

**LEEDS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT  
DECEMBER 2008**

## **CONTENTS**

|   | <b>Page</b> |
|---|-------------|
| <b>1 Introduction</b>   | <b>3</b>    |
| <b>2 The Leeds Policy Context</b>   | <b>5</b>    |
| <b>3 The Local Development Scheme</b>                                       | <b>6</b>    |
| <b>4 Monitoring Information</b>   | <b>10</b>   |
| <b>5 Progress Since the Last AMR</b>  | <b>36</b>   |
| <b>Appendix 1 – Housing Trajectory 2008-26 –<br/>Details of Assumptions</b> | <b>38</b>   |
| <b>Appendix 2 - DCLG Core Indicators</b>                                    | <b>39</b>   |

## 1 Introduction

1.0.1 This report is the fourth of an annual series of reports monitoring the Leeds Local Development Framework (LDF). It describes progress on work on the new LDF, presents monitoring data for the year from 1 April 2007 to 31 March 2008 and outlines ways in which the City Council's monitoring work is being developed. Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs) always report on events during the preceding Local Government Year and are published at the end of December each year.

### 1.1 Monitoring Context

1.1.1 The Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 set the framework for the modernisation of planning in the UK as part of a "plan led" system. The Act and other supporting legislation place expectations on local authorities to plan for sustainable communities. As part of the new system, Local Development Frameworks and Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) replace the system of Unitary Development Plans and Regional Planning Guidance. At a local (Leeds MD) level the Local Development Framework will provide the spatial planning framework for the use of land within the city and a key mechanism to deliver the spatial objectives of the Community Strategy (Vision for Leeds).

1.1.2 A key task for the City Council under the new planning system is the preparation of a Local Development Scheme (LDS)<sup>1</sup>. This sets out a three - year programme with milestones for the preparation of Local Development Documents - documents which together will comprise the Local Development Framework. The LDS and its work programme will be reviewed each year and the three - year programme will be rolled forward. Thus at any given time the LDF will consist of an integrated 'portfolio' of policy documents of different ages.

1.1.3 There is also a requirement to publish an annual report monitoring both progress on the Scheme and the performance of policies. The Regional Assembly (RA) is also required to produce an AMR and this includes coordinated information from the region's planning authorities. The RA's AMR is published at the end of February each year.

### 1.2 The Annual Monitoring Report

1.2.1 The Government has produced guidance on LDF monitoring<sup>2</sup>. This covers monitoring in its widest context - monitoring implementation of the Local Development Scheme, Local Development Orders and Simplified Planning Zone schemes, which will also form part of that framework. Monitoring is

---

<sup>1</sup> Leeds Local Development Scheme, June 2005 <http://www.leeds.gov.uk/> then Environment and Planning, then Planning, then Local Development Framework links

<sup>2</sup> Local Development Framework Monitoring: A Good Practice Guide, DCLG, March 2005, <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/regionalspatialstrategy>

becoming an increasingly important aspect of “evidence based” policy making. In the past, monitoring has been regarded as an ‘error-correcting’ mechanism to bring land use plans back on track by addressing negative feedback.

1.2.2 Within the current planning context it is noted that "Monitoring is essential to establish what is happening now, what may happen in the future and then compare these trends against existing policies and targets to determine what needs to be done. Monitoring helps to address questions like:

- are policies achieving their objectives and in particular are they delivering sustainable development?
- have policies had unintended consequences?
- are the assumptions and objectives behind policies still relevant?
- are the targets being achieved?"

1.2.3 In addition "It represents a crucial feedback loop within the cyclical process of policy-making. ... In the context of the new planning system, with its focus on delivery of sustainable development and sustainable communities, monitoring takes on an added importance in providing a check on whether those aims are being achieved. The ability to produce various local development documents, as opposed to one local plan document, allows authorities to respond quickly to changing priorities for development in their areas. Monitoring will play a critical part in identifying these. That is why part of the test of soundness of a development plan document is whether there are clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring."

1.2.4 "In view of the importance of monitoring, Section 35 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (“the Act”) requires every local planning authority to make an annual report to the Secretary of State containing information on the implementation of the local development scheme and the extent to which the policies set out in local development documents are being achieved. Further details of this requirement are set out in [Regulations]<sup>3</sup>. " Good Practice Guide paras. 1.1-1.3

1.2.5 The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), formerly the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), acknowledge that the first AMRs will not be able to cover everything set out in the Guide. "If authorities experience difficulties meeting the requirements of the Act and Regulations in terms of their first annual monitoring reports, they will need to present as full as an analysis as possible whilst setting out clearly what the problems are and how they will be overcome in the next report in December 2006." Guide para.3.16

---

<sup>3</sup> Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, Regulation 48, SI 2004 No. 2204 <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2004/20042204.htm>

1.2.6 The current document is the fourth AMR. It covers the continuing transitional period between the UDP and LDF systems. It is limited in scope for two reasons:

- There are currently no LDF policies and the policy context monitored consists of the saved UDP policies. These policies are listed in the Local Development Scheme but not many are specifically monitored.
- While some monitoring has been undertaken over the last few years this has concentrated on certain key areas, principally relating to the major land demands for housing and employment. With available resources it has not been practical to put into place comprehensive monitoring of the wide range of UDP policies.

1.2.7 The remainder of this report covers:

2. **the Leeds policy context** - a summary of the broader planning framework within which policy monitoring will be done.
3. **the Local Development Scheme** - a review of progress against the milestones in the Scheme and suggested amendments.
4. **monitoring information** relating to 2007/08 concentrating, wherever possible, on the DCLG and Regional Assembly key indicators.
5. **progress since the last AMR** - a review of experience with monitoring indicators over the past year and an identification of any issues that have arisen and how they might be resolved in the coming year.
6. **key indicator data** - appendices containing, for convenience, the Core Indicator data required by DCLG.

## 2 The Leeds Policy Context

### 2.1 The Wider Region

2.1.1 There is growing recognition that Yorkshire and Humberside's longer term economic prosperity and sustainable development is best achieved in working with a range of partners at a regional level. The concept of the "Leeds city-region" is therefore being developed, consisting of Leeds, Bradford, Calderdale, Kirklees, Wakefield, Barnsley, Craven, Harrogate, Selby and York. This idea is also reflected in the preparation of the new Regional Spatial Strategy, which identifies a series of 'sub' areas across the region, including the Leeds city-region.

2.1.2 The Leeds city-region has the potential to develop relatively quickly into a competitive city region, competing successfully with other European cities and contributing to improved economic performance. Stakeholders in the city region are now starting to recognise the advantages of closer co-operation in promoting transport improvements, higher education collaboration and in financial and professional services. Leeds needs to work collaboratively with other city regions, particularly Manchester, to ensure that the north of England realises its full potential.

## 2.2 The Vision for Leeds

2.2.1 In providing a framework to address the above issues and opportunities, the Vision for Leeds (Community Strategy)<sup>4</sup>, provides a vision for improving the social, economic and environmental well-being across the city. Following a period of extensive public involvement and engagement the 'Vision for Leeds 2004 – 2020' has been adopted, prepared by the Leeds Initiative - the Local Strategic Partnership for Leeds. The purpose of the Vision for Leeds is to guide the work of all the Leeds Initiative partners to make sure that the longer term aims for the city can be achieved.

2.2.2 The Vision has the following aims:

- Going up a league as a city
- Narrowing the gap between the most disadvantaged people and communities and the rest of the city
- Developing Leeds' role as the regional capital

## 2.3 The Leeds Unitary Development Plan

2.3.1 The City Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) was adopted 1 August 2001. Anticipating the need to prepare Local Development Frameworks and within the context of changes to national planning policy the City Council embarked upon an early and selective review of the Adopted UDP.

2.3.2 During the period from Dec 2002 to July 2006, the UDP Review progressed through the necessary statutory stages, involving placing the plan on deposit for representations, a Public Inquiry, the receipt and response to the Inspector's Report and the Council's Proposed Modifications. Following public consultation on the Proposed Modifications in the spring of 2006, the Plan was subsequently adopted at a full Council meeting on 19 July 2006.

## 3 The Local Development Scheme

3.0.1 In parallel to the progression of the Local Development Scheme, the City Council has also completed a review of UDP policies (detailed within the 2007 AMR), against guidance issued by the Secretary of State. A review is also underway of UDP policies adopted in 2006, with a view to requesting the Secretary of State to save these policies (January 2009) Consequently, once "saved", policies will continue to form part of the Development Plan until these are replaced or superseded by adopted LDF documents.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.leeds.gov.uk/page.aspx?egmsIdentifier=1BA7EB05F491317080256E160039EDC8>

### 3.1 Reporting Period 1 April 2007 – 31 March 2008

3.1.1 Following preparation of the City Council's initial Local Development Scheme, a revised Scheme was agreed with the Secretary of State, which became formally operational from 1 June 2005. Progress against the milestones and work programme set out in this revised Scheme was subsequently reported as part of the December 2006 AMR. Whilst that AMR reported that LDS programme was moving forward positively, it was noted that following further advice from the Government Office for Yorkshire & the Humber (GOYH) that it would be necessary to update the LDS for submission to the Secretary of State by 31 March 2007. This was necessary in order to adjust production timetables for a number of Local Development Documents to:

- make them more deliverable to reflect the need to complete further work in relation to the consolidation and development of the LDF evidence base - with regard to Local Development Documents in production and
- to take into account the slippage in the production of the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy and the implications for the preparation of Local Development Documents in Leeds.

Adjustments were also necessary to the production timetable for outstanding SPDs, to take into account resourcing and capacity issues.

3.1.2 Within this context, an updated LDS was considered by the City Council's Development Plan Panel and Executive Board and subsequently resubmitted to the Secretary of State in March 2007. The Secretary of State subsequently accepted the changes and the revised LDS was formally brought into effect on 5 July 2007.

3.1.3 A major Development Planning commitment during this reporting period has been the City Council's commitment and input to the preparation of the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber. This includes participating as part of the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Assembly's Technical Advisory Group, Regional Planning Forum and Regional Planning Board. Following the Regional Spatial Strategy Examination in Public, the Panel report was issued on 04 May 2007 and the Proposed Changes issued on 28 September 2007. The City Council in turn made a number of extensive representations to the Proposed Changes document (including comments in relation to housing development, managing flood risk and the provision of infrastructure). Following consideration of representations, the Regional Spatial Strategy was adopted in May 2008.

3.1.4 Within this overall context, several strands of work are underway to continue to progress the LDF evidence base and the Local Development Documents incorporated within the LDS programme. Progress during the current reporting period can be summarised as follows.

- 3.1.5 Following pre-production work and earlier consultation, further consultation has been undertaken on the following Development Plan Documents: **City Centre Area Action Plan** Preferred Options consultation (16 April – 30 May 2007), **East & South East Leeds (EASEL) Area Action Plan** Preferred Options consultation (18 June – 30 July 2007), **Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan** Preferred Options consultation (5 October - 16 November 2007), **Core Strategy** Issues & Alternative Options consultation (23 October – 4 December 2007) and **West Leeds Gateway Area Action Plan** Preferred Options consultation (26 February – 8 April 2008).
- 3.1.6 Consistent with the City Council's current Local Development Scheme, work has also commenced on the preparation of a **Natural Resources and Waste** Development Plan Document. Within the context of the preparation of a detailed evidence base (a resource flow analysis and an analysis of the city's ecological footprint), consultation on an Issues and Alternative Options document is to commence in May 2008.
- 3.1.7 In the preparation of a series of Supplementary Planning Documents a wide range of pre-production work and consultation activity has been undertaken within the reporting period. This includes, the City Council Adoption of the **Designing for Community Safety** SPD (2 May 2007) and consultation on the following SPDs: **Travel Plans** and **Public Transport Improvements and Developer Contributions** (15 May – 29 June 2007), **Sustainable Design and Construction and Sustainability Assessment** (20 July – 10 September 2007), **Street Design Guide** (14 September – 26 October 2007) and **Tall Buildings** (7 January - 18 February 2008). Within the context of wider SPD work also, the City Council has also provided guidance to a number of community groups regarding the preparation of community led design guides and statements for future (City Council) adoption as SPDs (subject to their scope).
- 3.1.10 Associated with the preparation of Local Development Documents has been the continued development of the Sustainability Appraisal methodology to support the preparation of the various planning documents through the different production stages. Given the range of Local Development Documents in production in Leeds this has been a challenging and resource intensive process.
- 3.1.11 In the continued development of the LDF evidence base, a Leeds Employment Land Review has been undertaken and was completed in March 2006 (with follow up work being undertaken during the reporting period, as a basis to inform Employment Land issues within the context of the Core Strategy and Area Action Plans). In the support of the LDF evidence base, a district wide Strategic Flood Risk Assessment was completed in November 2007 and further technical studies underway within the Aire Valley Leeds AAP relating to land contamination and financial appraisal. In addition, a Greenspace Audit (consistent with the requirements of Planning Policy Guidance 17) is now underway and technical work to consider policy issues in relation to the emerging LDF Core Strategy.



### 3.2 Reporting Period 1 April 2008 – 31 March 2009

3.2.1 Looking ahead to the next AMR reporting period (1 April 2008 – 31 March 2009) are a number of challenges and opportunities for the Leeds LDF. These include:

- A review of policies as part of the 2006 UDP, with a view to requesting the Secretary of State to “save” policies beyond January 2009, where necessary,
- The need to review the LDF programme and potentially the Local Development Scheme, in the light of changes to national planning guidance (Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning, June 2008),
- To review the implications of the Adopted Regional Spatial Strategy (May 2008) for Leeds and the Regional Spatial Strategy Update (consultation to commence in November 2008),
- The need to progress Area Action Plans to Submission stage (following the analysis of consultation responses and the completion of further evidence base studies and technical work where necessary,
- Prepare Core Strategy Preferred Options for consultation,
- To undertake Issues & Alternative Options consultation on the Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document,
- To continue to progress the programme of Supplementary Planning Documents including the preparation of a new Affordable Housing SPD,
- Consistent with national guidance, to complete work on a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment for Leeds (including the establishment of a partnership group to oversee the technical process),
- To progress the PPG17 Greenspace Audit for completion in 2009,
- The need to continue to integrate Development Plan and regeneration work, where appropriate and where this adds value,
- To continue to develop the systems and processes to support the LDF and the monitoring requirements of the AMR and to continue to monitor progress against milestones and to adjustments where appropriate.
- To continue to work closely with the Government Office for Yorkshire & the Humber (GOYH) and a wide range of stakeholders to take the Leeds LDF process forward.

## 4 Monitoring Information

4.0.1 This section sets out information available from what is being monitored currently. This year's AMR concentrates on material required by DCLG and the Regional Assembly, using the revised definitions of the Core Indicators issued by CLG in July 2008. Although some of it is discussed in this part of the report for convenience the required information is also grouped in Appendix 2. For many of these topics / indicators either no information or incomplete counts exist. The monitoring work programme over the next year or so will continue to address this.

4.0.2 This part of the AMR will be expanded each year as LDF policies and their related monitoring sources are developed. It is intended that the monitoring range will be expanded to include matters of local interest reflected in LDF policies.

4.0.3 Topics covered in this AMR include:

- housebuilding performance and housing land supply indicators
- the supply of employment land
- the monitoring of changes in retail, office and leisure developments in Leeds as a whole and in the City Centre and town centres
- transport - measuring the accessibility of new residential developments to a range of facilities
- various matters relating to mineral aggregate production, waste management and other environmental concerns, including renewable energy generation capacity

4.0.4 There are other documents that include information which helps monitor the development of Leeds, chiefly the City Centre Audit<sup>5</sup>, the Leeds Economy Handbook<sup>6</sup> and the Local Transport Plan<sup>7</sup>. The relationship of these to the LDF monitoring effort will evolve and be tightened as work on the LDF develops.

### 4.1 Housing Trajectory

4.1.1 There has been a major change in housing land policy since last year's report, following the adoption of revised RSS in May 2008. Although strictly speaking this event fell outside the monitoring period, RSS has introduced new housing targets, which supersede both earlier RSS and UDP Review figures. For clarity, these targets are therefore used in this review. Core Indicator H1 summarises the new targets.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.leeds.gov.uk/> then Business, then Town centre management links

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.leeds.gov.uk/> then Business, then Business support and advice, then Local economy – reports and forecasts links

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.wyltp.com/> West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2: - 2006 - 2011

| <b>Table 1: H1 Plan period and net housing targets</b> |               |                        |  |
|--|---------------|------------------------|--|
| Start of period  | End of period | Total housing required | Source of requirement                      |
| 1/4/2004   | 31/3/2026     | 86440                  | RSS – The Yorkshire & Humber Plan May 2008 |

4.1.2 This aggregate requirement is made up of annual average net increases of 2260 in 2004-8 and 4300 from 2008 to 2026, estimated in RSS to be equivalent respectively to 2700 and 4740 gross. The latter figure is a radical departure from previous policy, which required average annual completions of 1930 gross. The new figure is two and a half times the old, and is the highest in the region; it is twice as large per head as the corresponding figure for Sheffield. It is also substantially higher than the best rates of housing stock increase achieved in Leeds at any time since the 1930s – the best performance in this period was about 2600 p.a. in the 1950s and 1960s.

4.1.3 Meeting the new target will require an overhaul of housing land allocation and release policies, which can only be achieved through the LDF – particularly Site Allocations DPD and AAPs. This process will inevitably take time, and as a result, output cannot reasonably be expected to adjust immediately. This much is recognised in RSS, which identifies Leeds in policy H1B and Table 12.2 as an area where output is likely to rise from below the 2008-26 average to above it. While RSS does not propose an actual delivery profile, it is quite clear that the 4300 total is an average to be met over the period as a whole, not necessarily in every year, and especially not in the early years.

4.1.4 In fact, housing output in Leeds has been exceptionally buoyant in recent years, as the H2 indicator shows. In the first 4 years of the RSS period (2004-8), output has exceeded the requirement of 2260 p.a. by

| <b>Table 2: H2a &amp; b Actual net additional dwellings</b> |        |        |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 2003-4  | 2004-5 | 2005-6 | 2006-7 | 2007-8 |
| 2991  | 2633   | 3436   | 3327   | 3576   |

3932 dwellings, or 43%. This over performance provides a useful cushion during the transition to the higher rates of output required post 2008, as will be shown below.

4.1.5 However, future supply prospects are at the core of this report. Indicators H2(c) and (d) require planning authorities to track possible future output against policy requirements and managed delivery targets over the life of the current plan or the next 15 years, whichever is the longer. Normally,

this is expected to be done in the context of a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), but no assessment is yet available. The Leeds SHLAA was launched in September 2008 and will not be completed until later next year.

4.1.6 In the absence of a SHLAA, a two part assessment of supply prospects has been undertaken, based on:

- A site specific assessment of supply over the period 2008-14 carried out in line with the PINs Guidance on demonstrating a 5 year supply of deliverable sites, and consistent with NI159 criteria,
- An extension from 2014 to 2026, based on stocks of land already identified in the UDP Review, in AAPs and in the Little London/Beeston Hill PFI, and also including an aggregate allowance for future windfall sites.

4.1.7 The 2008-14 assessment is described more fully in a separate document (“5 Year housing land supply 2008-13 & 2009-14”). As specified in the PINs guidance, it is drawn from three groups of sites – outstanding permissions and allocations and brownfield sites that have made sufficient progress through the planning system to be regarded as potentially available in the short term (“emerging sites” for short). Only phase 1 UDP allocations are included, as it remains UDP and Council policy to hold phase 2 and 3 allocations in reserve until output falls short of requirement. Although it is probable that some or all of these allocations will need to be released before 2014, there is at present no basis for predicting when this might be.

4.1.8 In the longer term (2014-26), outstanding capacity in existing plans and initiatives is fed through at constant rates over what are judged to be appropriate timescales. The major components of supply are residual UDP allocations (about 9000 dwellings) and Easel, Aire Valley and West Leeds Gateway AAP proposals (nearly 15000 units). Also included are windfall allowances, which average out at about 1400 units a year outside the City Centre, and 500 a year within it. The outer Leeds allowance is conservatively based on the long term average rate of windfall permissions over the period 1991-2008 – which gives a figure less than two thirds of the rates observed more recently since mid 2000. The City Centre figure is about two thirds of the rate actually achieved 1998-2008. The final main assumption concerns clearance, which is assumed to run at 255 p.a. – the average for 2003-8 - throughout the trajectory period.

4.1.9 It is important to be clear about what the trajectory is trying to do. The whole purpose is to give an idea of the extent to which housing **land supply** – as opposed to market demand – might be a constraint on output. To this end, it aims to judge how much housing could reasonably be expected to be delivered given favourable market conditions. A favourable market is a pre-condition for delivery of the post 2008 RSS target, which is of such a scale as to be unachievable except in such circumstances. The trajectory does not seek to project actual housebuilding, which in the short term at least is likely to fall sharply as a result of the collapse of the housing

market. But this collapse is a consequence of demand weakness – it has little to do with land supply problems and nor is it susceptible of resolution to any significant extent by supply side interventions. Consequently, it is not relevant to the assessment of the adequacy of the land supply.

- 4.1.10 Appendix 1 summarises the make-up of the full trajectory by component of supply and individual year and also gives more information about assumptions.
- 4.1.11 Indicators H2(c) and (d) appear on the next page. The first row summarises net housing additions potentially achievable each year 2008-26. The second row is intended to give the net site area associated with these additions, but this is a new introduction and information is not available this year. The third row shows the net residual dwelling additions required on average each year over the plan period, after taking account of past performance. The final row (“managed delivery target”) illustrates an alternative way of achieving the residual plan target that takes account of the practical necessity of increasing output progressively rather than instantaneously, as implied by the average plan figure.
- 4.1.12 This managed scenario builds upon the Local Area Agreement (LAA) target for net housing increase (NI154) agreed by Government and the City Council in June 2008. This sets Leeds a target of achieving net increases of 3400 a year between 2008 and 2011. CLG have recently confirmed that within the overall context of RSS housing requirements, the City Council can use this figure agreed as part of the LAA. Starting from this point, the managed target scenario shows how output would have to expand after 2011 in order to reach the plan target by 2026. Essentially, output would have to grow from below the long term average in the early years to above it later in the plan period, in a manner echoing the pattern envisaged by RSS policy H1B. Net increases would have to reach 4500 a year in about 10 years’ time.
- 4.1.13 The H2 trajectory suggests that a net increase of around 68000 dwellings might be achievable over 2008-26 from the identified sources of land. In round terms, this is about 6000 short of the residual requirement. However, this is a provisional calculation, which will need to be revised in the light of the SHLAA. In the meantime, it should not be interpreted dogmatically as a precise quantification of the current supply gap. Estimation of deliverable supply is subject to considerable uncertainty, especially over a period as long as 18 years, and many of the figures are likely to be subject to fairly wide margins of error. It will be for the Core Strategy to take a view about the degree of risk inherent in these calculations, and to act accordingly.
- 4.1.14 The 5 year housing supply per se is not a Core Indicator, but is clearly of relevance to this report. Table 3 summarises the 5 year supply data implicit in the H2 trajectory for the periods 2008-13 and 2009-14.

| <b>Table 3: Five year supply summaries</b> |                |                |
|--|----------------|----------------|
|  | <b>2008-13</b> | <b>2009-14</b> |
| Potential net supply                       | 17688          | 17590          |
|  |                |                |
| Residual RSS requirement H2c(c)            | 20410          | 20570          |
| Supply minus requirement                   | -2722          | -2980          |
|  |                |                |
| Managed requirement H2(d)                  | 17300          | 17600          |
| Supply minus requirement                   | 388            | -10            |

4.1.15 This table identifies potential net 5 year land supplies sufficient for 17688 dwellings in 2008-13 and 17590 in 2009-14. Set against the residual requirement averaged evenly over the entire period 2008-16 (H2c(c)), these supplies fall short by around 2700 units in 2008-13 (13%) and 3000 in 2009-14 (14%). Against the managed requirement (H2(d)), which recognises that the new RSS target cannot reasonably be expected to be met straight away (see para. 4.1.12 re. LAA), supply and requirement are broadly in balance in each period.

4.1.16 Returning to indicators H2(c) and (d) in Table 4, it can be seen that deliverability potentially improves in the years after 2014. This is in large part because allocations in phases 2/3 of the UDP and in the AAPs are assumed to begin feeding through at this time. In fact any supply tightness before then could be eased if the phase 2 and 3 allocations were to be released at an earlier date.

**Table 4: H2(c) & (d) Net additional dwellings in future years**

|  | 08-9          | 09-10 | 10-11 | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 23-24 | 24-25 | 25-26 | Total        |              |
|--|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|--------------|
| H2c(a)dwellings                            | 3527          | 4313  | 2971  | 2871  | 4006  | 3429  | 4349  | 4536  | 4536  | 4536  | 4553  | 3549  | 3538  | 3443  | 3443  | 3443  | 3343  | 3325  | <b>67711</b> |              |
| H2c(b) hectares                            | Not available |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |              |              |
| H2c(c) average annual residual requirement | 4082          | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082         | <b>73470</b> |
| H2(d) Managed target                       | 3400          | 3400  | 3400  | 3500  | 3600  | 3700  | 3900  | 4100  | 4300  | 4500  | 4500  | 4500  | 4500  | 4500  | 4500  | 4500  | 4400  | 4300  | <b>73500</b> |              |

**Table 5: Net cumulative residual trajectories to 2014**

|                                | 2004-5 | 2005-6 | 2006-7 | 2007-8 | 2008-9 | 2009-10 | 2010-1 | 2011-2 | 2012-3 | 2013-4 |
|--------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| RSS average annual requirement | 2260   | 2260   | 2260   | 2260   | 4300   | 4300    | 4300   | 4300   | 4300   | 4300   |
| Actual & projected supply      | 2633   | 3436   | 3327   | 3576   | 3527   | 4313    | 2971   | 2871   | 4006   | 3429   |
| Cumulative surplus(deficit)    | 373    | 1549   | 2616   | 3932   | 3159   | 3172    | 1843   | 414    | 120    | -751   |
|                                |        |        |        |        |        |         |        |        |        |        |
| Managed target H2(d)           | 2260   | 2260   | 2260   | 2260   | 3400   | 3400    | 3400   | 3500   | 3600   | 3700   |
| Actual & projected supply      | 2633   | 3436   | 3327   | 3576   | 3527   | 4313    | 2971   | 2871   | 4006   | 3429   |
| Cumulative surplus(deficit)    | 373    | 1549   | 2616   | 3932   | 4059   | 4972    | 4543   | 3914   | 4320   | 4049   |

- 4.1.17 It is also instructive to look at supply in the light of a cumulative residual trajectory of the type advocated in the original LDF Monitoring Guide, but not heard of much since. Such trajectories plot cumulative output against cumulative targets and are useful for showing the point in time when cumulative supply moves from surplus to deficit, or vice versa. Table 5 above shows these figures from the start of the RSS period in 2004, to the end of the 5 year assessment period in 2014.
- 4.1.18 In this table, actual supply 2004-8, and projected supply 2008-14 are plotted against first the yearly targets exactly as in RSS, and then the managed targets proposed under indicator H2(d). In both cases it can be seen that surplus supply has accumulated in the first 4 years of the RSS period when the target was for 2260 net dwellings a year. Against the subsequent average RSS target, these surpluses are then run down, finally disappearing in 2013-14. Against the lower managed targets, by contrast, the surplus continues to build for a year or two, and remains healthy even by 2013-4. Within the context of the agreed LAA housing requirement (see para. 4.1.7 above), an adequate 5 year supply, actual and prospective output is capable of remaining in credit against RSS targets for at least another 5 years.
- 4.1.19 Indicator H3 (Table 6 below) shows the volumes and percentages of gross housebuilding on previously developed land. The five year proportion remained at 93%, with last year's figure just below this at 92%. In the RSS period to date (2004-8), the proportion was 94%. The Council continues to attach considerable importance to maintaining these high rates of brownfield development. This is also a priority for RSS, which has a regional target of 65% - and if this is to be achieved it will require considerably higher rates in urban areas like Leeds where there is most scope for brownfield delivery.

| <b>Table 6: H3 New &amp; converted dwellings on previously developed land (PDL)</b> |                     |            |       |
|---|---------------------|------------|-------|
|   | Gross new dwellings | Number PDL | % PDL |
| 2003-8  | 17236               | 16078      | 93    |
| 2007-8  | 3833                | 3515       | 92    |

- 4.1.20 Indicator H4 reports changes in the net supply of gypsy and traveller pitches. There was no change over the last year.
- 4.1.21 Gross affordable housing completions (Indicator H5) are summarised below, using data from the Housing Strategy Statistical Appendix. 440 units were provided in 2007-8, the highest total for many years. Affordable housing is provided both via direct Government or Local Authority funding, and by means of planning agreements with private developers. The Council has set up an Affordable Housing Strategic Partnership to take advantage of enhanced state funding for affordable housing over coming years. Affordable provision of 300 units is planned for this year, rising to 500 the year after.



| <b>Table 7: H5 Gross Affordable Housing completions 2007-8</b> |              |       |
|--|--------------|-------|
| Social rented  | Intermediate | Total |
| 68   | 372          | 440   |

4.1.22 Despite last year's improved performance, the stock of affordable housing continues to fall, although now at a reduced rate. The HSSA indicates that the stock of City Council and Registered Social Landlord dwellings declined by 800 in 2007-8. This seems to be mainly the result of Right-to-Buy sales (although these are now on a much reduced scale) and housing clearance, which mainly affects the Local Authority stock.

4.1.23 H6 introduces indicators related to housing quality "Building for Life" assessments, but no arrangements are yet in place to monitor these.

## 4.2 The Supply of Employment Land

### Development Levels

4.2.1 As was hinted in last year's (2006/07) report, both floorspace and land-take indicators are much reduced this year. For 2006/07 starts on site totalled less than 17 ha with floorspace amounting to about 64,000 sqm. This has resulted in the expected lower levels of completions, despite the boost to the office total provided by the official completion of Bridgewater Place in April 2007.

4.2.2 The floorspace completed during the 2007/08 monitoring period amounted to 78310 sqm (842,950 sqft) – a total that was dominated by the office element of the mixed use scheme at Bridgewater Place of 25680 sqm gross (21830 sqm/ 234,930 sqft net).

4.2.3 Completions in the industrial and warehouse sectors were reduced significantly and represent the smallest levels of completion in these sectors since the AMRs began in 2003/04.

4.2.4 Unsurprisingly, land taken up during the year was also the lowest recorded in the series to date.

4.2.5 The pattern of office developments this year shows a contrast to last, which saw an emphasis on out-of-centre schemes. For 2007/08, 63% of new office floorspace completed was in city-centre schemes. Further, and again in contrast to any previous year, the city-centre schemes were almost entirely office elements of mixed use, residential-led developments.

4.2.6 Despite the city centre emphasis, out-of-centre schemes still provided a significant amount of new floorspace. The major developments completed this year included:

- Midpoint off Dick Lane BD3 (4030 sqm)
- Airport West Ph2 (3920 sqm)

- Global Avenue Millshaw LS11 (3200 sqm)
- Killingbeck Office Village off Killingbeck Drive LS14 (2830 sqm)
- Plot 3125 Thorpe Park Century Way LS15 (2370 sqm)
- Armley Court Ph1 Armley Road LS12 (1950 sqm)
- Ph1 Carrwood Park Swillington Common LS15 (1690 sqm)
- Ph1 Sussex Avenue Thwaite Gate LS10 (1240 sqm)

In all, out of centre schemes amounted to 24,820 sqm on 6.0 ha.

4.2.7 After a crop of major industrial and warehousing completions last year (76,920 sqm), most developments this year have been small in scale. The largest included the following:

- Unit 2 at Helios 47 at Garforth (6,060 sqm)
- Blackburn’s Warehouse Old Run Road LS10 (2,570sqm)
- Plot 230 Howley Park Rd East, Morley LS27 (1230 sqm)
- Swinnow Lane Bramley LS13 (1010 sqm)

4.2.8 The prospects for 2008/09 would seem to be much the same as for this year. By the mid point of 2008/09, about 87,300 sqm of new employment floorspace on less than 10 ha were under development or completed.

| Development Sector | 2004/05    |                               | 2005/06    |                               | 2006/07    |                               | 2007/08    |                               |
|--------------------|------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|
|                    | Area (ha.) | Floorspace ( m <sup>2</sup> ) | Area (ha.) | Floorspace ( m <sup>2</sup> ) | Area (ha.) | Floorspace ( m <sup>2</sup> ) | Area (ha.) | Floorspace ( m <sup>2</sup> ) |
| B1 Office          | 8.02       | 26090                         | 6.27       | 59390                         | 16.44      | 85600                         | 9.51       | 66670                         |
| B1 Other           | 1.36       | 3680                          | 1.25       | 3660                          | 0.47       | 1730                          |            |                               |
| B2 Industrial      | 8.58       | 30745                         | 3.60       | 18950                         | 7.92       | 28820                         | 1.78       | 6060                          |
| B8 Warehousing     | 1.21       | 4850                          | 6.74       | 15890                         | 13.08      | 48095                         | 2.13       | 5580                          |
| <b>Total</b>       | 19.17      | 65365                         | 17.87      | 97890                         | 37.91      | 164245                        | 13.42      | 78310                         |

*Note: Extensions not included; floorspace figures are gross internal area.*

4.2.9 For the first time since AMRs have been presented, this year we are able to report the amount of development completed in “within-curtilage” schemes. This term is used to describe extensions to existing premises, minor changes of use which result in additional employment space and new-build premises that are within the curtilages of existing buildings.

4.2.10 Overall, 'within-curtilage' development accounted for almost 20% of the new employment floorspace completed this year. Clearly, this is a substantial element, representing a measure of essential on-site adjustments of property to business needs. However, it is doubtful whether such schemes can be associated with an equivalent land area and for this reason we will continue to monitor and present results separately.

| <b>Apr07-Mar08</b>        | <b>New &amp; redeveloped sites</b> | <b>Within-curtilage developments</b> | <b>Total</b>                  |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Development Sector</b> | Floorspace ( m <sup>2</sup> )      | Floorspace ( m <sup>2</sup> )        | Floorspace ( m <sup>2</sup> ) |
| B1 Office                 | 66670                              | 4690                                 | 71360                         |
| B1 Other                  |                                    | 60                                   | 60                            |
| B2 Industrial             | 6060                               | 3380                                 | 9440                          |
| B8 Warehousing            | 5580                               | 10300                                | 15880                         |
| <b>Total</b>              | 78310                              | 18430                                | 96740                         |
| <b>Percentage</b>         | 80.9                               | 19.1                                 | 100.0                         |

### Regeneration Areas

4.2.11 New employment developments in the city's designated regeneration areas were very limited in number, size and type during 2007/08. In total only 5610 sqm on 1.8 ha. were completed during the year, comprising mainly new office schemes at Armley Court and Killingbeck Office Village, as listed above. The regeneration areas' share of new development in the city as a whole fell to less than 10%, compared with 30% and 26% in the two previous years.

4.2.12 It is now possible to look back over 5 years of monitoring development in regeneration areas, to see any patterns that might be emerging. The table below gives the position for the five-year period 2003-2008. This reveals that about 40% of the city's land take has been in designated Regeneration Areas, with about a third of new floorspace being associated it. Aire Valley's contribution dominates, accounting for 72% of both land take and floorspace added over the past five years.

| <b>Table 10: Leeds LDF Indicator- Land developed for employment by sector in Regeneration Areas</b> |                           |                         |               |                         |               |                         |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Apr03 - Mar08</b>  |                           |                         |               |                         |               |                         |
|   | <b>Regeneration Areas</b> |                         |               |                         | <b>Total</b>  |                         |
|   | <b>In</b>                 |                         | <b>Out</b>    |                         |               |                         |
| <b>Development Sector</b>   | ha. Developed             | m <sup>2</sup> complete | ha. Developed | m <sup>2</sup> complete | ha. Developed | m <sup>2</sup> complete |
| B1 Office   | 16.79                     | 46020                   | 43.72         | 249420                  | 60.50         | 295440                  |
| B1 Other  | 2.36                      | 6630                    | 2.58          | 8580                    | 4.94          | 15210                   |
| B2 Industrial   | 20.01                     | 86910                   | 17.36         | 62845                   | 37.37         | 149755                  |
| B8 Warehousing  | 15.60                     | 50320                   | 17.71         | 52165                   | 33.31         | 102485                  |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>54.75</b>              | <b>189880</b>           | <b>81.37</b>  | <b>373010</b>           | <b>136.12</b> | <b>562890</b>           |

*Regeneration Areas: as defined in Leeds UDP Review 2006 plus EASEL & WLG AAPs*

### **Development on Previously Developed Land**

4.2.13 Overall, the proportion of development on Previously Developed Land (PDL) in 2007/08 rose compared with 2006/07 (69% vs 59%). In terms of floorspace, the completion of several city centre office schemes, including the very large development at Bridgewater Place, has resulted in a rise (81% vs 62%) in the percentage of floorspace completed on PDL.

4.2.14 Industrial and warehousing schemes continue to be develop mainly on PDL sites. However, the smaller level of completions this year means that the percentage figures should be treated with caution.

4.2.15 Unlike housing development, there is no target for the proportion of employment schemes that should be on PDL. Nevertheless there is a policy preference, re-iterated in the draft PPS4 issued in Dec 2007, to “prioritise previously developed land which is suitable for re-use”. As recorded in Indicator BD2, almost 70% of employment development was on PDL and so the city’s performance would appear to be consistent with such a policy ambition.

| <b>Table 11: LDF Core Indicator BD2 - Land developed for employment by type<br/>Analysis by Previously Developed Land (PDL)</b> |              |                           |                |                           |                   |             |                      |             |
|---|--------------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|
| <b>Apr07 – Mar08</b>  |              |                           |                |                           |                   |             |                      |             |
|   | <b>PDL</b>   |                           | <b>Not PDL</b> |                           | <b>Total Land</b> |             | <b>Total Floorsp</b> |             |
| <b>Development Sector</b>   | Area (ha)    | Floorspace m <sup>2</sup> | Area (ha)      | Floorspace m <sup>2</sup> | Area (ha)         | % PDL       | m <sup>2</sup>       | % PDL       |
| B1 Office   | 6.27         | 54520                     | 3.24           | 12150                     | 9.51              | 65.92       | 66670                | 81.78       |
| B1 Other  |              |                           |                |                           | 0.00              |             | 0                    |             |
| B2 Industrial   | 1.78         | 6060                      |                |                           | 1.78              | 100.00      | 6060                 | 100.00      |
| B8 Warehousing  | 1.24         | 3010                      | 0.89           | 2570                      | 2.13              | 58.07       | 5580                 | 53.94       |
| <b>Total 2007/08</b>  | 9.29         | 63590                     | 4.13           | 14720                     | 13.42             | 69.19       | 78310                | 81.20       |
| <i>2006/07</i>  | <i>22.33</i> | <i>102555</i>             | <i>15.58</i>   | <i>61690</i>              | <i>37.91</i>      | <i>58.9</i> | <i>164245</i>        | <i>62.4</i> |

4.2.16 It is clear from past AMRs that indicator BD2 (previously named 1c) is subject to marked year-to-year fluctuations. Again, with the benefit of five years of data we can see some longer term patterns emerging.

4.2.17 Table 12 below shows that for the five years 2003-2008 the proportions of new employment development on PDL are 69% and 74% for land and floorspace, respectively.

| <b>Table 12: LDF Core Indicator BD2 - Land developed for employment by sector 2003-2008<br/>Analysis by Previously Developed Land (PDL)</b> |            |                           |                |                           |                   |       |                      |       |
|---|------------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|
| <b>Apr03 – Mar08</b>  |            |                           |                |                           |                   |       |                      |       |
|   | <b>PDL</b> |                           | <b>Not PDL</b> |                           | <b>Total Land</b> |       | <b>Total Floorsp</b> |       |
| <b>Development Sector</b>   | Area (ha)  | Floorspace m <sup>2</sup> | Area (ha)      | Floorspace m <sup>2</sup> | Area (ha)         | % PDL | m <sup>2</sup>       | % PDL |
| B1 Office   | 27.51      | 178810                    | 32.99          | 116630                    | 60.50             | 45.47 | 295440               | 60.52 |
| B1 Other  | 4.47       | 13480                     | 0.47           | 1730                      | 4.94              | 90.49 | 15210                | 88.63 |
| B2 Industrial   | 33.46      | 134415                    | 3.91           | 15340                     | 37.37             | 89.53 | 149755               | 89.76 |
| B8 Warehousing  | 28.58      | 87335                     | 4.73           | 15150                     | 33.31             | 85.79 | 102485               | 85.22 |
| <b>Total 2003-08</b>  | 94.01      | 414040                    | 42.11          | 148850                    | 136.12            | 69.07 | 562890               | 73.56 |

4.2.18 However, these figures mask the considerable differences between office developments and other types of employment scheme as shown in the extract below (Table 13). Industrial and warehousing developments have mainly been on PDL, at almost 90%. In contrast, the office sector has favoured a far higher proportion of green field locations, resulting in less than half the land take being previously used. Larger city centre office schemes boost the floorspace proportion to just over 60% previously used.

| <b>Table 13: Development on PDL by sector</b> |              |                   |
|---|--------------|-------------------|
| <b>2003-08</b>                                | <b>Land</b>  | <b>Floorspace</b> |
| <b>Development Sector</b>                     | <b>% PDL</b> | <b>% PDL</b>      |
| B1 Office                                     | 45.47        | 60.52             |
| B1 Other                                      | 90.49        | 88.63             |
| B2 Industrial                                 | 89.53        | 89.76             |
| B8 Warehousing                                | 85.79        | 85.22             |
| Total 2003-08                                 | 69.07        | 73.56             |

### **Employment Land Available by Type**

4.2.19 Table 14 indicates that the allocated supply which still has potential for employment development amounts to about 615 ha., a drop of about 10 ha. over last year.

4.2.20 Over the course of the UDP plan period, take-up of employment allocations has been of modest scale, owing in large measure to infrastructure constraints in the Aire Valley area. Completed employment schemes on allocated land across the city amounted to about 77 ha. in the five years since 2003, compared with about 59 ha. on windfall sites. Over 200 ha of allocations in Aire Valley depend on the opening of the East Leeds Link from Cross Green to Junction 45 of M1, but completion is due in November 2008.

4.2.21 For allocated land, the amounts that are Previously Developed (“brownfield”) and greenfield are broadly balanced at 322 ha vs 294 ha, but the greenfield supply is more concentrated upon providing for the B1 sector (20% PDL) rather than the B2/B8 industrial sectors (78% PDL).

4.2.22 While this reflects one of the objectives of the UDP in providing market opportunities for high quality peripheral office parks, this objective is now recognized as increasingly out-of-step with national planning guidance in PPS6 and with the Regional Spatial Strategy, which call for office developments to be focused on town and city centres.

4.2.23 In contrast the provision for B2/B8 sectors is dominated by brownfield sites, particularly the site of the former Skelton Grange Power Station and the land adjacent to the filter beds at Knostrop, which account for almost 150 ha.

**Table 14: LDF Core Indicator BD3 - Employment Land Supply by Development Sector**

| <b>31-Mar-08</b> | Allocations  |            | Windfalls    |            | Total        |            |
|------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| <b>Sector</b>    | ha.          | No. sites  | ha.          | No. sites  | ha.          | No. sites  |
| B1 Office        | 103.29       | 27         | 53.19        | 84         | 156.48       | 111        |
| B1 Other         | 165.53       | 22         | 11.19        | 18         | 176.71       | 40         |
| B2 & related     | 232.35       | 57         | 10.41        | 21         | 242.76       | 78         |
| B8 & related     | 114.46       | 19         | 57.99        | 15         | 172.45       | 34         |
| <b>Total</b>     | 615.62       | 125        | 132.78       | 138        | 748.40       | 263        |
| <i>31-Mar-07</i> | <i>626.7</i> | <i>125</i> | <i>124.4</i> | <i>133</i> | <i>751.1</i> | <i>258</i> |

4.2.24 As in previous years, windfall supply is almost entirely on Previously Developed Land - 96% at March 2008 – and shows a preponderance of small sites. However, this is a variable source of supply and its type, location and timing are uncertain. It provides a bonus rather than a supply that can be set against known sectors of demand.

**Table 15: LDF Core Indicator BD3- Allocated Employment Land by Sector and PDL**

| 31 Mar 08    |        |           |         |           |        |       |           |
|--------------|--------|-----------|---------|-----------|--------|-------|-----------|
| Sector       | PDL    |           | Not PDL |           | Total  |       |           |
|              | ha.    | No. sites | ha.     | No. sites | ha.    | % PDL | No. sites |
| B1 Office    | 31.10  | 14        | 72.20   | 13        | 103.29 | 30.1  | 27        |
| B1 Other     | 22.56  | 9         | 142.97  | 13        | 165.53 | 13.6  | 22        |
| B2 & Related | 158.95 | 38        | 73.40   | 19        | 232.35 | 68.4  | 57        |
| B8 & Related | 109.52 | 13        | 4.94    | 6         | 114.46 | 95.6  | 19        |
| <b>Total</b> | 322.12 | 74        | 293.50  | 51        | 615.62 | 52.3  | 125       |



### Loss of Employment Land to non-employment uses

4.2.25 Table 16 below reveals that losses of employment land are much reduced compared with last year: 15 ha as opposed to 25 ha. in 2006/07. As in previous years, the largest land take is for housing. This year, this involves just over 11 ha. Gains of employment land from greenfield and brownfield developments are also reduced - down by about 35%. The overall position for 2007/08 shows a net loss of just over 8.0 ha.

| <b>Tale 16: Leeds LDF Indicator- Loss of Employment Land to non-employment uses in Leeds MD and Regeneration Areas (1) 2007/08</b> |                 |                  |                              |                  |
|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Apr07-Mar08</b>   |                 |                  |                              |                  |
|  | <b>Leeds MD</b> |                  | <b>Of which: Regen Areas</b> |                  |
| <b>Loss to</b>   | <b>ha</b>       | <b>No. sites</b> | <b>ha</b>                    | <b>No. sites</b> |
| Housing  | 11.4            | 29               | 0.4                          | 2                |
| Retail/other commercial  | 2.0             | 5                |                              |                  |
| Other  | 1.7             | 9                | 0.3                          | 2                |
|  |                 |                  |                              |                  |
| <b>Total Loss 2007/08</b>  | <b>15.1</b>     | <b>43</b>        | <b>0.7</b>                   | <b>4</b>         |
| <i>2006/07</i>   | <i>25.2</i>     | <i>63</i>        | <i>4.0</i>                   | <i>16</i>        |
|  |                 |                  |                              |                  |
| <b>Gain from</b>   | <b>ha</b>       | <b>No. sites</b> | <b>ha</b>                    | <b>No. sites</b> |
| Greenfield Sites   | 2.9             | 5                |                              |                  |
| PDL not in empt use (2)  | 3.9             | 11               | 2.4                          | 3                |
|  |                 |                  |                              |                  |
| <b>Total Gain 2007/08</b>  | <b>6.8</b>      | <b>16</b>        | <b>2.4</b>                   | <b>3</b>         |
| <i>2006/07</i>   | <i>10.3</i>     | <i>18</i>        | <i>2.5</i>                   | <i>5</i>         |
|  |                 |                  |                              |                  |
| <b>Net Loss (Gain) 2007/08</b>   | <b>8.3</b>      |                  | <b>(1.7)</b>                 |                  |
| <i>Net Loss (Gain) 2006 / 07</i>   | <i>14.9</i>     |                  | <i>1.5</i>                   |                  |

Note: Losses/Gains based on start of development

(1) *Regeneration Areas: as defined in Leeds UDP Review 2006 plus EASEL & WLG AAPs*

(2) *Empt Land re-used for empt purposes: 1.3 ha on 6 sites of which 0.6 ha in Regen Areas*

4.2.26 The use of employment land for housing (11.4ha) was close to the average for the four years since 2004.

Some key features of the 2007/08 outturn are

- Most sites were of 1 ha. or less.

- Only one larger site was started this year – 2.43 ha. on the former brickworks at Lingwell Gate Lane (Ardsley & Robin Hood).
- The number of dwellings started on former employment land amounted to over 1100 units – a figure that is about 25% of the current revised RSS annual housing requirement. Almost half (600 units) were in five inner wards (Armley, Beeston & Holbeck, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill, City & Hunslet and Hyde Park & Woodhouse).

4.2.27 Gains have been lower this year, reflecting the lower take-up of both brownfield and greenfield sites. As last year, those greenfield sites that have started this year still feature mainly speculative out-of-centre office schemes, in further speculative phases of Business Parks at Turnberry Park Gildersome, Capitol Park Tingley and Carrwood Park at Swillington Common.

4.2.28 Table 17 below consolidates the values for Indicator 1e for the past four years.

| <b>Table 17: Leeds LDF Indicator - Loss of Employment Land to non-employment uses in Leeds MD and Regeneration Areas (1) 2004-08</b> |                 |                  |                              |                  |
|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Consolidated data</b>   |                 |                  |                              |                  |
|  | <b>Leeds MD</b> |                  | <b>Of which: Regen Areas</b> |                  |
| <b>Loss to</b>   | <b>ha</b>       | <b>No. sites</b> | <b>ha</b>                    | <b>No. sites</b> |
| Housing  | 48.2            | 129              | 8.0                          | 17               |
| Retail/other commercial  | 4.5             | 15               | 0.3                          | 3                |
| Other  | 5.0             | 24               | 1.9                          | 9                |
| <b>Total Loss 2004-08</b>  | <b>57.7</b>     | <b>168</b>       | <b>10.2</b>                  | <b>29</b>        |
| <b>Gain from</b>   | <b>ha</b>       | <b>No. sites</b> | <b>Ha</b>                    | <b>No. sites</b> |
| Greenfield Sites   | 28.1            | 31               | 4.5                          | 2                |
| PDL not in empt use (2)  | 18.8            | 45               | 6.7                          | 9                |
| <b>Total Gain 2004-08</b>  | <b>46.9</b>     | <b>76</b>        | <b>11.2</b>                  | <b>11</b>        |
| <b>Net Loss (Gain) 2004-08</b>   | <b>10.8</b>     |                  | <b>(1.0)</b>                 |                  |
| Note: Losses/Gains based on start of development   |                 |                  |                              |                  |

(1) Regeneration Areas: as defined in the UDP Review

4.2.29 Over the last four years the overall result has been a net loss of employment land of about 11 ha. For Regeneration Areas the result is more balanced. However, the most striking aspect is the take-up for

housing, which has averaged about 12 ha. a year. So far, gains have not compensated for this.

### **The Yorkshire and Humber Plan: Regional Spatial Strategy to 2026**

4.2.30 The Yorkshire and Humber Plan was adopted in May 2008 and is now part of the Development Plan for Leeds and contains policies, which will directly affect employment land policies within the Leeds LDF. Of particular relevance is policy E3 which sets the context for LDF authorities, by setting out indicative employment growth forecasts and the associated net change in land required over the plan period to 2021.

4.2.31 In contrast to the Housing policies, these forecast and requirements are not targets to be met – rather, they are the framework within which more detailed and more up-to-date forecasts and evidence of local land needs will be assessed as LDFs progress through the plan making process.

4.2.32 Although RSS Policy E3 allows LDF authorities to interpret its specific numerical requirements in the light of more up-to-date and local evidence, some matters are prescribed. In particular, RSS E3 requires LDF authorities to ensure that there is a five-year market-ready supply of employment sites identified and protected to meet current or longer term needs for economic development. Further, the supply and demand situation is to be monitored in a three-year cycle to ensure the suitability of the portfolio over the life of the plan. There is no definition within RSS of the term "market-ready supply", but it is likely that this will emerge during the technical process of translating the Plan's indicative forecasts and requirements into the city's employment land needs. It is this process that will determine the absolute size of a five-year market-ready supply.

4.2.33 In response to these aspects of the RSS, work is continuing to refine the Employment Land Review, with the aims of establishing the appropriate level of supply that should be maintained in Leeds and assessing the quality of the sites currently in the supply.

### **4.3 Retail, Office & Leisure Developments(2008)**

4.3.1 DCLG Core Output Indicator BD4 calls for the amount of retail, office and leisure floorspace completed in the year and asks for details of the percentage of this development located in town centres and out of town centres. Information on completed retail and leisure floorspace have been collated from planning application and Building Control records, supplemented by information from VOA and the Council's own record of new and extended properties added to the Non-Domestic Rating list.

Table 18 below presents Indicator BD4 for the city as a whole.

| <b>Town Centre Uses</b>           | <b>Completed Apr07 – Mar08</b> | <b>Apr06 – Mar07</b>          |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Use Class</b>                  | <b>Floorspace (Sqm Gross)</b>  | <b>Floorspace (Sqm Gross)</b> |
| <b>A1 Retail</b>                  | 7210                           | 13600                         |
| <b>A2 Office</b>                  | 1010                           | <i>n.a.</i>                   |
| <b>B1a Office</b>                 | 71360                          | 85600                         |
| <b>D2 Leisure</b>                 | 11750                          | 4520                          |
| <b>Total Completed Floorspace</b> | 91330                          | 103720                        |

4.3.2 As with most development sectors, completions of town centre uses are lower this year with the exception of leisure, which is boosted by the completion of the swimming and diving centre at Beeston. Commentary on the office sector has been covered under Indicator BD1, above.

For A1 retail schemes, two sites can be noted:

- Tesco at the Clarence Dock development
- Lidl Foodstore, Halton

4.3.3 DCLG indicator BD4 also seeks to examine the distribution of new retail, office and leisure development – the main town centre commercial uses. For this year’s AMR the outcome is shown in Tables 19 and 20 below. The term “Centres” refers to any of the retail centres shown on the UDP Proposals Map.

|                         | <b>Floorspace completed A1 (m<sup>2</sup>)</b> |              |  |              |
|-------------------------|--|--------------|--|--------------|
|                         | <b>sites less than 2500m<sup>2</sup></b>       |              | <b>sites 2500m<sup>2</sup> or more</b> |              |
|                         | <b>Net (1)</b>                                 | <b>Gross</b> | <b>Net (1)</b>                         | <b>Gross</b> |
| <b>Locations</b>        |  |              |  |              |
| Leeds City Centre       |  | 2560         |  | 0            |
| Town & District Centres |  | 3250         |  | 0            |
| Out-of-centre           |  | 1400         |  | 0            |
| <b>Total</b>            |  | 7210         |  | 0            |

Note 1. Net figures are not available

| <b>Table 20: Office &amp; Leisure Floorspace Completed in Leeds Centres 2007/08</b> |  |              |              |
|---|--|--------------|--------------|
| <b>Locations</b>  | <b>Floorspace completed (m2 gross)</b> |              |              |
|   | <b>A2</b>                              | <b>B1a</b>   | <b>D2</b>    |
| Leeds City Centre   | 100                                    | 43680        | 380          |
| Town & District Centres   | 650                                    | 180          | 220          |
| Out-of-centre   | 260                                    | 27500        | 11150        |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>1010</b>                            | <b>71360</b> | <b>11750</b> |

4.3.4 With only two years' values for these indicators it is difficult to assess their contribution to monitoring policies so far. However, the out-turn for 2007/08 shows that most new retail provision (81%) has been in locations that are in the city centre or in town and district centres designated within the UDP. In contrast to last year, only 19% of new A1 space has been outside such centres, compared with 75% in 2006/07.

4.3.5 This degree of year-to-year variation suggests that this indicator could be of interest, but needs a few years to "mature". We shall continue to report it annually, but further analysis will not be meaningful until we have at least five years of data.

#### 4.4 **Transport**

##### **Accessibility**

4.4.1 In its revisions to the Core Output Indicators issued in July 2008, DCLG removed two indicators relating to transport issues – the accessibility of new homes to various facilities and the level of compliance with non-residential car parking standards. Nevertheless, the Council is encouraged to continue monitoring these indicators where they are relevant to the implementation of spatial strategy. As accessibility is a key element of the sustainability assessment of new development, monitoring will continue.

4.4.2 The accessibility indicator involves calculating the percentage of new residential development within a range of times by **public** transport from a GP, hospital, primary and secondary school, employment and a major health centre. Progress has been made this year in measuring the accessibility of new dwellings to GP surgeries, hospitals, primary schools, high schools and further and higher education establishments. Work is still in progress on two further types of facility - major health centres and employment concentrations.

4.4.3 Values for the five indicators we have measured this year are set out below. The tables give the numbers of new dwellings completed in the year that are located within 15, 30, 45 or 60 minutes of a service or community facility. Where available the comparable indicator for last year is given.

- 4.4.4 The results for 2007/08 seem to show that the new dwellings completed have a lower accessibility profile than completions in 2006/07. Using the benchmark formerly used by CLG (30 minutes), we can see that cumulative percentage figures are significantly lower across all the facility types.
- 4.4.5 Year-to-year differences need to be interpreted with caution, however. At this level of detail, we have no previous values to guide us; changes can occur in all elements of the indicators as data-sets are updated.

**Table 21.1 Accessibility of New Dwellings to Hospitals 2007/08**

| Criterion             | No. units | Percent | % 2006/07 |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| <b>Not accessible</b> | 583       | 16.97   | 4.2       |
| <b>&lt;=60 mins</b>   | 2852      | 83.03   | 95.8      |
| <b>&lt;=45 mins</b>   | 2745      | 79.91   | 92.6      |
| <b>&lt;=30 mins</b>   | 2169      | 63.14   | 74.3      |
| <b>&lt;=15 mins</b>   | 583       | 16.97   | 37.6      |
| <b>Total Units</b>    | 3435      | 100.00  | 100.0     |

**Table 21.2 Accessibility of New Dwellings to GP Surgeries 2007/08**

| Criterion             | No. units | Percent | % 2006/07 |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| <b>Not accessible</b> | 573       | 16.68   | 2.1       |
| <b>&lt;=60 mins</b>   | 2862      | 83.32   | 97.9      |
| <b>&lt;=45 mins</b>   | 2862      | 83.32   | 97.9      |
| <b>&lt;=30 mins</b>   | 2862      | 83.32   | 97.9      |
| <b>&lt;=15 mins</b>   | 2652      | 77.21   | 97.1      |
| <b>Total Units</b>    | 3435      | 100.00  | 100.0     |

**Table 21.3 Accessibility of New Dwellings to Primary Schools 2007/08**

| Criterion             | No. units | Percent | % 2006/07 |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| <b>Not accessible</b> | 569       | 16.56   | 0.9       |
| <b>&lt;=60 mins</b>   | 2866      | 83.44   | 99.1      |
| <b>&lt;=45 mins</b>   | 2866      | 83.44   | 99.1      |
| <b>&lt;=30 mins</b>   | 2866      | 83.44   | 99.1      |
| <b>&lt;=15 mins</b>   | 2628      | 76.51   | 99.1      |
| <b>Total Units</b>    | 3435      | 100.00  | 100.0     |

**Table 21.4 Accessibility of New Dwellings to High Schools 2007/08**

| Criterion             | No. units | Percent | % 2006/07 |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| <b>Not accessible</b> | 577       | 16.80   | 2.3       |

|                    |             |               |              |
|--------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <=60 mins          | 2858        | 83.20         | 97.7         |
| <=45 mins          | 2858        | 83.20         | 97.7         |
| <=30 mins          | 2854        | 83.09         | 97.7         |
| <=15 mins          | 1800        | 52.40         | 82.9         |
| <b>Total Units</b> | <b>3435</b> | <b>100.00</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

**Table 21.5 Accessibility of New Dwellings to Tertiary Education 2007/08**

| Criterion             | No. units   | Percent       | % 2006/07<br>Not monitored |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Not accessible</b> | 577         | 16.80         | ..                         |
| <b>&lt;=60 mins</b>   | 2855        | 83.11         | ..                         |
| <b>&lt;=45 mins</b>   | 2743        | 79.85         | ..                         |
| <b>&lt;=30 mins</b>   | 2365        | 68.85         | ..                         |
| <b>&lt;=15 mins</b>   | 1370        | 39.88         | ..                         |
| <b>Total Units</b>    | <b>3435</b> | <b>100.00</b> | <b>..</b>                  |

4.4.6 Some work on accessibility is done within the ambit of the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (LTP). This uses Department for Transport (DfT) core accessibility indicators for residents of Leeds District. The indicators were calculated using public transport data for autumn 2004 and Population Census data from 2001 and are repeated again this year to provide context for the indicator values presented above.

**Access to further education**

85.4% and 99.9% of 16 – 19 year olds are within 30 and 60 minutes of a further education establishment by public transport.

**Access to work**

98.9% and 99.9% of people of working age are within 20 and 40 minutes of an employment centre by public transport.

99.6% and 99.9% of people in receipt of Jobseekers allowance are within 20 and 40 minutes of an employment centre by public transport.

**Access to hospitals**

87.1% and 99.9% of all households are within 30 and 60 minutes of a hospital by public transport.

92.2% and 99.9% of households without a car are within 30 and 60 minutes of a hospital by public transport.

**Access to GPs**

97.6% and 99.8% of all households are within 15 and 30 minutes of a GP by public transport.

99.1% and 99.9% of households without a car are within 15 and 30 minutes of a GP by public transport.

**Access to primary schools**

99.5% and 99.9% of all 5 - 11 year olds are within 15 and 30 minutes of the nearest primary school by public transport.

**Access to secondary schools**

95.9% and 99.8% of all 12 – 17 year olds are within 20 and 40 minutes of the nearest secondary school by public transport.

4.4.7 The bulk of Leeds is heavily urbanised and it has a dense public transport network. Consequently, at current service levels a very high proportion of the population falls within the 30 minute accessibility standard in the Key Indicator. For example, according to the figures set out above 99.9% of 5 -11 year olds live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school. Even if this measure is tightened to 15 minutes most of the District, and 99.5% of pupils, are covered.

4.4.8 As LDF policies are developed different local accessibility standards will be considered more appropriate to support local aspirations such as those contained in the Vision for Leeds. Accessibility to a range of facilities is one of the objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal framework against which every LDF policy option is assessed. In this context, the results presented in this AMR and in last year’s mark some early exploratory steps in establishing appropriate ways of measuring the accessibility of new development.

**4.5 Environmental Issues**

**Minerals**

4.5.1 Indicator M1 relates to the amount of land won aggregates produced in the city. There are currently 6 active crushed rock quarries in Leeds and one sand and gravel extraction site. Actual or estimated sales in 2007-8 are summarised below. Total estimated production was about one fifth up on the estimated figure for 2006-7.

| <b>Table 22: M1 Land won aggregate production 2007-8 (tonnes)</b> |              |        |
|---|--------------|--------|
| Sand & Gravel   | Crushed rock | Total  |
| 140,000   | 759000       | 899000 |

4.5.2 Indicator M2 covers the production of secondary and recycled aggregates. No secondary aggregates were produced in Leeds. It is estimated that about 250,000 tonnes of recycled aggregates were produced but this estimate is subject to wide margins of error. There is still no process for obtaining accurate production figures.



4.5.3 The City Council is assisting the contractor currently working on a study of sand and gravel resources at regional level. This study aims to help decide how best to exploit these resources. Part 2 of this Study, formally expected in April 2008, is now due to report by the end of the year.

### Waste Management

4.5.4 Indicator W1 seeks information about **new** waste management facilities. One new facility received planning permission in 2007-8 and is now operational.

| Reference   | Location                   | Capacity (tonnes p.a.) | Type  |
|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------|---|
| 07/00210/FU | Parkside Industrial Estate | 60000                  | Household, commercial & industrial waste processing & recycling |

4.5.5 In addition, a number of applications were approved to redevelop or extend existing facilities. These were:

- Knostrop Waste Water Treatment Works. Construction of 5 storage tanks and associated works to implement a new sludge management scheme (07/04382/FU).
- Carr Crofts Waste Transfer Station. Redevelopment of existing facility dealing with household waste, which will enable the site to reach the operating capacity of 75000 tonnes, which was previously unattainable (07/04398/FU).
- Gamblethorpe Household Waste Sorting site. Extension of an existing permission to 2010 to enable the facility to continue in operation (07/05610/LA).

4.5.6 The significance of new developments is difficult to assess in the continued absence of baseline information about overall waste management capacity. When completed, studies commissioned by the North East Environment Agency should provide this context.

4.5.7 Turning to **municipal waste**, the Integrated Waste Strategy for Leeds was adopted in October 2006. It covers the period from 2005 to 2035. The strategy outlines the context for and principles of the Council's strategic vision for waste management over the next 30 years and informs the action plan that accompanies it. The action plan which is updated each year is based around 9 key themes which cover the following issues: Education & Awareness, Waste Prevention, Market Development & Procurement,

Recycling & Composting, Medium & Long Term Recovery, Enforcement, Limiting Landfill, Planning and Commercial & Industrial Waste.

- 4.5.8 Key principles of the strategy are sustainability, partnership and being realistic and responsive. The key themes in the action plan will take these principles and policies forward to ensure that the City Council delivers sustainable waste management.
- 4.5.9 The strategy will inform the procurement of an integrated waste management contract for the Council, which will span the life of the strategy. In March 2008 Leeds City Council were successful in being awarded £68.7 million of PFI (Public Finance Initiative) Credits from DEFRA for a Residual Waste Treatment Facility. The Council advertised the contract in the Official Journal of European Union in July 2008 under the competitive dialogue procedure. Expressions of interest have been received and are currently being evaluated with a view to commencing the first stage of the procurement process towards the end of October 2008. The Councils stance in terms of both technology and sites is neutral therefore allowing the market to put forward a range of technologies and locations to be assessed in the evaluation process. It is anticipated that the facility will be fully operational in 2014 and will operate for a 25 year period.
- 4.5.10 Ensuring sustainable development forms part of a city-wide response to the concern to achieve a better balance between economic prosperity, social equity and environmental protection – making sure that sustainable development takes place in the context of living today with tomorrow in mind. This links into the work of the Leeds Initiative and the Vision for Leeds II. Concern over growing environmental damage has led to international targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other environmentally harmful effects. Through the strategy the City Council is working to further reduce the amount of biodegradable waste being sent to landfill and reduce Leeds' impact on climate change. The aim is to stimulate new and emerging businesses across Leeds whose primary purpose is to re-use items or reprocess materials. This will move waste management up the waste hierarchy with particular focus on reduction.
- 4.5.11 The key waste strategy targets set by Leeds are:
- Reduce the annual growth in waste per household to 0.5% by 2010 and to eliminate growth per household by 2020
  - Achieve a combined recycling and composting rate of greater than 50% of household waste by 2020
  - Recover value from 90% of all household waste by 2020.
- 4.5.12 Tables 24 and 25 below show amounts and percentages of **household waste** arising for 2007/8 compared with recent years. Overall waste arisings are also down on 2006/7, which is encouraging.
- 4.5.13 The Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (LATS) and a wide range of Council led waste prevention initiatives have brought about a decrease in the amount of waste being landfilled. Recycled tonnages continue to grow

due to the implementation of kerbside garden waste collections and increased participation in kerbside recycling.

| Management Type       | 2000-1         | 2001-2         | 2002-3         | 2003-4         | 2004-5         | 2005-6         | 2006-7         | 2007-8         |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Green (Compost)       | 1,852          | 4,965          | 8,006          | 7,953          | 12,644         | 13,540         | 14,207         | 17,916         |
| Other Recycled        | 22,308         | 32,737         | 33,888         | 40,357         | 53,570         | 57,389         | 61,118         | 67,667         |
| <i>Total Recycled</i> | <b>24,160</b>  | <b>37,702</b>  | <b>41,894</b>  | <b>48,310</b>  | <b>66,214</b>  | <b>70,929</b>  | <b>75,325</b>  | <b>85,583</b>  |
| Waste Incinerated     | 0              | 0              | 1,293          | 113            | 100            | 87             | 1,700          | 1,160          |
| Waste Landfilled      | 275,080        | 280,143        | 284,690        | 283,828        | 271,677        | 261,439        | 260,600        | 243,374        |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>299,240</b> | <b>317,845</b> | <b>327,877</b> | <b>332,250</b> | <b>337,990</b> | <b>332,455</b> | <b>337,625</b> | <b>330,117</b> |

| Management Type       | 2000-1     | 2001-2      | 2002-3      | 2003-4      | 2004-5      | 2005-6      | 2006-7      | 2007-8      |
|-----------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Green (Compost)       | 0.6        | 1.6         | 2.4         | 2.4         | 3.8         | 4.1         | 6.5         | 5.4         |
| Other Recycled        | 7.5        | 10.3        | 10.3        | 12.1        | 16.1        | 17.3        | 15.8        | 20.5        |
| <i>Total Recycled</i> | <b>8.1</b> | <b>11.9</b> | <b>12.8</b> | <b>14.5</b> | <b>19.9</b> | <b>21.3</b> | <b>22.4</b> | <b>25.9</b> |
| Waste Incinerated     | 0          | 0           | 0.4         | <0.0        | <0.0        | <0.0        | 0.5         | 0.4         |
| Waste Landfilled      | 91.9       | 88.1        | 86.8        | 85.4        | 80.1        | 78.6        | 77.1        | 73.7        |
| <b>Total</b>          | <b>100</b> | <b>100</b>  | <b>100</b>  | <b>100</b>  | <b>100</b>  | <b>100</b>  | <b>100</b>  | <b>100</b>  |

### Flooding / Water Quality

4.5.14 Indicator E1 records the number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency that approval would have adverse consequences for flood risk or water quality.

| Flood risk | Water quality | Total |
|------------|---------------|-------|
| 1          | 0             | 1     |

This information is derived from the EA's own list of planning applications to which it had objected in 2007-8. Their schedule identifies 30 applications in Leeds. In 19 of these cases, the objection was subsequently withdrawn, often as a result of the provision of missing information. 4 applications were refused (on 3 of which flood risk was cited as a refusal reason), 2 were withdrawn by the applicant, and 4 had not yet been determined.

4.5.15 The sole application approved against EA advice was for one detached house in Collingham (07/01091/FU). This was allowed because there was

an existing outline approval, because the dwelling had been raised to a level only slightly short of the 1 in 100 year flood level and because it was possible by planning condition to prevent any increase in flood risk for surrounding properties.

**Biodiversity**

4.5.16 Indicator E2 relates to information about losses or gains to areas of biodiversity importance, such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, and other sites of significant nature value. There were no net changes in Leeds last year.

**4.5.17 Core Indicator E3: Renewable Energy Generation**

4.5.18 CLG Core Indicator E3 covers data on renewable energy capacity installed by type, such as bio fuels, onshore wind, water, solar energy and geothermal energy. The Council’s monitoring systems for this topic are still evolving, but it is possible to show some basic data under E3 this year.

4.5.19 The context for monitoring renewable energy generation capacity in Leeds is provided by the Yorkshire & Humber Plan (RSS) in policy ENV5. This policy sets out Regional and Sub-regional targets for capacity in 2010 and 2021. These are complemented by indicative local targets for LDF authorities. These are summarised in the following table.

| <b>Table 26: Targets for Installed, Grid-connected Renewable Energy Capacity (MW)</b> |             |             |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Area</b>   | <b>2010</b> | <b>2021</b> |
| Regional: Yorkshire & the Humber  | 708 MW      | 1862 MW     |
| Sub-region: West Yorkshire  | 88 MW       | 295 MW      |
| Local: Leeds  | 11MW        | 75 MW       |

4.5.19 Installed grid-connected capacity in Leeds currently stands at 9.37 MW comprising the following sites, all of which are landfill gas installations.

| <b>Location</b>                     | <b>Capacity (MW)</b> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Skelton Grange Landfill             | 3.00                 |
| Peckfield Quarry & Landfill         | 3.09                 |
| Howden Clough Landfill              | 1.82                 |
| Gamblethorpe Landfill (Swillington) | 1.00                 |
| Morley former Sewage Works          | 0.46                 |
| <b>Total installed capacity</b>     | <b>9.37</b>          |

4.5.20 The Council has been leading the development of a citywide climate change strategy for Leeds. This emphasises the role of planning policy to limit carbon emissions in Leeds. The approach is to consider carbon emissions from new development holistically by including the impacts of location, built form and transport. The strategy also stresses the need for an energy generation strategy, to identify spatial opportunities for CHP, clusters of microgeneration and commercial scale renewables.

4.5.21 As part of the LDF programme, the Council has been progressing a Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document. This has reached the Issues and Alternative Options stage and a consultation document was issued for public consultation in May 2008, with responses to be returned by 19<sup>th</sup> June. The document sought views on issues arising from the potential for renewable energy technologies to meet the city's energy needs up to 2021.

## **5. Progress Since the Last AMR**

5.1.1 Since the inception of Annual Monitoring Reports in 2003/04, the Council has sought to extend its monitoring capability, focussing mainly on the Core Indicators. The process has been an evolutionary one, adapting existing systems and sources to meet the needs of the AMR and the growing requirements of the Regional Assembly, as the Regional Planning Body.

5.1.2 Following a review of experience over the early stages of AMRs, DCLG issued revisions to its Core Indicators, seeking to consolidate indicators into one consistent set across regional and local planning authorities. This resulted in the pruning of some indicators that the Council had found difficult to monitor meaningfully and also added new and extended existing indicators.

5.1.3 However, some additional load on the Council's monitoring effort is likely to arise from some of the changes by DCLG. In the wording of BD1, net additional floorspace by type is called for, which clearly implies that we will need to monitor the **change** in floorspace from now on. Potentially, this may require significant effort to establish the extent and nature of floorspace demolished or converted as part of the development process.

- 5.1.4 The initial benefits of the strengthening of monitoring resources last year have been consolidated during this year. Considerable effort continues to be channelled into linking information from planning applications and building control records with data from the Non-Domestic Rates register and the Valuation Office Agency (VOA). This has provided enhancements in the flow of information on starts and completions of developments in the key sectors of commercial activity, especially retail and leisure schemes.
- 5.1.5 However, this has been a difficult and uncertain process, reflecting the different priorities of the agencies involved. Our concern continues at the paucity of information available about developments where Approved Building Inspectors are appointed. Our concerns are shared by many other local authorities across the region, especially those that have no in-house building control service. This is an issue about which representation at regional and national levels will be necessary as the importance of development monitoring grows.
- 5.1.6 The revision of Core Indicator BD1 to require net change in floorspace to be monitored could provide the opportunity for LDF authorities to access VOA's floorspace data. Without this, the burden on monitoring teams is likely to be too great to allow a consistent full return of indicator BD1.
- 5.1.7 The effect of DCLG's revisions to the housing core indicators has also been to increase the load locally. New requirements now include:
- (a) An extension of the Trajectory to a minimum of 15 years instead of 10, plus the inclusion of a second delivery yardstick (managed release)
  - (b) Land area, as well as dwelling capacity, now required by single year – an onerous addition, of seemingly low added value.
  - (c) Information on whether CABE's Building for Life criteria have been complied with – this will require a completely new monitoring system.
- 5.1.8 Issues relating to the spatial organisation of evidence are being addressed as part of the work being done to establish a corporate Land & Property Gazetteer. This is designed to hold records of every address in Leeds and their map locations. Eventually the Gazetteer will be used as a common source of reference for all address-based City Council records. Great improvements in Gazetteer data quality have been made and this work continues. The increase in staff has contributed greatly to this work. Since the last AMR upgrades to the Gazetteer have enabled land-use information to be attached directly to property records, allowing more focussed LDF-relevant queries. In addition, across the Council work on reconciling various City Council databases to the Gazetteer has continued, with complete integration of Council Tax and ALMO property records being achieved. Over the last AMR period we have made substantial inroads into matching Non-Domestic Rating records and would hope to complete the matching process over the next AMR period. We also have a legal requirement to be fully integrated with Register of Electors and this must be achieved by December 2009. Work to complete the matching process is currently in progress. As well as providing a more consistent flow of

information on the completion of new properties, this will provide opportunities to analyze and present information on new housing and commercial development at a variety of scales e.g. AAP and other special policy areas such as town centres and regeneration areas.

## Appendix 1: Housing Trajectory 2008-26 – Details of Assumptions

| <b>HOUSING TRAJECTORY 2008-26 - DETAILS OF ASSUMPTIONS</b> |  |              |              |              |              |              |  |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              | <b>TOTAL</b>   |              |
|--|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>Supply Component</b>                                    | <b>2008 based 5/6 year supply assessment</b> |              |              |              |              |              | <b>Stock and trend based estimates</b> |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              | <b>2008-26</b> |              |
|  | <b>08-9</b>                                  | <b>09-10</b> | <b>10-11</b> | <b>11-12</b> | <b>12-13</b> | <b>13-14</b> | <b>14-15</b>                           | <b>15-16</b> | <b>16-17</b> | <b>17-18</b> | <b>18-19</b> | <b>19-20</b> | <b>20-21</b> | <b>21-22</b> | <b>22-23</b> | <b>23-24</b> | <b>24-25</b> |                | <b>25-26</b> |
| Permissions at 31/3/08                                     | 3212   | 3798         | 2361         | 1523         | 1527         | 1070         |  |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |                | <b>13491</b> |
| Emerging sites at 31/3/08                                  | 0  | 143          | 212          | 745          | 1715         | 1715         |  |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |                | <b>4530</b>  |
| UDP Phase 1 Allocations                                    | 384  | 441          | 469          | 552          | 713          | 593          | 286                                    | 286          | 286          | 286          | 288          |              |              |              |              |              |              |                | <b>4572</b>  |
| UDP Phase 2/3 Allocations                                  |  |              |              |              |              |              | 1050                                   | 1050         | 1050         | 1050         | 1050         | 334          | 334          | 334          | 334          | 334          | 334          | 336            | <b>7590</b>  |
| Easel AAP  |  |              |              |              |              |              | 580                                    | 580          | 580          | 580          | 580          | 580          | 580          | 580          | 580          | 580          | 580          | 580            | <b>6960</b>  |
| Aire Valley AAP  |  |              |              |              |              |              | 560                                    | 560          | 560          | 560          | 560          | 560          | 560          | 560          | 560          | 560          | 560          | 540            | <b>6700</b>  |
| West Leeds Gateway AAP                                     |  |              |              |              |              |              | 100                                    | 100          | 100          | 100          | 100          | 100          | 100          | 100          | 100          | 100          |              |                | <b>1000</b>  |
| Little London/Beeston & Holbeck PFI                        |  |              |              | 120          | 120          | 120          | 120                                    | 120          | 120          | 120          | 120          | 120          | 95           |              |              |              |              |                | <b>1175</b>  |
| H4 outside City Centre                                     |  |              |              |              |              |              | 1222                                   | 1409         | 1409         | 1409         | 1424         | 1424         | 1438         | 1438         | 1438         | 1438         | 1438         | 1438           | <b>16925</b> |
| H4 inside City Centre                                      |  |              |              |              |              |              | 500                                    | 500          | 500          | 500          | 500          | 500          | 500          | 500          | 500          | 500          | 500          | 500            | <b>6000</b>  |
| Infill   | 186  | 186          | 186          | 186          | 186          | 186          | 186                                    | 186          | 186          | 186          | 186          | 186          | 186          | 186          | 186          | 186          | 186          | 186            | <b>3348</b>  |
| <b>GROSS SUPPLY</b>  | <b>3782</b>                                  | <b>4568</b>  | <b>3226</b>  | <b>3126</b>  | <b>4261</b>  | <b>3684</b>  | <b>4604</b>                            | <b>4791</b>  | <b>4791</b>  | <b>4791</b>  | <b>4808</b>  | <b>3804</b>  | <b>3793</b>  | <b>3698</b>  | <b>3698</b>  | <b>3698</b>  | <b>3598</b>  | <b>3580</b>    | <b>72301</b> |
| Clearance  | 255  | 255          | 255          | 255          | 255          | 255          | 255                                    | 255          | 255          | 255          | 255          | 255          | 255          | 255          | 255          | 255          | 255          | 255            | <b>4590</b>  |
| <b>NET SUPPLY</b>  | <b>3527</b>                                  | <b>4313</b>  | <b>2971</b>  | <b>2871</b>  | <b>4006</b>  | <b>3429</b>  | <b>4349</b>                            | <b>4526</b>  | <b>4526</b>  | <b>4526</b>  | <b>4553</b>  | <b>3549</b>  | <b>3538</b>  | <b>3443</b>  | <b>3443</b>  | <b>3443</b>  | <b>3343</b>  | <b>3325</b>    | <b>67711</b> |

Assumptions for 2008-14 are detailed in the report "5 Year Housing land Supply 2008-13 & 2009-14"

Phase 1 Allocations include 4 phase 2/3 sites with permission.

Some Easel & AV proposals are included in existing permissions or phase 1 allocations - residual capacity is assigned post 2014.

H4 capacity outside City Centre assumes continuation of 1991-2008 average rate of brownfield permissions, 8% leakage rate and latest completion profile.

H4 in the City centre assumes completion of schemes under construction in first 2 years, then 700 a year until 2014, then 500 a year.

AAP capacities are as indicated in Preferred Option documents, except West Leeds Gateway where capacity is notional.

Clearance assumes continuation of 2003-8 average.



## Appendix 2 – DCLG Core Output Indicators

### Business Development and Town Centres

| <b>BD1: Total Amount Additional Employment Floorspace - by type, Apr07 to Mar08</b> |                               |                             |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>Development Type</b>   | <b>Gross ( m<sup>2</sup>)</b> | <b>Net ( m<sup>2</sup>)</b> |
| B1a Office  | 71360                         | Not available               |
| B1 b&c Other  | 60                            | Not available               |
| B2 Industrial   | 9440                          | Not available               |
| B8 Warehousing  | 15880                         | Not available               |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>96740</b>                  | <b>Not available</b>        |

| <b>BD2: Total Amount Additional Employment Floorspace on Previously Developed Land (PDL) - by type, Apr07 to Mar08</b> |                               |              |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------|
| <b>Development Type</b>  | <b>Gross ( m<sup>2</sup>)</b> | <b>% PDL</b> |
| B1a Office   | 59210                         | 83.0         |
| B1 b&c Other   | 60                            | 100.0        |
| B2 Industrial  | 9440                          | 100.0        |
| B8 Warehousing   | 13310                         | 83.8         |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>82020</b>                  | <b>84.8</b>  |

| <b>BD3: Employment land available by type, March 2008</b> |                            |                          |                      |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Sector</b>   | <b>Allocations<br/>ha.</b> | <b>Windfalls<br/>ha.</b> | <b>Total<br/>ha.</b> |
| B1 Office   | 103.29                     | 53.19                    | 156.48               |
| B1 Other  | 165.53                     | 11.19                    | 176.71               |
| B2 & related  | 232.35                     | 10.41                    | 242.76               |
| B8 & related  | 114.46                     | 57.99                    | 172.45               |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>615.62</b>              | <b>132.78</b>            | <b>748.40</b>        |

| <b>BD4: Floorspace completed in retail, office and leisure schemes ('town centre uses'), Apr07 – Mar08</b> |                    |                  |
|--|--------------------|------------------|
| <b>Town Centre Use</b>   | <b>Sqm (gross)</b> | <b>Sqm (net)</b> |
| <b>A1 Retail</b>   | 7210               | n.a              |
| <b>A2 Office</b>   | 1010               | n.a.             |
| <b>B1a Office</b>  | 71360              | n.a              |
| <b>D2 Leisure</b>  | 11750              | n.a              |
| <b>Total Completed Floorspace</b>  | 91330              | n.a              |

## Housing

| <b>H1: Plan period and net housing targets</b> |                      |                               |  |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Start of period</b>                         | <b>End of period</b> | <b>Total housing required</b> | <b>Source of requirement</b>               |
| 1/4/2004                                       | 31/3/2026            | 86440                         | RSS – The Yorkshire & Humber Plan May 2008 |

| <b>H2a &amp; b: Actual net additional dwellings</b> |               |               |               |               |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>2003-4</b>                                       | <b>2004-5</b> | <b>2005-6</b> | <b>2006-7</b> | <b>2007-8</b> |
| 2991  | 2633          | 3436          | 3327          | 3576          |

| <b>H2(c) &amp; (d): Net additional dwellings in future years</b> |               |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |              |
|--|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
|  | 08-9          | 09-10 | 10-11 | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 23-24 | 24-25 | 25-26 | Total        |
| H2c(a)dwellings  | 3527          | 4313  | 2971  | 2871  | 4006  | 3429  | 4349  | 4536  | 4536  | 4536  | 4553  | 3549  | 3538  | 3443  | 3443  | 3443  | 3343  | 3325  | <b>67711</b> |
| H2c(b) hectares  | Not available |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |              |
| H2c(c) average annual residual requirement                       | 4082          | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | 4082  | <b>73470</b> |
| H2(d) Managed target   | 3400          | 3400  | 3400  | 3500  | 3600  | 3700  | 3900  | 4100  | 4300  | 4500  | 4500  | 4500  | 4500  | 4500  | 4500  | 4500  | 4400  | 4300  | <b>73500</b> |

| <b>H3: New &amp; converted dwellings on previously developed land (PDL)</b> |                     |            |       |
|---|---------------------|------------|-------|
|   | Gross new dwellings | Number PDL | % PDL |
| 2003-8  | 17236               | 16078      | 93    |
| 2007-8  | 3833                | 3515       | 92    |

| <b>H4: Net additional pitches (Gypsy &amp; Traveller) 2007-8</b> |         |       |
|--|---------|-------|
| Permanent  | Transit | Total |
| 0  | 0       | 0     |

| <b>H5: Gross Affordable Housing completions 2007-8</b> |              |       |
|--|--------------|-------|
| Social rented  | Intermediate | Total |
| 68   | 372          | 440   |

| <b>H6: Housing Quality – Building for Life Assessments 2007-8</b> |
|---|
| No data available   |

## Environmental Quality

| <b>E1: No. of planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice 2007-8</b> |               |       |
|---|---------------|-------|
| Flood risk  | Water quality | Total |
| 1   | 0             | 1     |

| <b>E2: Change in areas of biodiversity importance 2007-8</b> |          |       |
|--|----------|-------|
| Loss   | Addition | Total |
| 0  | 0        | 0     |

**E3: Renewable Energy Generation**

| <b>Grid-connected capacity only</b>          | Wind Onshore | Solar Photovoltaics | Hydro | Landfill Gas | Sewage Sludge Digestion | Municipal (and industrial) solid waste combustion | Co-firing of biomass with fossil fuels | Bio-mass |       |
|--|--------------|---------------------|-------|--------------|-------------------------|---|--|----------|-------|
|  |              |                     |       |              |                         |   |  | Animal   | Plant |
| Permitted installed capacity (MW) 2007- 8    | 0            | 0                   | 0     | 0            | 0                       | 0   | 0                                      | 0        | 0     |
| Completed installed capacity (MW) 2007- 8    | 0            | 0                   | 0     | 3.00         | 0                       | 0   | 0                                      | 0        | 0     |
| Identified installed capacity (MW) 31/3/2008 | 0            | 0                   | 0     | 9.37         | 0                       | 0   | 0                                      | 0        | 0     |

## Minerals

| <b>M1: Primary land-won aggregate production 2007-8 (tonnes)</b> |              |        |
|--|--------------|--------|
| Sand & Gravel  | Crushed rock | Total  |
| 140,000  | 759000       | 899000 |

| <b>M2: Secondary &amp; recycled aggregate production 2007-8 (tonnes)</b> |            |            |
|--|------------|------------|
| Secondary  | Recycled   | Total      |
| 0  | 250000 (1) | 250000 (1) |
| <i>Note (1): estimate only</i>   |            |            |

## Waste

| <b>W1 - New Waste Management Facilities, 2007-8</b> |                            |                        |   |
|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Reference   | Location                   | Capacity (tonnes p.a.) | Type  |
| 07/00210/FU   | Parkside Industrial Estate | 60000                  | Household, commercial & industrial waste processing & recycling |

| <b>W2 - Municipal Waste Arising by Management Type (tonnes)</b> |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |                |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Management Type   | 2000-1         | 2001-2         | 2002-3         | 2003-4         | 2004-5         | 2005-6         | 2006-7         | 2007-8         |
| a. Green (Compost)  | 1,852          | 4,965          | 8,006          | 7,953          | 12,644         | 13,540         | 14,207         | 17,916         |
| b. Other Recycled   | 22,308         | 32,737         | 33,888         | 40,357         | 53,570         | 57,389         | 61,118         | 67,667         |
| c. Total Recycled (a+b)   | 24,160         | 37,702         | 41,894         | 48,310         | 66,214         | 70,929         | 75,325         | 85,583         |
| d. Incinerated  | 0              | 0              | 1,293          | 113            | 100            | 87             | 1,700          | 1,160          |
| e. Landfilled   | 275,080        | 280,143        | 284,690        | 283,828        | 271,677        | 261,439        | 260,600        | 243,374        |
| <b>Total (c+d+e)</b>  | <b>299,240</b> | <b>317,845</b> | <b>327,877</b> | <b>332,250</b> | <b>337,990</b> | <b>332,455</b> | <b>337,625</b> | <b>330,117</b> |