



---

## Report of the Director of City Development

### *Development Scrutiny Board*

Date: 18<sup>th</sup> December 2007

### Subject: City Centre Area Action Plan Preferred Options Consultation Responses

---

#### Electoral Wards Affected: All

Ward Members consulted  
(referred to in report)

#### Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

#### 1. Purpose

- 1.1. To give Scrutiny Board Members a summary of the scale & nature of representations received on the City Centre Area Action Plan Preferred Options.

#### 2. Background

- 2.1. The City Centre Area Action Plan (CCAAP) is part of the Local Development Framework for Leeds. It is a statutory plan with the primary purpose of providing a policy framework to help determine planning applications, although it should also set out proposals for transport, sites & areas of change and contributions & other benefits to be sought from development.
- 2.2. As a statutory plan, it has to be prepared following a process prescribed by national regulations. The CCAAP has to go through these stages:
- informal consultation stage (regulation 25) during 2005-06
  - Preferred Options stage (regulation 26) 2007
  - Submission stage (regulation 28) 2008
  - Public Examination – 2009
  - Adoption – 2010
- 2.3. It should be noted that as the CCAAP has to be prepared according to a statutory process, opportunities for comment to influence the nature & content of the plan are limited to formal consultation periods. The City Council has opportunity to determine how it responds to public consultation representations through the Development Plan Panel and Executive Board.

### **3. Representations received on the Preferred Options**

- 3.1. During the formal six week consultation period in April & May 2007, over 2000 points of representation were received from 114 different people & organisations.
- 3.2. Each representor's responses have been logged on a database and comments recorded in full or summarised. The role of the database is principally to provide a record of who said what. Because many representors have raised similar objections to others, this database contains a lot of repetition. A print-out would be too lengthy for useful analysis.
- 3.3. Hence, Officers have prepared a table of points raised<sup>1</sup>. This combines multiple comments raising the same issue into a single point which will be more useful for analysis. A summary of the headline points is provided as Appendix 1 and the full table of points raised is provided as Appendix 2. As yet, City Development has not formulated responses to the points raised. This is discussed in section 4 below.
- 3.4. A very wide range of comments have been received ranging from suggestions to modify text, maps & photos to major strategic issues. Some of the key issues include the following:
  - Making the plan more "visionary"
  - Housing & hotel development on areas of high flood risk
  - The size of the city centre
  - Requirements for on-site renewable energy
  - Provision of public space
  - Adding further Proposal Areas & elaborating upon the existing ones
  - Controlling the mix of flats suitable for family occupation
  - New public transport infrastructure & route safeguarding
  - Extending the loop road to south of the river
- 3.5. Representations have been received from over 100 individuals and organisations covering a wide spectrum of interests in the City centre. They include residents, landowners, developers, business organisations, special interest groups, other City Council services, young people, older people and statutory bodies. A full list of representors is provided in Appendix 3.

### **4. Next steps**

- 4.1. The consultation responses to the Preferred Options are an important step in preparation of the Plan. In order to keep respondents informed of progress, the table of responses will be placed on the LCC website and respondents will be notified.
- 4.2. The formulation of the City Council's response to the representations received will take time. A full set of responses cannot be completed until the City Council decides how to take forward the Plan. Some of the questions to be resolved have strategic implications for a range of service divisions of the Council who need to be involved in decision making. Many issues are

---

<sup>1</sup> A health warning is necessary that the table is not 100% complete. A small number of comments concerning environmental matters (PO-21 – PO-29) and Proposal Areas (PA-03 and PA-09) are still to be added.

interrelated, for example provision of public space through pedestrianisation of streets needs to be planned taking account of the ability to re-route highways.

- 4.3. City Development is currently committed to producing a “City Centre Vision”. The impetus for this emerged in the spring of 2007, midway through the preparation process for the CCAAP. It will be important to make sure that the City Centre Vision and the CCAAP are at least complementary, if not integral. This may mean delaying the CCAAP until the nature of the City Centre Vision is clear. If the City Centre Vision introduces any major new plans or departures from the CCAAP, it may be necessary for the Preferred Options stage of the CCAAP to be repeated (see para 2.2 above). The CCAAP would be considered unsound if the Submission plan introduced major new elements which had not been subject to consultation earlier on.

## **5. Conclusion**

- 5.1. The CCAAP has reached a stage where consultation responses to the Preferred Options should play an influential role in shaping the Submission Plan and helping to form the City Centre Vision. The careful summarising and cataloguing of responses as set out in Appendices 1 & 2 will help make the responses easier to apply.

## **6. Recommendation**

- 6.1. Scrutiny Board is invited to note and comment on this report.