

## Outer North West Area Committee

### Joint Inner & Outer Transport Sub Group

Appendix 4a

**Note of 9<sup>th</sup> August 2013 Meeting  
 10.30 am Civic Hall Committee Rm2**

Item	Present	Actions
	Cllr Cleasby (Chair) - Horsforth Ward (Ch) Cllr Wadsworth – Guiseley & Rawdon (CW) Cllr Anderson – Adel & Wharfedale (CA) Cllr Rik Downes Otley & Yeadon (CD) Cllr Illingworth – Kirkstall (CI) Andrew Hall – Highways and Transportation (AH) Lois Pickering – Planning (LP) Tim Draper – Road Safety (TD) Rachel Marshall – Area Support Team (RM)	
	<b>Apologies</b>	
	Cllr Walshaw – Headingley (CW) Andrew Wheeler – NGT (AW) David Feeney – Planning (DF) Cllr Christine Towler - Hyde Park & Woodhouse	
1.0	<b>Welcome and introductions</b>	
2.0	<b>Minutes &amp; Matters arising</b>	
2.1	Agreed and nothing further	
3.0	<b>Site Allocations Consultation Update</b>	
3.1	LP talked through the Planning consultation strategy advising the group that there had been an extended consultation period from 3 <sup>rd</sup> June to 29 <sup>th</sup> July. Adverts regarding the consultation and events had been placed on local radio, buses, libraries and One Stops, Yorkshire Evening Post and to all email contacts through the LDF. With all ward Members and MPs informed. Online consultation through the website which had included comments from Highways	
3.2	Posters and flyers had been placed in schools, One Stops, care homes, housing offices, nurseries etc.	
3.3	A total of 16 information events had been held across Leeds during the period of consultation. Planning had worked with local Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Planning organisations in terms of providing information or attending events. Display boards and information had been provided to any local community groups requesting them.	
3.4	Feedback is currently being assessed and there are no confirmed numbers of responses as yet. LP gave a rough estimate of; 1900 online through the website 1500 paper responses 1500 emails received	

	All of which will be entered into a database for analysis over the next few weeks. So far it seems by some margin the most responses have been about housing which was expected.	
3.5	CA and CI asked for it to be noted that there had been considerable issues with completing the online forms which were reported to be slow and inefficient, particularly in going back a page. It was stated that electronic consultation should be reviewed.	<b>NOTED</b>
3.6	It was also reported that the site itself was hard to navigate and not easy to understand where things were and hard to distinguish smaller areas. LP advised large scale plans had been given to groups who requested them and that it was possible to zoom in online to look at areas in more detail.	
3.7	LP informed the group that an initial report would be going to Plans Panel to report back on the drop-ins and no. of attendees with a further report on the context and content of responses once they had been assessed. This will include considering representations from Developers and Consultants in the same way as public responses. Publication of a draft plan on property allocations, which would not be colour coded, would follow. Consultation with Members to be followed by a public consultation on the plan late 2014 which might lead to some further alterations. Then it will go to the Secretary of State for examination before the plan being adopted in 2015.	
3.8	It was noted however that the Core Strategy would need to be adopted first even though concerns were raised that the process was too slow and would lead to problems with the site allocation plan. LP advised that a great deal of work had been done in a short timescale and that the Core Strategy is due for examination in October 2013	
3.9	CA asked about sites currently under discussion now – how will decisions be made when a developer is ready to submit an application and there are objections. Concerns were that developers would have free rein on sites if the 5 year land supply agreement was not in place.	
3.10	LP advised that anyone can apply for any site currently under consideration. Planning has the Executive Board (EB) report to judge each application alone. Under this report there are agreed criteria on PAS sites and there is a presumption against building on greenbelt sites.	
3.6	LP to respond to an issue CA <b>raised</b> as to whether or not those that have commented previously can appeal in regards to the Core Strategy.	<b>LP</b>
3.7	LP advised that the duty to co-operate with other local authorities had been fulfilled. Concerns were raised on whether the cumulative impact will be considered in terms of transport and education. LP told Members that Planning may insist on a junction being installed as part of a development or after a site has been built rarely before.	
3.8	CA agreed that there was insufficient capacity or funding to carry out traffic assessments for each site but in view of that could not developments be phased in. AH responded that once the sites had potential agreements more information could be available.	
	<i>CD left 11.45 am</i>	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Travel Behaviour Team</b>	
4.1	TD provided the group with a briefing note on the Influencing Travel Behaviour Team's work (see attached). Their role being to engage with the public on sustainable travel. Traffic plans are monitored to ensure they are kept up to date. Limited staff and resources mean they need to	

	consider the areas most in need.	<b>APP1</b>
	<i>Meeting was extended to 13.00 due to extended discussion on the site allocation consultation</i>	
4.2	They work closely with schools as statistics confirm that 12 & 13 yr olds constitute the highest numbers of pedestrian casualties. This involves working with Yr 6 pupils to look at how they will be getting from home to high school. This could mean looking at bus routes and taking pupils on a public bus to show them the stops and where it is safe to cross the road.	
4.3	If cycling is an option, it was recognised in some areas it would not be, how they can support the pupil to cycle and if so what is the best route. Funding has provided bike officers from Sustans to work in Horsforth and Rawdon. Their role is to encourage safe cycling	
4.4	CW asked about a specific travel plan for a company in Rawdon that is rated as very good but appears to allow greater expansion of the workforce which in turn means no significant improvement in the parking issues around the firm.	
4.5	TD replies that firms can employ flexible working practices that mean a greater number of employees, with some working from home etc but still means there is a significant number of people driving to an office. Members felt the cost of public travel was prohibitive and costs should be reduced. TD advised a corporate bus pass was available to buy and could encourage use of public transport. It was suggested travel costs be considered for a future agenda item, with Metro to be invited.	<b>NOTED</b>
<b>5.0/6.0</b>	<b>Traffic Control Report and Traffic Assessments</b>	
5.1	Due to time constraints AH had little time to go through the two agenda items assigned to him.	
5.2	A question was raised as to why double yellow lines had been removed near the Kirkstall, Morrisons site at the Bridge Road junction. AH to investigate.	<b>NOTED</b>
5.3	AH discussed a site visit to Poynton and gave a hand out which visually demonstrated the use of shared space between pedestrians and vehicles. This is a fairly controversial site costing £4.6m where traffic and pedestrians have equal priority, no pedestrian crossings or traffic lights at a multi entry junction. AH advised there were no plans to consider any sites in Leeds at this time and there were many criteria to be considered, visually impaired pedestrians for example.	<b>APP2</b>
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Potential Dates of Future Meetings</b>	
7.1	Not discussed	
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Any Other Business and Future Agenda Items</b>	
8.1	CW asked that the NGT response due to go to Area Committee in September be discussed at the Transport Sub Group instead. This was agreed with Chair. A date will be fixed for the 2 <sup>nd</sup> week in September to bring NGT to a special meeting; this will allow responses to be fed into the ONW Area Committee on the 23 <sup>rd</sup> September and from there to full Council.	
8.2	The Chair asked that the group email RM with any items to be considered. These can be fed through to NGT team for consideration	

	prior to the meeting. So far these have been; <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Design flaws</li><li>• Fares are too high</li><li>• Issues with the route</li><li>• Lack of consultation</li><li>• Headingley would like to consider road charging</li><li>• Differing viewpoints between Inner &amp; Outer N.W</li><li>• Need to have a cohesive argument</li></ul>	
	<b>Meeting closed 13.00 pm</b>	