

## **Development Plan Panel**

**Tuesday, 11th October, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, C Fox,  
M Hamilton, T Leadley, J Lewis, K Mitchell  
and N Walshaw

### **14 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed all in attendance to the October meeting of Development Plan Panel.

### **15 Declaration of Interests**

Councillor James Lewis declared a personal interest in relation to agenda item 7, Draft National Planning Policy Framework – Consultation Response, in his capacity as Chair of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority. (Minute No. 18 refers)

### **16 Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Councillor Nash.

### **17 Minutes - 9th August 2011**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> August 2011 be approved as a correct record.

### **18 Draft National Planning Policy Framework - Consultation Response**

The Director of City Development submitted a report which outlined Leeds City Council's (LCC's) proposed consultation response to the draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The following information was appended to the report:

- NPPF consultation questions
- Draft letter in response to NPPF consultation.

The Chair welcomed to the meeting, David Feeney, Head of Forward Planning and Implementation, to present the report and respond to Members questions and comments.

The key areas of discussion were:

- Recommendation that the final LCC response / recommendations should cross reference the corresponding paragraphs in the NPPF consultation document.
- Concern about the “presumption in favour” of sustainable development being dropped and the adverse impact on local communities.

- Concern that the principle of simplifying and streamlining the planning system should not be accepted and the response to Leeds MPs and other relevant organisations should be amended to reflect this.
- The importance of planning guidance informing planning decisions. Where the review of guidance was necessary, this should be undertaken on a more gradual basis.
- In relation to section 2, para. 2.4, suggested amendment to last line to read ‘...permission should not be bought and sold’.
- The need to specify the number of windfall units delivered over a 5 year period in demonstrating the significant contribution windfall had made in the city. In relation to section 3, para. 5 (Housing Provision) the word “say” needs to be inserted into the sentence as follows “At a minimum build of say 30 units/hectare...”.
- Concern about the lack of cohesion between the draft NPFF, the localism bill and other key planning guidance.
- Concern in relation to para. 75 of the draft NPFF which states that ‘planning policies should avoid the long term protection of employment land or floorspace, and applications for alternative uses of designated land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses.’ The Development Plan Panel (DPP) was of the view that this approach would be catastrophic for Leeds, as it would not allow the city to plan for longer term job growth and would result in employment land and premises being displaced by higher value uses (reflecting market signals).
- Development of the Core Strategy and clarification about LCC position prior to adoption of national guidance.
- Concern about the lack of strategic direction in relation to transport issues (see section 3, para. 13 (Transport)).
- Concern that the draft NPFF did not reflect Council Policies and City Priorities and should therefore be redrafted to strongly state that the NPFF as written was contrary to City Council Policies and City Priorities for sustainable development (in delivering environmental, social and economic objectives at the same time), urban regeneration, protecting local character, distinctiveness and environmental quality (see section 4, para. 4.3.1 (Council Policies and City Priorities)). This was due to the draft NPFF being unduly weighted in favour of development and the economic aspects of sustainable development.
- In relation to the consultation response form (questions 11a and 11b), it was suggested to change ‘Agree’ to ‘Disagree’ but qualify reason in text box to note ‘The City Council supports the principle of the need for a collaborative approach with schools promoters in resolving issues prior to formal planning applications being submitted.’ The DPP had concerns regarding the weight being attached to establishing new schools and how this related to aligning provision with the strategic planning for schools and the delivery of an overall housing strategy (and for this to be underpinned with the necessary infrastructure).

## **RESOLVED –**

That the Development Plan Panel recommends the following to Executive Board:

- (a) That the response to the draft NPFF, as amended, be noted
- (b) That the amended submission be endorsed, as LCC's formal response to the national consultation, on an all party basis
- (c) That with the exception of 11a and 11b being altered from 'Agree' to 'Disagree' and the inclusion of additional text, the responses set out in the consultation questionnaire at appendix 1, be approved
- (d) That the draft letter for MPs and relevant parties, as amended, be approved
- (e) That a copy of the amended report be forwarded to the Secretary of State (Communities & Local Government), shadow party spokesmen, Leeds MPs and other relevant organisations including the Local Government Association.

### **19 Natural Resources & Waste Development Plan Document - Independent Examination & Schedule of Changes**

The Director of City Development submitted a report which outlined a series of further changes being considered by the Inspector in relation to the Natural Resources & Waste Development Plan Document (DPD).

Appended to the report was a copy of the changes being considered by the Inspector.

David Feeney, Head of Forward Planning and Implementation, presented the report.

**RESOLVED –** That the attached changes to the report, be noted.

### **20 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Tuesday, 8<sup>th</sup> November 2011 at 1.30pm.

(The meeting concluded at 2.45pm.)