



Originator: Peter Shilson

Tel: 247 8122

Report of the Director of Development

Executive Board

Date: 13 December 2006

Subject: Local Development Framework – Annual Monitoring Report

Electoral Wards Affected:

All

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call In

Not Eligible for Call In

(Details contained in the report)

Item 25 on the agenda for this meeting seeks approval to The Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report for 2006 (the AMR). The report was considered and noted at the meeting of the Development Plan Panel on 5 December 2006. The Panel noted an amendment to the AMR which incorporated statistics relating to flooding and water quality whose production had been delayed.

The appendix to this supplementary report sets out the amended section. The only other changes to this year's AMR are editorial consequences of this amendment.

Recommendation

Members are invited to note this supplementary amendment to the LDF Annual Monitoring Report for 2006.

Flooding / Water Quality

- 4.6.13 DCLG’s Core Indicator 7 consists of the number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency (EA) on either flood defence grounds or water quality grounds. This indicator is intended as a proxy measure both of inappropriate development in flood plains and development that could adversely affect water quality. It is considered that while the indicator may be adequate at national and regional levels as giving a broad picture of development pressures affected by flood and water quality issues it is unhelpful at detailed local level.
- 4.6.14 In Leeds during the monitoring period there were 18 planning applications that the EA objected to although there is no record of the City Council having received 6 of these. In 10 of the 18 cases the objection was because a Flood Risk Assessment had not been supplied and in eight cases the Agency considered that the Assessment that had been supplied was not adequate. The position at the end of November for those cases where Council records of objections exist is shown in Table 12.

Status	% of all	Major application	Minor application
Approved – initial EA objection overcome	33	4	0
Approved	0	0	0
Refused	25	0	3
Withdrawn	33	2	2
Undecided	8	1	0
Total	100	7	5

Table 12

- 4.6.15 The City Council would require a flood risk assessment in cases where the Environment Agency has drawn attention to this. However, any flood risk identified would be weighed in the overall balance of planning considerations on development proposals, and due weight accorded depending on the degree of risk.