



Report of the Director of City Development

Development Plan Panel

Date: 5 May 2009

Subject: EASEL Area Action Plan – Progress Report

Electoral Wards Affected:

Gipton & Harehills

Burmantofts & Richmond Hill

Killingbeck & Seacroft

Temple Newsam

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. An Area Action Plan (AAP) is being prepared for East and South East Leeds (Easel). The purpose is to provide a land use and spatial planning framework within a 'key area of change' within the city. Members will recall that the plan has been subject to "Preferred Options" consultation. The purpose of this report is to provide a further update on progress in preparation towards submission of the plan for independent examination and to advise members of the scope and format of the forthcoming public consultation and information sharing process which is to take place during the summer.

1.0 Purpose Of This Report

- 1.1 To advise and update Development Plan Panel on recent progress on the preparation of EASEL AAP, and outline the next steps, particularly relating to proposals for further consultation and information sharing on the proposed plan changes with residents and stakeholders.

2.0 Background Information

- 2.1 Members will recall that an update was given on progress on preparation of the EASEL AAP at the Development Plan Panel meeting of 6th January 2009. The update related to:
- the scale of development and the difficulty in identifying potential longer term development sites, given that they are likely to include existing housing, which could lead to planning blight, failure to sell property or uncertainty about carrying out improvements
 - the intention to prepare Neighbourhood Plans for each of the EASEL communities in tandem with preparation of the AAP
 - 4 technical studies in preparation to demonstrate the “soundness” of plan:
 - EASEL and Aire Valley town and local centre assessment
 - EASEL drainage strategy
 - EASEL transport strategy
 - Greenspace review

3.0 Recent Progress

EASEL and Aire Valley town and local centre assessment

- 3.1 A key element of sustainable communities, is the provision of a good network of local facilities which can act not only as a community “hub” but also reduce the need to travel to facilities further a field. Consultants, White Young Green were appointed to provide an overview of town and local centres and neighbourhood parades in EASEL and communities closest to Aire Valley Leeds (AVL) and to advise on a strategy for development of town and local centres and the location of uses within both EASEL and AVL areas. The study is now nearing completion with publication expected in May. Telephone, in-street, and business surveys were undertaken in autumn 2008, alongside physical surveys of the use of the units in centres and neighbourhood parades in EASEL and those close to AVL. There is a clear need to improve the local ‘offer’ of future retail and service facilities within the EASEL and AVL area, to meet the day to day shopping needs of existing and future local residents.
- 3.2 Seacroft and Cross Gates town centres are the dominant shopping destinations within EASEL. The consultants consider that it is essential to ensure that their role and function are maintained, by protecting the current uses within them, promoting environmental improvements, and restricting out of centre development elsewhere in EASEL. Other town centres also play important roles and would benefit from similar approaches.
- 3.3 White Young Green estimate that additional food superstore provision totalling approximately 5,700 sqm (gross) could be supported up to 2013, which should be within the western part of the EASEL AAP area - to reduce current travel distances for residents in these neighbourhoods. The former Tradex site on the edge of Harehills Lane town centre (which has a recent application by Morrisons currently pending) and the All Saints (Great Clothes) site on York Road in Richmond Hill, are

considered to be the most viable and sustainable options. All Saints could become a new town centre alongside re-provision of the existing school, church, etc. For comparison goods (i.e. non-food), there is a potential floorspace requirement of up to 2,780 sqm (net) by 2013 (although some of this is assumed to be contained within any food superstore provision). The extension to Seacroft town centre previously proposed in the AAP is not deemed to be a preferable option. This is on the basis that there is a greater need to provide facilities in the western part of EASEL and a limit to the level of retail facilities which can be introduced without causing viability issues in other centres. The study has also identified and clarified the network of local centres and neighbourhood parades, and confirms their important role for local residents. Appendix 1 identifies each of the centres within EASEL and their suggested status within the retail hierarchy. The consultants' recommendations for AVL will be reported separately.

EASEL drainage strategy

- 3.4 Major flooding incidents suffered by residents in parts of East Leeds in recent years, coupled with the prospect of a significant level of new development within the EASEL area, could result in an increase in flood risk by increasing impermeable areas. This would clearly not be acceptable. It is important to be able to demonstrate that new development will not exacerbate existing problems but can indeed assist in resolving flooding problems.
- 3.5 In seeking to address these issues, consultants Jeremy Benn Associates were appointed to develop a strategic approach to draining development sites and future regeneration areas within EASEL AAP. The EASEL area is predominantly served by a system of combined sewers with combined sewer overflows discharging excess storm water to the watercourses. It is the norm now for new developments to be required to introduce separate systems of drainage for foul and surface water drainage. The difficulty is that promoting a separate system of drainage potentially adds to more surface water discharging into watercourses which could increase flows and add to flooding risk. The problem needs to be tackled strategically to ensure reductions in flows.
- 3.6 Good progress has been made in establishing critical flood areas which are important in structuring a strategy. Six strategic sub-catchment areas have been defined within the EASEL area and the key issues, overall strategy and integrated solutions identified for each. These include infiltration methods including swales, detention/infiltration basins, storage tanks, attenuation basins, strategic storage for clusters of sites, overland flow capture using green infrastructure and opening up of culverts. Further work continues to develop adoption, maintenance and management strategies, costing of the recommended measures and opportunities for habitat enhancement.

EASEL transport strategy

- 3.7 The City Council's strategic partner, Mouchel were appointed to establish a strategy to improve the sustainability of transport and movement in the EASEL area. This involved establishing the growth in travel demand based on the AAP development scenario, reviewing the transport interventions set out in the AAP and establishing an implementation and delivery mechanism.
- 3.8 The strategy which is being developed suggests specific actions and interventions which are required to meet current gaps in transport provision or meet changes in demand resulting from AAP development proposals. Mouchel's have concluded

that overall, the expected change in traffic demand as a result of the EASEL proposals will be relatively small and will be focused on key corridors. Some of this increased demand is likely to be attracted to public transport and will not appear as traffic on the roads. There will be increases in traffic demand resulting from changes outside EASEL which will impinge on the highway network and may necessitate some local improvements, especially at key junctions, in order to remove the adverse impacts of local congestion. There are likely to be significant increases in demand for public transport in peak periods between EASEL and employment opportunities in the city centre and AVL.

3.9 Within the context of this work, a possible programme and likely costs and sources of funding is being developed. The interventions proposed by the consultants include:

- Improvements to public transport on both radial corridors and orbital routes, Improvements to integrated ticketing for public transport serving EASEL,
- Provision of new and improved public transport interchange facilities,
- Improvements to community transport,
- Introduction of a neighbourhood travel team,
- A high occupancy vehicle lane on A58/Easterly Road,
- Outbound bus priority measures on Roundhay Road,
- Bus priority measures on South Parkway,
- A new Quality Bus Corridor through EASEL centred around a bus only link between Gipton and Harehills,
- Traffic management measures at and around Harehills Corner,
- Upgrading of Cartmel Drive to connect to an agreed new road link between EASEL and Aire Valley Leeds at Halton Moor.

4.0 Next Steps

4.1 Work is continuing on the citywide greenspace review which will be used to prioritise greenspace improvements and potential remodeling of greenspace areas. When complete it is the intention that each of the above studies will be published on the council's website prior to publication of the AAP and used to inform development of policies and site allocations.

4.2 Work is ongoing to establish a delivery and implementation programme for each of the proposals. As the evidence base nears completion the AAP Proposals Map is now being revised for use during consultation prior to publication of the Submission Draft AAP. The consultation process and preparations for it are outlined below.

Background to public consultation and information sharing

4.3 Extensive consultation has previously been undertaken during the course of development of the Area Action Plan. This is currently documented in the "Report of Consultation on the Alternative Options", June 2007 and the "Report of Consultation on Preferred Options published in September 2007. The entire consultation process and outcome (including changes made to the plan) will be drawn together in a redrafted "Consultation Statement" which will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the submission draft AAP. The City Council needs to demonstrate that the consultation process has allowed for effective engagement of all interested parties and accords with the council's own "Statement of Community Involvement".

- 4.4 Government advice on the consultation process has changed as the LDF process continues to evolve. At the outset it appeared that consultation needed to involve the whole plan area and all proposals within it, now the advice is that “consultation should be proportionate to the scale of issues involved in the plan.” Through discussion with Government Office it is clear that consultation can be undertaken any time between now and deposit of the plan, with any groups or stakeholders we consider need to be informed of changes to be made to the plan prior to submission. There is no need to fully revise the plan and text prior to consultation, or to repeat the consultation process which took place at earlier stages involving exhibitions on the whole plan within communities during a specific 6 week timeframe. Consultation can take place on a much more informal and targeted basis with a timescale adapted to suit our requirements. The important issue is to ensure that those who are most directly affected, are made aware of changes to the plan and still have the opportunity to influence it.

Issues to be considered in consultation and information sharing

- 4.5 Significant changes between the Preferred Options and the deposit Draft AAP, which have currently been identified are summarised below. The most fundamental of these is the identification of future regeneration areas. The plan previously identified housing sites within three phases. Phases 1 and 2 involved either cleared sites, those previously allocated in the UDP or those for which clearance proposals had been published. Phase 3 involved sites largely occupied by existing housing. Considerable uncertainty exists regarding the scale of change within these currently developed areas and therefore it is extremely difficult to predict the amount of housing which may be delivered. The position will become much clearer when Neighbourhood Plans are prepared allowing a finer grained assessment of development opportunities and property condition within the area. In these circumstances it is not desirable to make firm allocations and it is more appropriate to identify potential for change by identifying them as “future regeneration areas”. A large scale copy of the Preferred Options AAP plan and the emerging submission draft AAP will be available at Development Plan Panel to assist in identification of the changes. These can be summarised as follows:

Seacroft

- Deletion of Seacroft town centre proposal and development of land off Ramshead Approach only for housing or mixed used i.e. no demolition in the Eastdeans and Hansby's.
- Proposed housing site H3 to be re- allocated as Future Regeneration area.
- Proposed housing site H10 to be re- allocated as Future Regeneration areas.

Halton Moor

- Deletion of part of housing site H23 (Rathmell Road area) and potential replacement by Future Regeneration area.
- Halton Moor potential change area to be redefined as a Future Regeneration Area, bringing it line with other longer term proposals within the plan.
- Deletion of proposed greenspace area and reallocation to site H21.

Osmondthorpe

- E1 is under consideration as mixed use development or housing.
- A railway station is not considered to be viable and the railway search area is therefore proposed for deletion.

Lincoln Green

- M10 reduction and replacement by Future Regeneration Area.

Burmantofts

- M5 reduction and replacement by Future Regeneration Area

Gipton

- 6 housing sites now Future Regeneration Area.
- Cemetery proposal site reallocated as a housing site.

- 4.6 Further changes may be necessary following completion of the town and local centre, transport and drainage strategies. These changes will need to be conveyed to residents through a variety of consultation and information sharing methods including residents meetings, forums, newsletters, and letters. Briefings will be offered to Ward Members and the MP's to update them and obtain further views.
- 4.7 A consultation strategy and list of meetings and events to be covered is being developed. Events currently identified are listed below. Advice is currently being sought on potential residents group meetings. The intention is to produce a leaflet listing significant changes within each neighbourhood. Officers intend to work with colleagues in Environment and Neighbourhoods and East North East Homes to convey a comprehensive message regarding change within the area. The consultation will therefore advise of new and up and coming initiatives more generally and will not focus entirely on the AAP.

Pre - Submission Consultation Summer 2009

Dates	Events
1 st June	Richmond Hill Burmantofts Forum
2 nd June	Osmondthorpe Forum
5 th & 6 th June	Wykebeck Valley Conference
6 th June	Cross Green Residents meeting
9 th June	EASEL Ward Member meeting
11 th June	ENEL Board
18 th June	Inner East Area Committee
4 th July	Seacroft Gala
7 th July	Outer East Committee
11 th July	Gipton Gala

- 4.8 The plan is to be redrafted in the light of further comments received and will be presented to the Development Plan Panel, Executive Board and Council prior to publication and submission to the Secretary of State. Once the plan has been published residents and all other stakeholders have 6 weeks in order to allow representations. This is not a consultation; all consultation must take place prior to this – it is merely the time allowed for representations. Any representations are then published and considered through the Examination process.

5.0 Legal and resource implications

- 5.1 Once adopted (following Independent Examination), the Area Action Plan will form part of the Development Plan for the area.

6.0 Implications for council policy and governance

6.1 None

7.0 Conclusions

7.1 This report has provided an update on recent progress on the preparation of EASEL AAP, and outlines the next steps, particularly relating to proposals for further consultation and information sharing on the proposed plan changes with residents and stakeholders.

8.0 Recommendations

8.1 The Development Plan Panel is asked to note the progress and next steps in relation to the preparation of the EASEL Area Action Plan and the next stages in production of the submission draft.

Background Papers

EASEL Area Action Plan Preferred Options – June 2007

Development Plan Panel Report – 6th January 2009 – Leeds Local Development Framework Area Action Plans: Progress Report

APPENDIX 1 Town, local and neighbourhood parades identified within EASEL

Location	Preferred Options proposal	Submission draft proposal	Comments
Cross Gates Town Centre	Town	Town	Small boundary changes to reflect existing uses.
Halton Town Centre	Town	Town	Small boundary changes to reflect existing uses.
Harehills Corner Town Centre	Town	Town	Small boundary changes to reflect existing uses.
Harehills Lane Town Centre	Town	Town	Maintain town centre extension proposal along Cowper Road. Review boundary in relation to former Tradex site.
Seacroft Town Centre	Town	Town	Small boundary changes to reflect existing uses. No longer proposing north-eastern extension into adjacent housing.
All Saints (Great Clothes), Richmond Hill	Local	Town	Developer interest in food store as anchor for wider regeneration and redeveloped local facilities (which would be unviable without a larger store).
Coldcotes Circus, Gipton	Local	Local	Although currently a neighbourhood parade, its location would provide a focus for future improvements and facilities for Gipton.
Lincoln Green	Local	Local	Retain centre in this location. Reference to moving the centre closer to the hospital to be deleted.
Upper Accommodation Road, Richmond Hill	Local	Local	Important to maintain role as focus for local community. Viability issues given internal location.
Oakwood Lane/Oak Tree Drive (Fearnville), Gipton	Local	Local	Although currently a neighbourhood parade, its location would provide a focus for future improvements and facilities for Gipton.
Shaftsbury Corner, Harehills	-	Local	Job centre and new health centre alongside local shops means the centre functions at higher level than a neighbourhood parade.
Harehills Road	-	Local	An important element of the unique retailing nature of Harehills, with the character of a local centre despite close proximity to 2 town centres.
Hollin Park	-	Local	On EASEL boundary but provides for some residents of Gipton and functions as more than a neighbourhood parade.
South Parkway, Seacroft	Local	N'hood parade	An active parade, however it only comprises retail units (including post office), and expansion is unlikely to be viable given the proximity to Seacroft town centre.
Halton Moor	-l	N'hood parade	Limited passing trade and lack of expansion opportunities for it to function as more than a n'hood parade. No longer proposing new centre due to viability issues and impact on existing parade.
Dawlishes and Iceland (York Road), Burmantofts	-	N'hood parade	Identified through survey as a neighbourhood parade.
Ivys (York Road), Burmantofts	-	N'hood parade	As above
Harehills – Roundhay Road/Roseville Road	-	N'hood parade	“
Harehills – Roundhay Road - Archway	-	N'hood parade	“
Selby Road (Halton Moor)	-	N'hood parade	“
York Road / Barwick Road	-	N'hood parade	“
Cross Gates Road	-	N'hood parade	“
Cross Green – Cross Green Lane / Easy Road	-	N'hood parade	“
Dib Lane – Hollin Park	-	N'hood parade	“
Easterly Road	-	N'hood parade	“
Gipton – Gipton Approach	-	N'hood parade	“

Gipton – Dib Lane	-	N'hood parade	“
Harehills Lane (north of Town Centre)	-	N'hood parade	“
Harehills Lane (south)	-	N'hood parade	“
Richmond Hill – East End Park	-	N'hood parade	“
York Road – Seacroft Hospital	-	N'hood parade	“