Environment Agency | Support is given to the statements made in Section 4 "Design and Sustainability". These issues should be addressed more thoroughly through specific policies, objectives or guidance in the Preferred Options stage. | A design code will be developed which will provide clarity on acceptable design quality within the area. |
| Yorkshire Forward | It may be appropriate to require new major development in EASEL to meet BREEAM or EcoHomes excellent/very good standard. | Housing developments will be required to comply with Eco Homes energy efficiency "very good" standard and the Lifetime Homes standard. |
| Yorkshire Forward | The AAP should design in space for the sorting and segregation of household waste as its source and provision of on-site waste management facilities (communal recycling bins). | These aspects will be fully considered as part of redevelopment proposals. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

Delivery & Implementation

| Representor (where relevant) | Comments | LCC Response |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Local residents | The EASEL plans illustrate the provision of a potential new leisure centre at Killingbeck. There have been separate discussions on whether funding for this comes from PFI. If PFI funding is used, will the monies that would have come from the Regeneration Initiative be available to be spent on other leisure facilities, or indeed another leisure centre elsewhere in the EASEL area? | PFI funding is not available at this current time. Additional PFI funding is under consideration and alternative sites will be reviewed. |
| Local residents | There is concern that the plans focus on the outer areas and that there is little gain in the inner areas. Stage 2 and 3 need to ensure that there are benefits in the inner areas. People in these areas have had years of consultation overload, but have seen nothing coming out of it! | Land use changes are concentrated on the areas of land where the Council have significant land owning interest and these areas are in the most part within the outer parts of EASEL. Housing redevelopment in these locations is more deliverable. However, we are aware that improvements are also required in the inner areas. The Preferred Options identifies priority one and priority two areas within the EASEL older housing areas which will enable funds to be directed to those areas which require most intervention. A menu of interventions will be explored for each area and is likely to include replacement of particularly poor dwellings, enveloping and group repair schemes, demonstration projects, environmental improvements and traffic calming, such as the use of homezone principles. |
| Local residents | The benefits need to be spread fairly across the whole EASEL area | Benefits from the Regeneration Initiative will be directed to where greatest priority lies. It is accepted that a strategic view is required which does not rely on developing/redeveloping the least problematic areas. |
| Local residents | What are the timescales for redevelopment? | A function of the EASEL AAP is to outline when the sites within it will be developed. The Preferred Options will begin to address phasing and when proposals are likely to be implemented. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Local residents | The need for short-term action in the inner city parts of EASEL – can't wait 10 years for action. | There needs to be some early wins in the areas of older housing. Priority areas for interventions will be identified in the Preferred Option (see above). |
| Local residents | Can all the benefits in the Options be provided and has a balance sheet been done? | The Easel Regeneration Initiative is the key delivery mechanism but there is no guarantee that all the proposals in the Easel AAP will be capable of delivery. |
| Local residents | Which Option fits with the EASEL initiative? | The Area Action Plan has been prepared with the knowledge of the proposals put forward by Bellways in their bid. However the AAP reflects wider land-use issues and not just those affecting Council owned land. |
| Local residents | Would it not be better to carry out the first phase and then show where the next phase will be planned. | Applications for the phase one sites were submitted in February 2007 to develop 742 new homes over the next 5 years. The Area Action Plan aims to provide a comprehensive planning framework for the whole EASEL area. Information on the phasing of sites will be included in the Preferred Options. |
| Local residents | Does the delivery of the AAP depend on government finance | The scale of investment required to achieve change in EASEL is beyond any likely availability of public resources, so LCC will be working in association with a private sector partner, Bellways, to ensure that long term investment in the area is secured. However, the initiative will also be tapping into public finance, where available. |
| Aire Valley Leeds (AVL) | Support is given to the objectives of the AAP. However, how and when objectives are expected to be achieved will need addressing. | Monitoring will play a critical part in identifying any review of the EASEL Area Action Plan that may be required. The Council will therefore develop a means of monitoring the Area Action Plan that can assess the extent to which the plan's vision and objectives are being achieved and, where this is failing, explain why and set out the steps to be taken to correct this. |
| AVL | There is a need for more information regarding the implementation and potential funding sources | The EASEL Area Action Plan will be delivered through the EASEL Regeneration Initiative The EASEL Regeneration Initiative will be supported by a Regeneration Plan. This document will set out a 5 year rolling programme of area based regeneration activity which will work towards the alignment of services in the area and provide a comprehensive approach to addressing the social and economic aspects as well as the physical aspects of regeneration. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Alliance for Green Socialism | Disagree with the assumption that all investment must be private. Development of the area should be financed publicly rather than privately (LCC can raise money more cheaply than any private concern) | See comments on government finance. |
| Bellway PLC (Via GVA Grimley) | There is concern that this process is commenced without the benefit of detailed neighbourhood masterplanning which is required in Bellway's vision for the regeneration initiative. The regeneration initiative will require planning policies specific to EASEL including affordable housing, housing, S106 contributions, greenspace, density etc. As the regeneration initiative will be implemented before the end of 2006 Bellway would urge the review of the outcomes of this AAP process in conjunction with the masterplanning process. | The AAP provides a strategic and comprehensive planning framework for the EASEL area. Detailed masterplanning will be undertaken once the AAP has been approved. The Preferred Option will begin to look at the type of policies which will be included in the AAP, and will certainly include policies relating to housing density, design, affordable housing targets and the likely level of developer contributions. |
| Connect Housing | It is hoped that flexibility will exist for Connect to become an investor where such investment adds value to the community provision and to our existing stock and service provision. | Noted. |
| Connect Housing | It would be helpful to identify the relative deliverability of schemes and their relative priority. The proposals must be brought forward with a clear and unambiguous delivery plan for achieving the objectives set out for Harehills and Cross Green which are more difficult to achieve. | A section on delivery and implementation will be included within the Preferred Option. In terms of investment in the areas of older housing, appropriate interventions will be referred to in the Preferred Option, but must be subject to more detailed proposals in regeneration plans for each sub-area. |
| English Heritage | The revenue from developments should be used to repair historic assets (i.e. St Mary's Convent Church is on English Heritage's building at risk) | The Council only has an obligation for the upkeep of buildings that are in their ownership. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | register). | |
| GOYH | Consideration should to be given to the deliverability of proposals before the preferred option is drawn up. In particular, questions of responsibility, means of delivery and the likely timescale for each option needs to be considered. This should then lead to consideration of how these will be monitored. | A section on delivery and implementation will be included within the Preferred Option. This document will also provide information on the likely phasing of proposals. |
| GOYH/Yorkshire Forward | It should be demonstrated that the option eventually chosen has a realistic chance of success. A risk analysis may be a way to inform the option appraisal. | This will be informed by the EASEL Initiative Delivery Plan. |
| Yorkshire Forward | The proposals must be deliverable and feasible. | Delivery will be addressed in the Preferred Options document. |
| Threadneedle Property Investments Ltd | As the AAP covers a huge area it would be more effective to focus on areas for the preparation of separate AAPs. This would allow location specific constraints and opportunities to be considered in more detailed AAPs and strategic decisions re housing numbers and employment land in the Core Strategy. | Producing an AAP for the whole of the EASEL area ensures that a strategic approach can be taken and that the benefits from development can be spread across the area, dependent on need. Whilst the AAP will provide the strategic approach, more detailed work will be undertaken through Neighbourhood planning. |
| East Leeds Extension Developers Consortium | The AAP has been drafted in a policy vacuum and there is no clear relationship to the adopted UDP, no formal link to the Core Strategy or a housing/employment allocations DPD. | The UDP Review provides the existing policy and underpins the EASEL AAP. The EASEL AAP will also be linked to the Core Strategy as it develops and carries more weight. |
| East Leeds Extension Developers Consortium | There is no analysis within the AAP of the potential links with strategies and plans for adjoining areas i.e. the East Leeds Extension (ELE) proposals. This is a serious oversight bearing in mind that AAP needs to be compatible with other LDF documents and the UDP. Synergy between EASEL and the ELE could cover the following: | The AAP will link to other strategies, otherwise it will not be a sound document. In terms of how the EASEL proposals links with adjoining areas, this will be made more explicit in the Preferred Options document, in terms of the public transport links into Whinmoor, Thorpe Park providing employment opportunities and the proposed extension of Seacroft District Centre, to serve a catchment wider than that of Seacroft alone. |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Public transport linkages * Links to jobs and training opportunities * The use and potential expansion of retail, service and leisure facilities | |
| East Leeds Extension Developers Consortium | Phasing and implementation of the three Options is not discussed. | See previous comments on phasing and delivery. |

General Issues

| Representor (where relevant) | Comments | LCC Response |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Bellway PLC (Via GVA Grimley) | <p>Add the following to the AAP objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * To establish a new housing market, which meets the needs of the transformed aspirations of existing and future residents * To provide a physical infrastructure needed to enable people to live healthier lives * To apply innovations which will establish EASEL as a model of environmentally sensitive development in the UK * To align EASEL and all other public and private programmes within the area | The objectives have been agreed in partnership with key stakeholders and members of the public. The third bullet point which relates to EASEL as a model of environmentally sensitive development will be picked up in the text of the Preferred Options document. |
| Connect Housing | Reference should be made to developments and proposals adjoining the area i.e. Swarcliffe PFI | References will be made to linkages with Swarcliffe in the Preferred Options document, particularly in terms of a public transport route and the extension of Seacroft district centre. |
| GOYH | Particular consideration should be given to the Planning Inspectorate's 'Test of Soundness' upon which much of the future consideration by GOYH will be based. | Noted. This will be addressed in progressing the AAP. |
| Threadneedle Property Investments | AVL and EASEL AAPs need to support one another in their objectives, strategies and | EASEL and AVL AAPs do complement one another and there are direct relationships between the two in terms of accessibility and employment |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------|
| Ltd | delivery. | linkages. |
|-----|-----------|-----------|

Boundary Changes

| Representor (where relevant) | Comments | LCC Response |
|---|---|--|
| Threadneedle Property Investments Ltd | Cross Gates town centre should be included in the boundary of the AAP. | The boundary of the AAP reflects that of the Regeneration Initiative. Maintaining this avoids confusion. |
| Threadneedle Property Investments Ltd Boundary | The Vickers site provides an excellent opportunity for new development. The site should be considered for residential. PPG3 and draft PPS3 encourage use of previously developed, vacant former employment land. There is a surplus of employment land across the City. If the boundary is not extended, the AAP should at least reflect land available on boundary which will deliver substantial housing provision. | The Vickers site lies quite a distance beyond the boundary of EASEL. As above the AAP boundary reflects the RI area. It is recognised that the site offers redevelopment potential and along with other sites beyond the AAP boundary there should be reference made to them wither on a plan or within the text of the Preferred Option Report. |
| Local residents | Old Seacroft Grange - potential for restaurant or hotel Library and old youth club - underused and potential for development The open fields adjacent to the Windmill Health Centre Vacant sites on the Seacroft industrial estate The former Foxwood school and its playing fields Seacroft Village Green - underused. Improved, tree lined park etc. | Pre-application interest in redeveloping Seacroft Grange (listed) for residential. Old youth club site identified in Option 2 and 3 for redevelopment. Within District Cneter boundary. Seacroft Village Green protected N1 greenspace and village green. Enhancements have not been identified in the Preferred Options, but this does not preclude monies being spent on upgrading the area as and when available. |
| Leeds Teaching | The AAP should recognise and support the | Noted |

EASEL AAP: THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSULTATION

| | | |
|---------------------|--|--|
| Hospitals NHS trust | <p>principles of the Making Leeds Better (MLB) programme and should recognise the significance of the St James site to the City and EASEL area.</p> <p>In relation to the proposed development of the St James site, the Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust cannot rule out at this stage the need to expand outside the existing site to allow for further developments. Therefore would like to be involved in discussions relating to developments and opportunities in the area.</p> | |
|---------------------|--|--|