

**CORE STRATEGY PRE SUBMISSION CHANGES SUSTAINABILITY
APPRAISAL ADDENDUM**

OCTOBER 2012

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. METHODOLOGY.....	2
3. THE PROPOSED CHANGES AND INITIAL 'SCREENING'.....	3
4. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED CHANGES 'SCREENED IN', AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	59

APPENDIX 1 –THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK

APPENDIX 2 – G7 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL MATRIX

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS ADDENDUM

The Government's Planning Advisory Service has produced guidance on SA, which states that a supplementary report can be produced which documents the appraisal of 'supplementary change' to a DPD (PAS, 2009).

This document forms an addendum to the February 2012 SA Report and identifies whether the outcomes of that report should be varied from those originally reported, as a result of the Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes. Where they should be varied, this addendum has been created to specify where and how, including any supplementary recommendations (e.g. mitigation and monitoring). This includes further policy wording changes.

As such, this addendum is a full SA of the proposed changes contained in the CS Pre Submission Changes, but should be read in conjunction with the original SA Report.

1.2 ADDENDUM STRUCTURE

This addendum presents the following information:

Section 1: this section (general background)

Section 2: method used in assessing the Schedule of Changes

Section 3: a review, or 'screening' exercise, of the Schedule of Changes for their potential to alter the SA (i.e. their 'likely significant effects')

Section 4: the detailed assessment of the proposed changes 'screened in' to requiring further assessment, including conclusions and recommendations.

1.3 GUIDANCE ON DEALING WITH PROPOSED CHANGES

Guidance on SA states:

[Proposed] Changes [to a DPD] that are not significant will not require further sustainability appraisal work. ... Where proposed changes ... have significant sustainability effects, you will need to make relevant sustainability appraisal information available. This information must be consistent with the scope and level of detail of the sustainability appraisal conducted by the local authority. It should also refer to the same baseline information in identifying the likely significant effects of the revised policy or new site.

(PAS,
2009)

This addendum abides fully by this guidance, and has been done on a consistent basis to the original SA work and SA Report.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 METHOD OF ASSESSMENT

In conducting SA of the CS Pre Submission Changes proposed changes, the following tasks have been done.

- I. An initial SA 'screening' of each policy change has first been compared against the CS Publication Draft DPD policies and supporting information to check whether or not it changes what the original policy intended (and thus if it could change the SA results), and also whether or not it changes any of the SA's original assumptions.
- II. Where necessary, further SA assessment work of proposed changes: where the CS Pre Submission Changes were 'screened in' to requiring further attention by the SA, the changes and reasonable alternatives have been assessed in order to identify potential effects and inform the proposed changes and their future implementation.
- III. Check the SA monitoring framework: as a result of the previous step, the SA monitoring framework was checked in order to ensure it still addressed the potential significant implications of the CS DPD and uncertainties of the SA.

Changes have been made both to the policies and supporting text however only a review of the policies is set out within this document. Review of the the supporting text confirmed that it does not change the assumptions made when reviewing the policies but provides further background detail. The intent and effect that the CS will have can therefore be assessed through policy and therefore the view was taken that the supporting text does not effect the SA outcomes of the CS.

2.2 LIMITATIONS AND UNCERTAINTIES SPECIFIC TO THE PROPOSED CHANGES

The introduction of policy G7 provides a degree of uncertainty with regard to the accessibility of any sites which come forward. The assessment predicts that the policy should ensure that there is positive outcome for access by public transport and pollution linked to trips however the lack of detail within the text of the policy means that the level of access provision is uncertain.

3. THE PROPOSED CHANGES AND INITIAL SCREENING

3.1 SEA 'SCREENING' OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES

The initial review, or 'screening', of the CS Pre Submission Changes is documented in Table 1 below. This exercises 'screens' the changes to filter out those which do not change the way in which the CS DPD would be implemented on the ground, and therefore are certain not to change the SA Report's outcomes as previously documented. Those which are 'screened in' are those which have the potential to change the SA outcome (answer being 'yes' in the second column), and which therefore require further SA assessment in Section 4.

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

Table 1 – SEA Screening

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <p><u>GENERAL POLICY</u></p> <p><u>WHEN CONSIDERING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS, THE COUNCIL WILL TAKE A POSITIVE APPROACH THAT REFLECTS THE PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINED IN THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK. IT WILL ALWAYS WORK PROACTIVELY WITH APPLICANTS JOINTLY TO FIND SOLUTIONS WHICH MEAN THAT PROPOSALS CAN BE APPROVED WHEREVER POSSIBLE, AND TO SECURE DEVELOPMENT THAT IMPROVES THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS OF LEEDS.</u></p> <p><u>PLANNING APPLICATIONS THAT ACCORD WITH THE POLICIES IN THIS PLAN (AND WHERE RELEVANT, WITH POLICIES IN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS) WILL BE APPROVED WITHOUT DELAY, UNLESS MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS INDICATE OTHERWISE.</u></p> <p><u>WHERE THERE ARE NO POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE APPLICATION OR RELEVANT POLICIES ARE OUT OF DATE AT THE TIME OF MAKING THE DECISION THEN THE COUNCIL WILL GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION UNLESS MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS INDICATE OTHERWISE – TAKING INTO ACCOUNT WHETHER:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>• ANY ADVERSE IMPACTS OF GRANTING PERMISSION WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY AND DEMONSTRABLY OUTWEIGH THE BENEFITS, WHEN ASSESSED AGAINST THE POLICIES IN THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK TAKEN AS A WHOLE; OR</u> <u>• SPECIFIED POLICIES IN THAT FRAMEWORK INDICATE THAT DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE RESTRICTED</u> 	<p>No</p>	<p>The general policy which is pursuant to the new National Planning Policy Framework does not effect the approach that the Council would take. In the absence of this policy the Council would continue to take the approach outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework and decide planning applications on this basis.</p>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial Policy 3 amended as follows: <p style="text-align: center;"><u>SPATIAL POLICY 3: ROLE OF LEEDS CITY CENTRE</u></p> <p>THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CITY CENTRE AS AN ECONOMIC DRIVER FOR THE DISTRICT AND CITY REGION WILL BE MAINTAINED AND ENHANCED BY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) PROMOTING THE CITY CENTRE’S ROLE AS THE REGIONAL CAPITAL FOR MAJOR NEW RETAIL, LEISURE, HOTEL, CULTURE AND OFFICE DEVELOPMENT; (ii) MAKING THE CITY CENTRE THE MAIN FOCUS FOR OFFICE DEVELOPMENT IN THE DISTRICT (FOCUSSED UPON THE WEST END, SOUTH BANK & HOLBECK URBAN VILLAGE); (iii) VALUING THE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE LIFE, VITALITY AND ECONOMY OF THE CITY CENTRE MADE BY THE UNIVERSITIES, LEEDS GENERAL INFIRMARY, MAJOR MUSEUMS AND ARENA (iv) COMPREHENSIVELY PLANNING THE REDEVELOPMENT AND RE-USE OF VACANT AND UNDER-USED SITES <i>AND BUILDINGS</i> FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT AND NEW AREAS OF PUBLIC SPACE (INCLUDING A MAJOR CITY CENTRE PARK IN THE SOUTH BANK AREA); (v) IMPROVING PUBLIC TRANSPORT LINKS BETWEEN THE CITY CENTRE AND THE REST OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING LEEDS BRADFORD INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT; (vi) MANAGING FLOOD RISK ISSUES COMPREHENSIVELY THROUGH SUPPORTING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE LEEDS FLOOD ALLEVIATION SCHEME AND USE OF OTHER FLOOD MITIGATION MEASURES; (vii) ENHANCING STREETS AND CREATING A NETWORK OF OPEN AND GREEN SPACES TO MAKE THE CITY CENTRE MORE ATTRACTIVE, <i>FAMILY FRIENDLY</i> AND EASIER FOR PEOPLE TO USE AND IN 	<p>No</p>	<p>The policy is amended to be more family friendly which could have a positive effect on elements of the social objectives. It was not however considered to be sufficient to improve the previous score of slight positive. Other changes add clarity and so have already considered as part of the previous SA assessment.</p>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>CONSOLIDATING AND ENHANCING SENSE OF PLACE;</p> <p>(viii) IMPROVING CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THE CITY CENTRE AND ADJOINING NEIGHBOURHOODS;</p> <p>(ix) SUPPORT THE ROLE OF LEEDS CITY STATION, ENHANCING LEEDS' ROLE AS A REGIONAL TRANSPORT HUB AND SUPPORTING THE POTENTIAL FOR THE INTEGRATION OF HIGH SPEED RAIL;</p> <p>(x) EXPANDING CITY LIVING WITH A BROADER HOUSING MIX (INCLUDING FAMILY HOUSING).</p>		
---	--	--

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p><u>SPATIAL POLICY 6: THE HOUSING REQUIREMENT AND ALLOCATION OF HOUSING LAND</u></p> <p>70,000 (NET) NEW DWELLINGS NET BETWEEN 2012 AND 2028 WILL BE ACCOMMODATED AT A RATE OF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3,660 PER ANNUM FROM 2012/13 TO THE END OF 2016/17 (18,300) • 4,700 PER ANNUM FROM 2017/18 (51,700) <p>DELIVERY OF 500 DWELLINGS PER ANNUM (8,000 OVER THE PLAN PERIOD) IS ANTICIPATED ON SMALL AND UNIDENTIFIED SITES.</p> <p>GUIDED BY THE SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY, THE COUNCIL WILL IDENTIFY 66,000 DWELLINGS GROSS (62,000 NET) TO ACHIEVE THE DISTRIBUTION IN TABLES H2 AND H3 IN SPATIAL POLICY 7 USING THE FOLLOWING CONSIDERATIONS:</p> <p>i) SUSTAINABLE LOCATIONS (WHICH MEET STANDARDS OF PUBLIC</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Minor amendment to text which reinforces the policy position and does not introduce new elements to be assessed.</p>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>TRANSPORT ACCESSIBILITY -SEE THE WELL CONNECTED CITY CHAPTER), SUPPORTED BY EXISTING OR ACCESS TO NEW LOCAL FACILITIES AND SERVICES,</p> <p>ii) PREFERENCE FOR BROWNFIELD AND REGENERATION SITES,</p> <p>iii) THE LEAST IMPACT ON GREEN BELT PURPOSES,</p> <p>iv) OPPORTUNITIES TO <i>REINFORCE OR</i> ENHANCE THE DISTINCTIVENESS OF EXISTING NEIGHBOURHOODS AND QUALITY OF LIFE OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES THROUGH THE DESIGN AND STANDARD OF NEW HOMES,</p> <p>v) THE NEED FOR REALISTIC LEAD-IN-TIMES AND BUILD-OUT-RATES FOR HOUSING CONSTRUCTION,</p> <p>vi) THE LEAST NEGATIVE AND MOST POSITIVE IMPACTS ON GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE, GREEN CORRIDORS, GREENSPACE AND NATURE CONSERVATION,</p> <p>vii) GENERALLY AVOIDING OR MITIGATING AREAS OF FLOOD RISK.</p>		
---	--	--

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as follows: <p><u>SPATIAL POLICY 8: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES</u></p> <p>A COMPETITIVE LOCAL ECONOMY WILL BE SUPPORTED THROUGH:</p> <p>(i) THE PROVISION AND SAFEGUARDING OF A SUFFICIENT SUPPLY OF LAND AND BUILDINGS, AS PART OF A WIDE PORTFOLIO OF SITES TO MATCH EMPLOYMENT NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR B CLASS USES.</p> <p>(ii) PROMOTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STRONG LOCAL ECONOMY THROUGH ENTERPRISE AND INNOVATION, IN FACILITATING EXISTING STRENGTHS IN FINANCIAL AND BUSINESS SERVICES AND</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The SA needs to consider the impact of the broadening of the policy to include support for leisure and tourism.</p>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>(iii) MANUFACTURING AND TO CONTINUE TO GROW OPPORTUNITIES IN HEALTH AND MEDICAL, LOW CARBON MANUFACTURING, DIGITAL AND CREATIVE, RETAIL, HOUSING AND CONSTRUCTION, SOCIAL ENTERPRISE, <u>LEISURE AND TOURISM</u> AND THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR. JOB RETENTION AND CREATION, PROMOTING THE NEED FOR A SKILLED WORKFORCE, EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AND REDUCING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES.</p> <p>(iv) SEEKING TO IMPROVE ACCESSIBILITY TO EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT, WALKING AND CYCLING ACROSS THE DISTRICT AND ESPECIALLY IN RELATION TO JOB OPPORTUNITIES IN THE CITY CENTRE AND AIRE VALLEY LEEDS (URBAN ECO SETTLEMENT AND ENTERPRISE ZONE).</p> <p>(v) SUPPORTING THE RURAL ECONOMY, CONSISTENT WITH THE SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY AND THE PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF A HIGH QUALITY RURAL ENVIRONMENT.</p> <p>(vi) SUPPORTING TRAINING / SKILLS AND JOB CREATION INITIATIVES VIA PLANNING AGREEMENTS LINKED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF APPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENTS GIVEN PLANNING PERMISSION.</p> <p>(vii) DEVELOPING THE CITY CENTRE AND THE TOWN/LOCAL CENTRES AS THE CORE LOCATION FOR NEW RETAIL AND OFFICE EMPLOYMENT <u>AND OTHER MAIN TOWN CENTRE USES</u></p> <p>(viii) SUPPORTING DEVELOPMENT IN EXISTING LOCATIONS/SITES FOR GENERAL INDUSTRIAL AND WAREHOUSE, PARTICULARLY IN LOCATIONS WHICH TAKE FULL ADVANTAGE OF EXISTING SERVICES, HIGH LEVELS OF ACCESSIBILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE (INCLUDING LOCATIONS AND SITES ACCESSIBLE BY RAIL AND/OR WATERWAY).</p> <p>(ix) <u>SUPPORT THE ADVANCEMENT OF HIGH QUALITY COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE TO FOSTER SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TO ENHANCE BUSINESS LINKS.</u></p> <p>(x) <u>SUPPORT THE RETENTION AND PROVISION OF NEW BUSINESS START-UP UNITS INCLUDING SMALL WORKSHOPS, WHERE APPROPRIATE.</u></p>		
---	--	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><u>SPATIAL POLICY 10: GREEN BELT</u></p> <p>A SELECTIVE REVIEW OF THE GREEN BELT WILL NEED TO BE CARRIED OUT TO ACCOMMODATE THE SCALE OF HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH IDENTIFIED IN SPATIAL POLICY 6 AND SPATIAL POLICY 9, AS WELL AS AN ADDITIONAL CONTINGENCY TO CREATE NEW PROTECTED AREAS OF SEARCH (TO REPLACE THOSE IN THE UDP WHICH WILL BE ALLOCATED FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT). THE SELECTIVE REVIEW WILL GENERALLY CONSIDER GREEN BELT RELEASE AROUND:</p> <p>(i) THE MAIN URBAN AREA (LEEDS CITY CENTRE AND SURROUNDING AREAS FORMING THE MAIN URBAN AND SUBURBAN AREAS OF THE CITY);</p> <p>(ii) MAJOR SETTLEMENTS OF GARFORTH, GUISELEY/YEADON/RAWDON, MORLEY, OTLEY, ROTHWELL AND WETHERBY;</p> <p>(iii) SMALLER SETTLEMENTS (LISTED IN TABLE 1 : SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY);</p> <p>EXCEPTIONALLY, SITES IN OTHER SETTLEMENTS <u>OUTSIDE THE SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY</u> COULD BE CONSIDERED, WHERE THEY ARE <u>WILL BE</u> IN SUSTAINABLE LOCATIONS WITH ACCESS TO <u>AND ARE ABLE TO PROVIDE A FULL</u> RANGE OF LOCAL FACILITIES AND SERVICES AND <u>WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THEIR HOUSING MARKET CHARACTERISTIC AREA</u>, AND WHERE SITES ARE MORE APPROPRIATE IN MEETING THE SPATIAL OBJECTIVES OF THE PLAN THAN THE ALTERNATIVES IN HIGHER ORDER SETTLEMENTS <u>WITHIN THE SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY</u>. OTHERWISE REVIEW OF THE GREEN BELT WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED TO ENSURE THAT ITS GENERAL</p>	No	<p>The amendment provides further detail as to the criteria that will have to be met for sites to consider which may come forward for development that are outside the scope of the selective review. The aim of of the policy and the general approach remains the same and so the expectation is of no change to the SA outcome.</p>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>EXTENT IS MAINTAINED.</p> <p>IN ASSESSING WHETHER SITES IN THE SELECTIVE GREEN BELT REVIEW SHOULD BE ALLOCATED FOR DEVELOPMENT, THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA WILL BE APPLIED:</p> <p>(iv) SITES WILL BE ASSESSED AGAINST THE PURPOSES OF INCLUDING LAND IN GREEN BELTS IDENTIFIED IN NATIONAL GUIDANCE (PPG2/DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK). THESE PURPOSES ARE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TO CHECK THE UNRESTRICTED SPRAWL OF LARGE BUILT UP AREAS, • TO PREVENT NEIGHBOURING TOWNS FROM MERGING, • TO ASSIST IN SAFEGUARDING THE COUNTRYSIDE FROM ENCROACHMENT, • TO PRESERVE THE SETTING AND SPECIAL CHARACTER OF HISTORIC TOWNS; AND • TO ASSIST IN URBAN REGENERATION. <p>(v) DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS NOT PART OF THE SELECTIVE GREEN BELT REVIEW WILL BE CONSIDERED AGAINST THE SUITE OF GREEN BELT POLICIES SAVED FROM THE UDP AND THROUGH THE EMERGING GUIDANCE AND LEGISLATION OF THE LOCALISM ACT.</p>		
---	--	--

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p><u>SPATIAL POLICY 11: TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PRIORITIES</u></p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The amendments provide clarity and reinforce the existing policy position and therefore add nothing materially that would have an impact on the SA outcome.</p>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

		<p><u>THE DELIVERY OF AN INTEGRATED TRANSPORT STRATEGY FOR LEEDS WILL BE SUPPORTED, WHICH INCLUDES A RANGE OF INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS AND OTHER INTERVENTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OBJECTIVES OF WEST YORKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3 AND THE LEEDS CITY REGION TRANSPORT STRATEGY (2009). THE INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN AND THE KEY DIAGRAM GIVE FURTHER DETAILS OF THE SCOPE OF THESE IMPROVEMENTS/INTERVENTIONS. THESE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS/INTERVENTIONS ARE ALSO SUPPORTED BY THE DEMAND MANAGEMENT MEASURES OUTLINED IN POLICY T1.</u></p> <p><u>SPATIAL PRIORITIES</u></p> <p>(i) <u>PUBLIC TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE BUS AND RAIL NETWORKS (INCLUDING SUPPORTING THE ROLE OF LEEDS CITY STATION, ENHANCING LEEDS' ROLE AS A REGIONAL TRANSPORT HUB, AND NEW RAIL STATIONS WHERE APPROPRIATE) AND INVESTMENT IN A RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM TO INCREASE RADIAL ROUTE CAPACITY TO THE CITY AND TOWN CENTRES AND TO IMPROVE RELIABILITY TOGETHER WITH INVESTMENT IN THE PROVISION OF PARK AND RIDE FACILITIES;</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>SURFACE ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS TO SUPPORT GROWTH OF LEEDS BRADFORD INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT (SEE ALSO SPATIAL POLICY 12);</u></p> <p>(iii) <u>TARGETED HIGHWAY SCHEMES TO ALLEVIATE CONGESTION AND ASSIST IMPROVED CONNECTIVITY FOR LOCAL AND STRATEGIC ORBITAL MOVEMENTS, AND THE STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK;</u></p> <p>(iv) <u>EXPANSION OF THE LEEDS CORE CYCLE NETWORK TO IMPROVE LOCAL CONNECTIVITY;</u></p> <p>(v) <u>IMPROVED FACILITIES FOR PEDESTRIANS TO PROMOTE SAFETY AND ACCESSIBILITY, PARTICULARLY CONNECTIVITY BETWEEN THE 'RIM' AND THE CITY CENTRE;</u></p> <p>(vi) <u>MEASURES TO DELIVER SAFER ROADS;</u></p> <p>(vii) <u>THE PROVISION OF INFRASTRUCTURE TO SERVE NEW DEVELOPMENT (INCLUDING WITHIN REGENERATION AREAS DEFINED IN SPATIAL POLICY 4 AND URBAN EXTENSIONS);</u></p> <p>(viii) <u>SUPPORTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE FOR NEW LOW CARBON TECHNOLOGIES;</u></p> <p>(ix) <u>TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENTS TO CONNECT TO AND FROM AND</u></p>
--	--	---

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p><u>WITHIN THE AIRE VALLEY LEEDS DEVELOPMENT AREA (SEE SPATIAL POLICY 5):</u></p> <p>(x) <u>SUPPORTING HIGH SPEED RAIL AS A LONGER TERM INTERVENTION TO SERVE LEEDS AND THE WIDER CITY REGION BY PROVIDING A SUBSTANTIAL ENHANCEMENT TO INTER-CITY CONNECTIVITY.</u></p> <p>(xi) <u>PROVISION FOR PEOPLE WITH IMPAIRED MOBILITY TO IMPROVE ACCESSIBILITY</u></p> <p><u>ROUTES DESIGNATED IN THE EMERGING TRANSPORT STRATEGY OR PROGRAMMED WORKS WILL BE PROTECTED FROM DEVELOPMENT. CURRENT PROPOSALS ARE IDENTIFIED ON THE KEY DIAGRAM, THE LEEDS TRANSPORT STRATEGY MAP (MAP 9) AND SAVED UDP POLICIES.</u></p>		
---	--	--

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as follows: <p><u>SPATIAL POLICY 12: MANAGING THE GROWTH OF LEEDS BRADFORD INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT</u></p> <p>THE CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT OF LEEDS BRADFORD INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT WILL BE SUPPORTED TO ENABLE IT TO FULFIL ITS ROLE AS AN IMPORTANT REGIONAL AIRPORT. THE FURTHER GROWTH OF THE AIRPORT WILL BE SUPPORTED. SUBJECT TO:</p> <p>(i) PROVISION OF MAJOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE (SUCH AS TRAM TRAIN) AND SURFACE ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS <u>AT AGREED PASSENGER LEVELS;</u></p> <p>(ii) AGREEMENT OF A SURFACE ACCESS STRATEGY WITH IDENTIFIED FUNDING <u>AND TRIGGER POINTS;</u></p> <p>(iii) ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS AND AGREED PLANS TO MITIGATE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS, WHERE APPROPRIATE;</p>	No	The amendments provide clarity and reinforce the existing policy position and therefore add nothing materially that would have an impact on the SA outcome.

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

(iv) THE MANAGEMENT OF ANY LOCAL IMPACTS AND IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES,, <u><i>INCLUDING VISUAL AND HIGHWAY ISSUES.</i></u>		
PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p style="text-align: center;"><u>SPATIAL POLICY 13: STRATEGIC GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE</u></p> <p>THE STRATEGIC GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE LEEDS DISTRICT IS DEFINED <u><i>INDICATED</i></u> ON THE KEY DIAGRAM. THIS INFRASTRUCTURE PERFORMS MANY IMPORTANT FUNCTIONS AND PROVIDES FOR OPPORTUNITIES FOR RECREATION. WITHIN THESE AREAS THE COUNCIL WILL MAINTAIN AND, IN PARTNERSHIP WITH OTHERS, ENHANCE THE FOLLOWING KEY CORRIDORS:</p> <p>(i) THE AIRE VALLEY, ALONG THE RIVER AND CANAL CORRIDORS AND INCLUDING; WEST LEEDS COUNTRY PARK AND KIRKSTALL VALLEY PARK TO THE NORTH; FAIRBURN INGS; ST AIDANS AND AIRE VALLEY LEEDS TO THE SOUTH, INCORPORATING THE PROPOSED URBAN ECO-SETTLEMENT (WHICH HAS PARTICULAR AIMS TO STRENGTHEN GREEN LINKS TO LEEDS CITY CENTRE, THE LOWER AIRE VALLEY, TEMPLE NEWSAM, AND ROTHWELL COUNTRY PARK);</p> <p>(ii) SOUTH LEEDS (INCLUDING THE MORLEY-MIDDLETON-HOLBECK CORRIDOR);</p> <p>(iii) THE LIMESTONE RIDGE (WHICH RUNS NORTH-SOUTH AT THE EASTERN EDGE OF THE DISTRICT);</p> <p><i>(iv) THE WHARFE VALLEY; <u>AND CHEVIN RIDGE;</u></i></p>	No	The amendments provide clarity and reinforce the Publication Draft policy position and therefore add nothing materially that would have an impact on the SA outcome.

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>(v) WYKE BECK VALLEY;</p> <p>(vi) WOODHOUSE RIDGE;</p> <p>(vii) MEANWOOD VALLEY;</p> <p>(viii) TONG COCKERSDALE;</p> <p>(ix) GLEDHOW VALLEY.</p>		
---	--	--

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><u>POLICY CC1: CITY CENTRE DEVELOPMENT</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">THE CITY CENTRE WILL BE PLANNED TO ACCOMMODATE AT LEAST THE FOLLOWING:</p> <p>(i) 655,000 SQM OF OFFICE FLOORSPACE.</p> <p>(ii) 31,000 SQM OF NET ADDITIONAL RETAIL SPACE (COMPARISON), FOLLOWING COMPLETION OF THE TRINITY AND EASTGATE SCHEMES AND SUBJECT TO NEED BEING CONFIRMED IN A FURTHER RETAIL STUDY.</p> <p>(iii) 10,200 DWELLINGS.</p> <p>(iv) SUPPORTING SERVICES AND OPEN SPACES <u>AND IMPROVEMENTS TO THE PUBLIC REALM</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">THIS WILL BE ACHIEVED THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF OUTSTANDING PERMISSIONS, DECISION MAKING ON PLANNING</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The majority of the amendments provide further clarity rather than a policy change. Criteria 'b' provides a more supportive statement for residential development however the view was taken that this would not affect the SA outcome which remains slightly positive.</p>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>APPLICATIONS, MASTER-PLANNING, AND IDENTIFICATION OF APPROPRIATE SITES AND MIXED USE ALLOCATIONS THROUGH LDF ALLOCATIONS DOCUMENTS, ACCORDING TO THE</p> <p>FOLLOWING CRITERIA:</p> <p>a) FAVOURING LOCATIONS WITH THE BEST PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACCESSIBILITY FOR LARGE SCALE OFFICES,</p> <p>b) MIXED OFFICE/RESIDENTIAL SCHEMES TO SITE RESIDENTIAL ON UPPER FLOORS AND AWAY FROM MAJOR ROADS <u>ENCOURAGING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING NEW BUILDINGS AND CHANGES OF USE OF EXISTING PROVIDING THAT IT DOES NOT PREJUDICE THE TOWN CENTRE FUNCTIONS OF THE CITY CENTRE AND THAT IT PROVIDES A REASONABLE LEVEL OF AMENITY FOR OCCUPIERS</u></p> <p>c) HOSPITAL, UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE, AND CULTURAL FACILITIES TO BE RETAINED IN THE CITY CENTRE.</p> <p>d) COMPARISON RETAIL SPACE WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED OUTSIDE OF THE PRIME SHOPPING QUARTER WHEN IT CANNOT BE ACCOMMODATED WITHIN THE PRIME SHOPPING QUARTER, OR IN THE CASE OF BULKY GOODS RETAILING SPACE CANNOT BE ACCOMMODATED ALSO IN AREAS DESIGNATED FOR BULKY GOODS RETAILING. <u>THIS WILL BE ACCORDING TO NPPF SEQUENTIAL TESTING, AND, IN THE CASE OF PROPOSALS OF 2,500SQM OR MORE ACCORDING TO NPPF IMPACT TESTING.</u></p> <p>e) CONSIDERING PROPOSALS FOR CONVENIENCE RETAILING AND CONVENIENCE FACILITIES (SUCH AS DRY CLEANERS, OFF-LICENSES, SMALL BRANCH BANKS, CAFÉS, AND PUBS) AS FOLLOWS:</p> <p>i) BELOW <u>UP TO</u> 200 SQM ACCEPTABLE ANYWHERE WITHIN THE CITY CENTRE,</p> <p>ii) 200 1- 372 SQM SEQUENTIAL TEST TO INCLUDE THE PRIME SHOPPING QUARTER AND ANY DESIGNATED PARADES <u>LOCAL CONVENIENCE CENTRES</u> IF THEY FALL WITHIN 300M WALKING DISTANCE, <u>OR IF THE PROPOSAL IS NOT COMPLEMENTARY TO THE FUNCTION OF OFFICE AREAS OR ENTERTAINMENT OR CULTURAL DESTINATIONS,</u></p>		
---	--	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p><u>INCLUDING THE WATERFRONT</u></p> <p>iii) 372.3 – 1,499 SQM (GROSS) SEQUENTIAL TEST TO INCLUDE THE PRIME SHOPPING QUARTER, ALL DESIGNATED PARADES <u>LOCAL CONVENIENCE CENTRES</u> AND THOSE CENTRES IDENTIFIED IN POLICY P1 THAT FALL WITHIN A 5 MINUTE INBOUND OFF-PEAK DRIVE TIME,</p> <p>iv) 1,500 SQM AND ABOVE SEQUENTIAL TEST AS PER III) ABOVE PLUS AN IMPACT ASSESSMENT ON THE PRIME SHOPPING QUARTER AND PARADES <u>LOCAL CONVENIENCE CENTRES</u> AND CENTRES IDENTIFIED IN III) ABOVE,</p> <p>v) AGGREGATING FLOORSPACE TOGETHER FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE ABOVE THRESHOLDS IF MORE THAN ONE UNIT IS PROPOSED,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">SUCH THAT WHERE A REALISTIC ALTERNATIVE OPPORTUNITY EXISTS IN-CENTRE IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, OR EDGE OF CENTRE IN THE SECOND, OR WHERE THE IMPACT ON THE VIABILITY AND VITALITY OF THE PRIME SHOPPING QUARTER, A CENTRE OR DESIGNATED PARADE <u>LOCAL CONVENIENCE CENTRES</u> WOULD BE HARMFUL <u>SIGNIFICANTLY ADVERSE</u>, PROPOSALS WILL BE RESISTED.</p> <p>F) A CONCENTRATION OF SHOPS WITH GROUND FLOOR FRONTAGES SHOULD BE MAINTAINED IN THE PRIME SHOPPING QUARTER FOR REASONS OF VITALITY. PROPOSALS FOR NON-RETAIL USE SHOULD NOT RESULT IN THE PROPORTION OF RETAIL FRONTAGE LENGTH FALLING BELOW 80% IN PRIMARY FRONTAGES OR BELOW 50% IN SECONDARY FRONTAGES.</p> <p>PROPOSALS FOR USES OUTSIDE OF THE “A” CLASS WILL NOT BE PERMITTED WITHIN DESIGNATED GROUND FLOOR FRONTAGES.</p> <p><u>NB ALL THRESHOLDS ARE FOR GROSS INTERNAL AREA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 5.1.19 amended as follows: To address the physical and social disconnectivity between the City Centre and the inner-city (the Rim), the Council will advance and promote schemes to improve pedestrian linkages. Particular attention will be given to overcoming obstacles to movement such as Armley Gyratory, Sheepscar Junction and the Southern Inner Ring Road/M621. The West Leeds Gateway 	
---	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>Supplementary Planning Document provides more information about Armley Gyratory. In line with Policy CC3, new development will need to be laid out and designed to improve connectivity, for example large redevelopment sites might be laid out with new traversing roads or pathways to improve connectivity; smaller developments might enhance an existing route by providing lighting or installing windows overlooking the route to improve natural surveillance. <u>Any provision made under Policy CC3, will need to be considered in relation to the open space provision or contributions expected under Policy G5. The focus of these policies is to provide appropriate levels of on and off site contributions to open space and infrastructure to improve amenity and connectivity.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY CC3: IMPROVING CONNECTIVITY BETWEEN THE CITY CENTRE & NEIGHBOURING COMMUNITIES</u></p> <p>DEVELOPMENT AT APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS IS REQUIRED TO HELP PROVIDE AND IMPROVE ROUTES CONNECTING THE CITY CENTRE WITH ADJOINING NEIGHBOURHOODS AND IMPROVE CONNECTIONS WITHIN THE CITY CENTRE IN ORDER TO <u>IMPROVE ACCESS TO JOBS AND SERVICES, TO ENCOURAGE GREATER USAGE AND MAKE WALKING AND CYCLING EASIER, SAFER AND MORE ATTRACTIVE, NEW DEVELOPMENT WILL BE EXPECTED:</u></p> <p><u>i) TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS (AND CONTRIBUTIONS THROUGH THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY ONCE INTRODUCED).</u></p> <p><u>ii) IF PROPOSALS ARE LOCATED IN THE LINE OF OR ADJACENT TO A NEW ROUTE OR A ROUTE PLANNED FOR IMPROVEMENT, TO MAKE APPROPRIATE ROUTE ENHANCEMENTS OR APPROPRIATE OFF SITE CONTRIBUTIONS.</u></p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Policy wording amendments reinforce the previous support for contributions to providing accessible jobs and services. The outcome therefore remains significantly positive against a number of environmental SA objectives with no change of outcome.</p>
---	-----------	--

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to	Reason
------------------	--------------	--------

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

	change SA outcome?	
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY H1: MANAGED RELEASE OF SITES</u></p> <p>LDF ALLOCATION DOCUMENTS WILL <u>PHASE¹</u> THE RELEASE OF ALLOCATIONS ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA IN ORDER TO ENSURE SUFFICIENCY OF SUPPLY, GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH SPATIAL POLICY 7, AND ACHIEVEMENT OF A PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND TARGET OF 65% FOR THE FIRST 5 YEARS AND 55% THEREAFTER. SUBSEQUENT PHASES (AFTER THE FIRST 5 YEARS OF THE PLAN) <u>SUBJECT TO THESE CONSIDERATIONS, PHASES WITH THE EARLIEST RELEASE</u> SHOULD BE MADE UP OF SITES WHICH BEST ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) LOCATION IN REGENERATION AREAS, ii) LOCATIONS WHICH HAVE THE BEST PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACCESSIBILITY, iii) LOCATIONS WITH THE BEST ACCESSIBILITY TO LOCAL SERVICES, iv) LOCATIONS WITH LEAST IMPACT ON GREEN BELT OBJECTIVES, SITES WITH LEAST NEGATIVE AND MOST POSITIVE IMPACTS ON <u>EXISTING AND PROPOSED</u> GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE, GREEN CORRIDORS, GREEN SPACE AND NATURE CONSERVATION, <p>CONSIDERATION WILL BE GIVEN TO BRINGING FORWARD LARGE SITES, OF MORE THAN 750 DWELLINGS, TO FACILITATE, EARLY DELIVERY IN THE PLAN PERIOD.</p> <p>IN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, ALLOCATED SITES MAY BE PERMITTED TO BE RELEASED IN ADVANCE OF THEIR PHASING OUTLINED ABOVE, SO LONG AS THE PERMITTED SITE DELIVERS INFRASTRUCTURE AND HOUSING INVESTMENT THAT IS NEEDED WITHIN REGENERATION PRIORITY AREAS. IN SUCH CASES, SUITABLE MECHANISMS WILL BE</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The amendments do not significantly alter the purpose of the policy with the view being taken that this therefore meant that the effect on SA objectives would remain the same.</p>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>AGREED TO ENSURE THAT DELIVERY WITHIN THE REGENERATION PRIORITY AREA OCCURS EITHER BEFORE, OR IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DELIVERY OF THE PERMITTED SITE.</p> <p>WHERE A FIVE YEAR SUPPLY (<i>PLUS APPROPRIATE NPPF BUFFER</i>) OF DELIVERABLE HOUSING SITES CANNOT BE DEMONSTRATED THROUGH ANNUAL MONITORING, CONSIDERATION WILL BE MADE TO RELEASE THE SUBSEQUENT PHASE OR PHASES OF SITES TO HELP ADDRESS THE SHORTFALL. THE <i>ANY</i> RELEASE OF FURTHER PHASES OF HOUSING LAND MAY</p> <p><i>WILL ONLY</i> BE CONSIDERED IF IT IS FOUND THAT EITHER:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) DELIVERY ON PDL IN THE PAST YEAR HAS MET THE TARGET; ii) DELIVERY ON PDL IS EXPECTED TO MEET THE TARGET FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS; OR iii) A SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF SITES (EQUIVALENT TO THE FIVE YEAR SUPPLY FIGURE MINUS THE WINDFALL ALLOWANCE) ARE REASONABLY CAPABLE OF BEING DEVELOPED. <p><i>¹ TO ESTABLISH A SERIES OF SEQUENTIAL BANDINGS OF SITES</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY H2: NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ON NON ALLOCATED SITES</u></p> <p>NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WILL BE ACCEPTABLE IN PRINCIPLE ON NON-ALLOCATED LAND, PROVIDING THAT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) THE NUMBER OF DWELLINGS DOES NOT EXCEED THE CAPACITY OF TRANSPORT, EDUCATIONAL AND HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE, AS EXISTING OR PROVIDED AS A CONDITION OF DEVELOPMENT. ii) FOR DEVELOPMENTS OF 5 OR MORE DWELLINGS THE LOCATION SHOULD ACCORD WITH THE ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS IN TABLE 2 OF APPENDIX 2 iii) GREEN BELT POLICY IS SATISFIED FOR SITES IN THE GREEN BELT <p>IN ADDITION, GREENFIELD LAND:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) SHOULD NOT BE DEVELOPED IF IT HAS INTRINSIC VALUE AS AMENITY SPACE OR FOR RECREATION OR FOR NATURE CONSERVATION, AND 	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Amendments to the criteria relating to the development of greenfield land have the potential to alter the effect on environmental SA objectives.</p>
--	------------	---

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p><u>OR</u> MAKES A VALUABLE CONTRIBUTION TO THE VISUAL, HISTORIC AND/OR SPATIAL CHARACTER OF AN AREA, OR</p> <p>b) MAY BE DEVELOPED IF IT CONCERNS A PIECE OF DESIGNATED GREENSPACE FOUND TO BE SURPLUS TO REQUIREMENTS BY THE OPEN SPACE, SPORT & RECREATION ASSESSMENT (PPG17AUDIT).</p> <p>Market Assessment (2011) identifies an annual need of 1158 affordable housing dwellings. Not all of this need will be met by the planning system, other methods of delivery such as grant funded schemes also play an important role in the delivery of affordable housing. <u><i>Given the high level of need, opportunities need to be taken to seek to secure affordable housing (or contributions) from all developments of new dwellings.</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 5.2.17 amended as follows: <u><i>Within this context</i></u>, Policy H5 provides an overall framework for the provision of affordable housing. It is appropriate that details such as thresholds and targets is provided through a Supplementary Planning Document. This will reflect market conditions and can be reviewed as economic conditions change and the life of the Core Strategy within the context of Policy H5. <u><i>For schemes that are below the threshold to require the provision of on-site affordable housing, the City Council will seek contributions toward affordable housing in conjunction with the Community Infrastructure Levy.</i></u> Policy amended as follows: <u>POLICY H5: AFFORDABLE HOUSING</u> <u><i>THE COUNCIL WILL SEEK AFFORDABLE HOUSING EITHER ON-SITE, OFF-SITE OR FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS FROM ALL DEVELOPMENTS OF NEW DWELLINGS.</i></u> HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS ABOVE A CERTAIN THRESHOLD SHOULD INCLUDE A PROPORTION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING TO BE <u><i>NORMALLY</i></u> PROVIDED ON THE DEVELOPMENT SITE. THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROVISION SHOULD PROVIDE FOR A TENURE MIX IN TERMS OF SUBMARKET AND SOCIAL RENTED HOUSING. OVER THE PLAN PERIOD TO 2028 THE 	<p>No</p>	<p>The view was taken that the amendments to the policy will have no significant effect on the SA outcomes. The amendment strengthens the existing very positive predicted effect against SA7 as widening the policy to include development of less than 15 units supports the development of affordable housing. Further amendments relating to when the off site contributions will be payable also leave the SA outcome unaffected as it provides more detail and the viability and feasibility methodology used to make affordable housing decisions at the planning application stage remain the same.</p>
---	-----------	---

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>THRESHOLD, AMOUNT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND TENURE SPLITS MAY VARY DEPENDING ON HOUSING NEEDS AND MARKET CONDITIONS APPLICABLE AT THE TIME. AN AFFORDABLE HOUSING SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT WILL THEREFORE PROVIDE UP TO DATE GUIDANCE ON <u>THRESHOLDS</u>, TARGETS, <u>AFFORDABILITY MIX AND</u> PROVISION SOUGHT, WHICH MAY VARY DEPENDING ON THE LOCAL AREA. AN ANNUAL UPDATE TO THE SPD OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRICE BENCHMARK FIGURES WILL ALSO BE PROVIDED.</p> <p>THE BROAD RANGE OF PROVISIONS <u>FOR A SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT</u> WILL BE:</p> <p>i) A THRESHOLD BETWEEN 10 AND 15 DWELLINGS WILL APPLY – <u>ON-SITE</u> AFFORDABLE HOUSING WILL BE SOUGHT ON ANY DEVELOPMENT AT OR ABOVE THE THRESHOLD. THERE IS NO SITE SIZE THRESHOLD.</p> <p>ii) OVERALL TARGETS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING WILL VARY FROM 5 TO 50%.</p> <p>iii) AFFORDABILITY OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING TO BE DESIGNED TO MEET IDENTIFIED NEEDS OF HOUSEHOLDS AS FOLLOWS;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR HOUSEHOLDS ON LOWER QUARTILE EARNINGS • 60% AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR HOUSEHOLDS ON LOWER DECTILE EARNINGS <p>DURING THE CORE STRATEGY PLAN PERIOD, AFFORDABLE HOUSING SPDS WILL DETERMINE WHAT PARTICULAR THRESHOLDS, TARGETS AND AFFORDABILITY MIX WILL APPLY TO WHICH AREAS OF LEEDS</p> <p><u>iv) OFF SITE CONTRIBUTIONS TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT GEOGRAPHICAL VARIATIONS IN THE HOUSING MARKET AND THE SEPARATE REQUIREMENTS OF THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY.</u></p> <p>THE AFFORDABLE UNITS SHOULD BE A PRO-RATA MIX IN TERMS OF SIZES AND TYPES OF THE TOTAL HOUSING PROVISION, UNLESS THERE ARE SPECIFIC NEEDS WHICH INDICATE OTHERWISE, AND THEY SHOULD BE SUITABLY INTEGRATED THROUGHOUT A DEVELOPMENT SITE.</p> <p>APPLICANTS MAY CHOOSE TO SUBMIT INDIVIDUAL VIABILITY APPRAISALS TO VERIFY THAT THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING TARGET</p>	
--	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>CANNOT BE MET. IN SUCH CASES, AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROVISION MAY BE REDUCED ACCORDINGLY.</p> <p><u>AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROVISION SHOULD BE ON SITE UNLESS OFF SITE PROVISION OR A FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION CAN BE ROBUSTLY JUSTIFIED.</u></p> <p>ELDERLY PERSONS SHELTERED HOUSING AND LOW COST MARKET HOUSING SHOULD NOT EXPECT THE REQUIREMENT FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING TO BE AUTOMATICALLY WAIVED OR REDUCED, ALTHOUGH INDIVIDUAL VIABILITY APPRAISALS WILL BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.</p> <p>SECURE ARRANGEMENTS IN THE FORM OF S106 AGREEMENTS, MUST BE AGREED TO ENSURE DELIVERY AND THAT AFFORDABILITY EMBODIED WITHIN AFFORDABLE HOUSING IS MAINTAINED FOR FUTURE PEOPLE OF LEEDS IN HOUSING NEED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY H6: HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMOS), STUDENT ACCOMMODATION, AND FLAT CONVERSIONS</u></p> <p>A) WITHIN THE AREA OF LEEDS COVERED BY THE ARTICLE IV DIRECTION FOR HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (HMOS), DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR NEW HMOS WILL BE DETERMINED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> TO ENSURE THAT A SUFFICIENT SUPPLY OF HMOS IS MAINTAINED IN LEEDS, TO ENSURE THAT HMOS ARE DISTRIBUTED IN AREAS WELL CONNECTED TO EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATIONAL DESTINATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH HMO OCCUPANTS, TO AVOID DETRIMENTAL IMPACTS THROUGH HIGH CONCENTRATIONS OF HMOS, WHICH WOULD UNDERMINE THE BALANCE AND HEALTH OF COMMUNITIES. <u>TO ENSURE THAT PROPOSALS FOR NEW HMOS ADDRESS RELEVANT AMENITY AND PARKING CONCERNS.</u> <u>TO AVOID THE LOSS OF EXISTING HOUSING SUITABLE FOR FAMILY OCCUPATION IN AREAS OF EXISTING HIGH CONCENTRATIONS OF HMOS.</u> 	<p>No</p>	<p>The amendments serve to reinforce and more clearly state the ambition of the policy with no change to the expected SA outcome.</p>
--	-----------	---

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>ADDITIONAL POLICY MAY BE NEEDED IN THE FUTURE TO DELIVER THE STRATEGIC AIMS OF POLICY H6. BASED ON THESE CRITERIA, SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING ADVICE WILL SET CEILINGS FOR THE PROPORTION OF HMOS DESIRABLE IN DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHIES OF LEEDS.</p> <p>B) DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR PURPOSE BUILT STUDENT ACCOMMODATION WILL BE CONTROLLED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) TO HELP EXTEND THE SUPPLY OF STUDENT ACCOMMODATION TAKING PRESSURE OFF THE NEED FOR PRIVATE HOUSING TO BE USED,ii) TO AVOID THE LOSS OF EXISTING HOUSING SUITABLE FOR FAMILY OCCUPATION,iii) TO AVOID EXCESSIVE CONCENTRATIONS OF STUDENT ACCOMMODATION (IN A SINGLE DEVELOPMENT OR IN COMBINATION WITH EXISTING ACCOMMODATION) WHICH WOULD UNDERMINE THE BALANCE AND WELLBEING OF COMMUNITIES,iv) TO AVOID LOCATIONS WHICH ARE NOT EASILY ACCESSIBLE TO THE UNIVERSITIES BY FOOT OR PUBLIC TRANSPORT OR WHICH WOULD GENERATE EXCESSIVE FOOTFALL THROUGH QUIET RESIDENTIAL AREAS <u>WHICH MAY LEAD TO DETRIMENTAL IMPACTS ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY.</u> <p>C) DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR CONVERSION OF EXISTING HOUSES INTO FLATS WILL BE ACCEPTED WHERE ALL THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA APPLY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) THE PROPERTY IS NOT A BACK-TO-BACK DWELLING;ii) THE PROPERTY IS OF SUFFICIENT SIZE (MIN. 100M SQ GROSS) AND THE INTERNAL LAYOUT IS SHOWN TO BE SUITABLE FOR THE NUMBER OF UNITS PROPOSED;iii) THE IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURING DWELLINGS IS NOT LIKELY TO BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE AMENITY OF THEIR OCCUPANTS BY VIRTUE OF THE CONVERSION ALONE OR CUMULATIVELY WITH A CONCENTRATION OF CONVERTED DWELLINGS, HMOS, OR RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTIONS;iv) WHERE THERE IS A DEMAND FOR FAMILY SIZED ACCOMMODATION AND THE PROPERTY HAS (OR HAS THE POTENTIAL FOR PROVISION OF) GOOD ACCESS TO SUITABLE SPACE FOR PRIVATE		
--	--	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>RECREATION, PROVISION IS NORMALLY MADE FOR AT LEAST ONE FAMILY SIZED UNIT IN THE PROPOSED MIX OF FLATS;</p> <p>v) SUFFICIENT EASILY ACCESSIBLE AND APPROPRIATELY LOCATED OFF AND ON STREET CAR AND CYCLE PARKING IS INCORPORATED;</p> <p>vi) THE PROPOSED DWELLINGS PROVIDE SATISFACTORY INTERNAL LIVING ACCOMMODATION IN TERMS OF DAYLIGHT, OUTLOOK AND JUXTAPOSITION OF LIVING ROOMS AND BEDROOMS;</p> <p>vii) EACH DWELLING HAS SAFE AND SECURE (AND WHERE POSSIBLE, LEVEL) ACCESS FROM THE STREET AND ANY PARKING AREAS AND SUITABLE ACCESSIBLE ENCLOSURES ARE PROVIDED FOR REFUSE STORAGE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY H7 : ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOW PEOPLE</u></p> <p>THE CITY COUNCIL WILL IDENTIFY SUITABLE SITES (OF AROUND NO MORE THAN 42 15 PITCHES PER SITE) TO ACCOMMODATE GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE, THROUGH A SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:</p> <p>i) SITES MUST BE LOCATED NEAR MAJOR ROADS AND HAVE REASONABLE ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT, HEALTH CARE, SCHOOLS, SHOPS AND LOCAL SERVICES (AND SHOULD NOT BE LOCATED ON LAND THAT IS DEEMED UNSUITABLE FOR GENERAL HOUSING SUCH AS LAND THAT IS CONTAMINATED, ADJACENT TO REFUSE SITES, LANDFILL SITES, HEAVY INDUSTRY OR ELECTRICITY PYLONS.),</p> <p>ii) SITES SHOULD AVOID ZONES OF HIGH FLOOD RISK (<u>ZONE 3 FLOOD RISK AREAS</u>),</p> <p>iii) THE FOLLOWING ORDER OF PREFERENCE FOR CATEGORIES OF LAND SHOULD BE FOLLOWED: BROWNFIELD, GREENFIELD AND GREEN BELT,</p> <p>iv) ALTERATIONS TO THE GREEN BELT BOUNDARY TO ACCOMMODATE SITES WILL ONLY BE CONSIDERED IN EXCEPTIONAL</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The amendments include a clearer explanation of the Publication Draft policy position and a minor correction to the maximum pitches per site to be consistent with national guidance. The view was taken that this change was not sufficient to significantly affect the SA outcome.</p>
---	-----------	---

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>CIRCUMSTANCES, TO MEET A SPECIFIC IDENTIFIED NEED. IN SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES AND AS PART OF THE SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD, AND SITE WILL BE SPECIFICALLY ALLOCATED AS A GYPSY, TRAVELLER AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE SITE ONLY.</p> <p>v) SITES SHOULD AVOID DESIGNATED AREAS, INCLUDING NATURE CONSERVATION SITES AND SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS AND SHOULD NOT INTRODUCE UNACCEPTABLE OFF-SITE IMPACTS SUCH AS MIGHT OCCUR FROM RECREATIONAL PRESSURES ON SUCH SITES.</p>		

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><u>POLICY EC1: GENERAL EMPLOYMENT LAND</u></p> <p>(A) GENERAL EMPLOYMENT LAND WILL BE IDENTIFIED, IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, TO MEET THE IDENTIFIED NEED FOR LAND TO ACCOMMODATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, INDUSTRY, WAREHOUSING AND WASTE USES OVER THE PLAN PERIOD (AS IDENTIFIED IN SPATIAL POLICY 9) INCLUDING A MARGIN OF CHOICE FOR THE MARKET BY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) CARRYING FORWARD EXISTING ALLOCATIONS AND OTHER COMMITMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN ASSESSED TO BE SUITABLE, AVAILABLE AND DELIVERABLE FOR GENERAL EMPLOYMENT USE OR, ii) IDENTIFYING NEW ALLOCATIONS OF GENERAL EMPLOYMENT LAND TO ADDRESS DEFICIENCIES IN THE EXISTING SUPPLY OVER THE DISTRICT AND WITHIN LOCAL AREAS IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS, SUBJECT TO THE SUITABILITY, AVAILABILITY AND DELIVERABILITY OF 	No	Improved clarity is not expected to effect SA outcome.

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>THAT LAND:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IN ACCESSIBLE LOCATIONS WITHIN THE MAIN URBAN AREA, MAJOR SETTLEMENTS AND SMALLER SETTLEMENTS; INCLUDING SITES WITH GOOD ACCESS TO THE MOTORWAY, RAIL AND WATERWAYS NETWORKS; • WITHIN REGENERATION AREAS IDENTIFIED IN SPATIAL POLICY 4. • WITHIN ESTABLISHED INDUSTRIAL AREAS; • WITHIN URBAN EXTENSIONS LINKED TO NEW HOUSING PROPOSALS TO HELP DELIVER SUSTAINABLE MIXED USE COMMUNITIES. <p>iii) PHASING THE RELEASE OF THE LAND CONSISTENT WITH THE OVERALL STRATEGY FOR MAJOR REGENERATION AND HOUSING GROWTH.</p> <p>iv) IDENTIFYING FREIGHT STORAGE / DISTRIBUTION OPPORTUNITIES AS PART OF THE OVERALL EMPLOYMENT LAND REQUIREMENT SET OUT IN SPATIAL POLICY 9. THE SITE SEARCH WILL BE FOCUSED IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALONG RAIL CORRIDORS, PARTICULARLY IN THE AIRE VALLEY • ALONG THE AIRE AND CALDER NAVIGATION <p>(B) OTHER USES (<i>I.E.</i> SUI GENERIS) WITH SIMILAR LOCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS TO THE EMPLOYMENT USES SET OUT UNDER (A) WHICH ARE GENERALLY LESS WELL SUITED TO LOCATING IN CENTRES, RESIDENTIAL AREAS OR OTHER ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS ARE ACCEPTABLE ON GENERAL EMPLOYMENT SITES.</p> <p>(C) IN THE EVENT OF AN OVERSUPPLY POSITION BEING REACHED DURING THE PLAN PERIOD, GENERAL EMPLOYMENT LAND ALLOCATIONS WILL BE ACCEPTABLE FOR USES OTHER THAN THOSE SET OUT IN PARTS (A) AND (B) OF THIS POLICY PROVIDING THE PROPOSAL ACCORDS WITH OVERALL STRATEGY AND OTHER PLAN POLICIES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy Amended as follows: <p style="text-align: center;"><u>POLICY EC2: OFFICE DEVELOPMENT</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS FOR ALLOCATIONS AND WINDFALL</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Increased support for regeneration areas and locating development in accessible locations through a sequential test approach needs to be considered as to effect on the SA outcome.</p>
--	-------------------	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>OFFICE DEVELOPMENT;</p> <p>TOWN CENTRES AND EDGE OF TOWN CENTRES ARE PROMOTED AS LOCATIONS FOR OFFICE DEVELOPMENT. A TARGET OF 655,000SQM FOR THE CITY CENTRE</p> <p>(i) AND 23,000 SQM (EQUIVALENT TO 2.3% OF IDENTIFIED NEED OVER THE PLAN PERIOD) OF NEW OFFICE FLOORSPACE IS SET FOR LOCATIONS IN OR ON THE EDGE OF TOWN CENTRES TO GUIDE ALLOCATION DOCUMENTS.</p> <p>(ii) THE CITY CENTRE WILL BE THE FOCUS FOR MOST OFFICE DEVELOPMENT WILL BE WITHIN AND/OR EDGE OF THE CITY CENTRE AND DESIGNATED TOWN AND LOCAL CENTRES. LOCATIONS ON THE EDGE OF THE CITY CENTRE WILL ALSO BE APPROPRIATE FOR OFFICES AS PART OF MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT.</p> <p>DUE TO THE AVAILABILITY OF DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN CENTRE AND EDGE OF CENTRE, OUT OF CENTRE PROPOSALS WOULD NORMALLY BE RESISTED HOWEVER THERE ARE WITH THE EXCEPTIONS OF WHICH ARE:</p> <p>(ii) EXISTING COMMITMENTS FOR OFFICE DEVELOPMENT WILL BE CARRIED FORWARD TO MEET THE IDENTIFIED FLOORSPACE REQUIREMENT OVER THE PLAN PERIOD, UNLESS IT WOULD BE MORE SUSTAINABLE FOR THE LAND TO BE RE-ALLOCATED TO MEET IDENTIFIED NEEDS FOR OTHER USES.</p> <p>(iii) TO PROVIDE FLEXIBILITY FOR BUSINESSES, SMALLER SCALE OFFICE DEVELOPMENT (UP TO 1,500 250 SQM) WILL BE ACCEPTABLE IN OUT OF CENTRE LOCATIONS IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS NOT BE SUBJECT TO SEQUENTIAL AND IMPACT ASSESSMENTS IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. REGENERATION AREAS IDENTIFIED UNDER SPATIAL POLICY 4 ii. OTHER ACCESSIBLE LOCATIONS (DEFINED IN POLICY T2) WITHIN THE MAIN URBAN AREA, MAJOR SETTLEMENTS AND SMALLER SETTLEMENTS. <p>ii..... SETTLEMENTS WITHIN THE HIERARCHY WHICH DO NOT HAVE A DESIGNATED CENTRES AS OUTLINED IN MAP 4</p> <p>iii.... VILLAGES OR RURAL AREAS THAT ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE</p>		
--	--	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>SETTLEMENTS HIERARCHY, WHICH WILL ALSO BE SUBJECT TO THE ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS AS DEFINED BY TABLE 1 IN APPENDIX 2,</p> <p><u>MAP 13: SHOWS WHICH LOCATIONS ARE SUBJECT TO A SEQUENTIAL ASSESSMENT</u></p> <p>(v) IN EXISTING MAJOR EMPLOYMENT AREAS, WHICH ARE ALREADY A FOCUS FOR OFFICES, SOME SMALL SCALE OFFICE FLOORSPACE MAY BE ACCEPTABLE WHERE THIS DOES NOT COMPROMISE THE CENTRES FIRST APPROACH.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY EC3: SAFEGUARDING EXISTING EMPLOYMENT LAND AND INDUSTRIAL AREAS</u></p> <p>THE EMPLOYMENT LAND REVIEW IDENTIFIES THE FOLLOWING LOCAL SUB AREAS— INNER NORTH EAST, INNER NORTH WEST, INNER WEST, OUTER NORTH WEST AND OUTER NORTH EAST WHERE THERE ARE CURRENTLY SHORTFALLS IN EMPLOYMENT LAND PROVISION.</p> <p><u>A) PROPOSALS FOR A CHANGE FROM B USE CLASSES ON SITES WHICH WERE LAST USED OR ALLOCATED FOR EMPLOYMENT TO OTHER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT USES INCLUDING TOWN CENTRE USES OR TO NON-EMPLOYMENT USES WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED WHERE:</u></p> <p><u>DEVELOPMENT OF SITES FOR NON-EMPLOYMENT USES, WHICH WERE LAST USED OR ALLOCATED FOR EMPLOYMENT WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED WHERE:</u></p> <p><u>(i) EXISTING BUILDINGS AND LAND ARE CONSIDERED TO BE NON-VIABLE IN TERMS OF MARKET ATTRACTIVENESS, BUSINESS OPERATIONS, AGE, CONDITION AND/OR COMPATIBILITY WITH ADJACENT USES AND</u></p> <p>(ii) THE PROPOSAL WOULD NOT RESULT IN THE LOSS OF A DELIVERABLE EMPLOYMENT SITE NECESSARY TO MEET THE EMPLOYMENT NEEDS</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The changes reinforce the existing aim to protect employment sites and are not therefore expected to result in a significant change to the SA outcome.</p>
--	-----------	---

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>DURING THE PLAN PERIOD ('EMPLOYMENT NEEDS' ARE AS IDENTIFIED IN SPATIAL POLICIES 8 & 9); AND <u>OR</u></p> <p>(iii) IN AREAS OF SHORTFALL THE PROPOSAL WILL DELIVER A MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT WHICH CONTINUES TO PROVIDE FOR A GOOD RANGE OF LOCAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND WOULD NOT UNDERMINE THE VIABILITY OF THE REMAINING EMPLOYMENT SITE; AND</p> <p><u>B) WHERE A PROPOSAL IS LOCATED IN AN AREA OF SHORTFALL AS IDENTIFIED IN THE MOST RECENT EMPLOYMENT LAND REVIEW, NON-EMPLOYMENT USES WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED WHERE:</u></p> <p>THE LOSS OF THE EMPLOYMENT PROVISION ON THE SITE CAN BE MITIGATED <u>SUFFICIENTLY</u> BY THE AVAILABILITY OF IDENTIFIED SITES <u>EXISTING EMPLOYMENT LAND AND PREMISES</u> IN THE *SURROUNDING AREA WHICH ARE SUITABLE TO MEETING THE EMPLOYMENT NEEDS OF <u>THE AREA</u></p> <p>(*SURROUNDING AREA WILL BE DEFINED BY DRIVE TIME AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACCESSIBILITY IN POLICY T2); AND</p>		
---	--	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason																														
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as follows: <p style="text-align: center;"><u>POLICY P1: TOWN AND LOCAL CENTRE DESIGNATIONS</u></p> <p>TOWN AND LOCAL CENTRES ARE DESIGNATED IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">TOWN CENTRES</th> <th style="text-align: center;">HIGHER ORDER LOCAL CENTRES</th> <th style="text-align: center;">LOWER ORDER LOCAL CENTRES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ARMLEY</td> <td>BEESTON</td> <td>ADEL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BRAMLEY</td> <td>BOSTON SPA</td> <td>ALWOODLEY, KING LANE</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CHAPEL ALLERTON</td> <td>HAREHILLS CORNER</td> <td>BEESTON HILL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>COLTON (SELBY ROAD)</td> <td>KIPPAX</td> <td>BURLEY LODGE</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CROSS GATES</td> <td>MOORTOWN CORNER</td> <td>BUTCHER HILL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DEWSBURY ROAD</td> <td>CHAPELTOWN ROAD</td> <td>CHAPELTOWN ROAD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FARSLEY</td> <td>MONTREAL, HARROGATE ROAD</td> <td>COLDCOTES CIRCUS*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GARFORTH</td> <td>CHAPELTOWN, PUDSEY</td> <td>CHAPELTOWN, PUDSEY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GUISELEY</td> <td>HOLLINS PARK</td> <td>COLLINGHAM VILLAGE</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	TOWN CENTRES	HIGHER ORDER LOCAL CENTRES	LOWER ORDER LOCAL CENTRES	ARMLEY	BEESTON	ADEL	BRAMLEY	BOSTON SPA	ALWOODLEY, KING LANE	CHAPEL ALLERTON	HAREHILLS CORNER	BEESTON HILL	COLTON (SELBY ROAD)	KIPPAX	BURLEY LODGE	CROSS GATES	MOORTOWN CORNER	BUTCHER HILL	DEWSBURY ROAD	CHAPELTOWN ROAD	CHAPELTOWN ROAD	FARSLEY	MONTREAL, HARROGATE ROAD	COLDCOTES CIRCUS*	GARFORTH	CHAPELTOWN, PUDSEY	CHAPELTOWN, PUDSEY	GUISELEY	HOLLINS PARK	COLLINGHAM VILLAGE	No	<p>The policy sets out the town and local centres that currently exist within Leeds. This therefore does not introduce a policy direction but provides a reference point for subsequent policies.</p>
TOWN CENTRES	HIGHER ORDER LOCAL CENTRES	LOWER ORDER LOCAL CENTRES																														
ARMLEY	BEESTON	ADEL																														
BRAMLEY	BOSTON SPA	ALWOODLEY, KING LANE																														
CHAPEL ALLERTON	HAREHILLS CORNER	BEESTON HILL																														
COLTON (SELBY ROAD)	KIPPAX	BURLEY LODGE																														
CROSS GATES	MOORTOWN CORNER	BUTCHER HILL																														
DEWSBURY ROAD	CHAPELTOWN ROAD	CHAPELTOWN ROAD																														
FARSLEY	MONTREAL, HARROGATE ROAD	COLDCOTES CIRCUS*																														
GARFORTH	CHAPELTOWN, PUDSEY	CHAPELTOWN, PUDSEY																														
GUISELEY	HOLLINS PARK	COLLINGHAM VILLAGE																														

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

		CENTRE			
HALTON	HORSFORTH, NEW ROAD SIDE	DRIGHLINGTON			
HAREHILLS LANE	KIRKSTALL ROAD	EAST ARDSLEY			
HEADINGLEY	MIDDLETON PARK CIRCUS	GALLOWAY LANE, PUDSEY			
HOLT PARK	<u><i>STREET LANE,</i></u> <u><i>ROUNDHAY</i></u>	GUISELEY, OXFORD ROAD			
HORSFORTH TOWN STREET		HAWKSWORTH ESTATES CENTRE			
HUNSLET		HOLBECK			
KIRKSTALL		HORSFORTH, STATION ROAD			
MEANWOOD		HYDE PARK CORNER			
MIDDLETON		IRELAND WOOD			
MOOR ALLERTON		LINCOLN GREEN			
MORLEY		LOWER WORTLEY			
OAKWOOD		RAWDON, LEEDS ROAD			
OTLEY		ROYAL PARKS			
PUDSEY		SLAID HILL			
RICHMOND HILL, AREA*		STANNINGLEY BOTTOM			

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

ROTHWELL		STREET LANE, ROUNDHAY
SEACROFT		TOMMY WASS
WETHERBY		WEETWOOD, FAR HEADINGLEY
YEADON		WOODLESFORD

** NEWLY IDENTIFIED CENTRES IN THE CITY CENTRE, TOWN AND LOCAL CENTRES STUDY*

- Policy amended as follows:

POLICY P2: ACCEPTABLE USES IN AND ON THE EDGE OF TOWN CENTRES

TOWN CENTRES OFFER SHOPPING AND SERVICES INTENDED TO MEET WEEKLY AND DAY-TO-DAY REQUIREMENTS. THE USES SET OUT BELOW ARE

ACCEPTABLE IN PRINCIPLE IN AND, SUBJECT TO A SEQUENTIAL ASSESSMENT EDGE OF CENTRE, AND WILL BE DIRECTED TOWARDS THE CENTRES LISTED IN POLICY P1.

- SHOPS, SUPERMARKETS AND SUPERSTORES
- NON-RETAIL SERVICES
- RESTAURANTS AND CAFES, DRINKING ESTABLISHMENTS AND HOT FOOD TAKEAWAYS,
- INTENSIVE LEISURE AND CULTURAL USES INCLUDING THEATRES, MUSEUMS, CONCERT HALLS, CINEMAS, LEISURE CENTRES, GYMS AND HOTELS
- HEALTH CARE SERVICES
- CIVIC FUNCTIONS AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES
- OFFICES
- HOUSING ~~WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE~~ ***IS ENCOURAGED*** IN CENTRES ABOVE GROUND FLOOR IN THE PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SHOPPING FRONTAGES OR OUTSIDE THE SHOPPING FRONTAGES, PROVIDING IT DID NOT COMPROMISE THE FUNCTION OF THE TOWN CENTRE.

- Policy amended as follows:

No

The amendments reinforce the existing ambitions of the policy with the use of more positive language and are not therefore expected to affect the SA outcome.

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p><u>POLICY P3: ACCEPTABLE USES IN AND ON THE EDGE OF LOCAL CENTRES</u></p> <p>LOCAL CENTRES OFFER SHOPPING AND SERVICES THAT MEET DAY-TO-DAY REQUIREMENTS THE USES SET OUT BELOW ARE ACCEPTABLE IN PRINCIPLE IN AND, SUBJECT TO A SEQUENTIAL ASSESSMENT, EDGE OF CENTRE, AND WILL BE DIRECTED TOWARDS THE CENTRES LISTED IN POLICY P1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WITHIN HIGHER ORDER LOCAL CENTRES SMALL SUPERMARKETS WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE IN PRINCIPLE UP TO AROUND 1,500 SQM 1,858 SQUARE METRES GROSS (20,000 SQUARE FEET). WITHIN LOWER ORDER LOCAL CENTRES SMALL FOOD STORES THAT ARE COMPATIBLE WITH THE SIZE OF THE CENTRE WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE. THESE SIZE THRESHOLDS ARE GIVEN AS GUIDANCE AND WOULD BE SUBJECT TO LOCAL CIRCUMSTANCES. A LARGER STORE MAY BE APPROPRIATE IF IDENTIFIED NEED CANNOT BE MET WITHIN A NEARBY TOWN CENTRE, • A BASIC RANGE OF FACILITIES INCLUDING SHOPS, BANKS, HEALTH CARE FACILITIES, PUBLIC-FACING COUNCIL SERVICES AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES THAT SERVE A LOCAL CATCHMENT AREA • RESTAURANTS, CAFES AND HOT FOOD TAKEAWAYS • OFFICES • HOUSING IS <i>ENCOURAGED</i> ACCEPTABLE WITHIN LOCAL CENTRES ABOVE GROUND FLOOR OR OUTSIDE OF THE SHOPPING FRONTAGES PROVIDING IT MAINTAINS THE VITALITY AND VIABILITY OF THE RETAIL AREA. <p><i><u>WITHIN LOWER ORDER LOCAL CENTRES, PROPOSALS FOR THE CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING RETAIL UNITS TO NON RETAIL UNITS (INCLUDING RESTAURANTS, CAFES AND TAKE-AWAY HOT FOOD SHOPS) WILL BE RESISTED WHERE THE VITALITY AND VIABILITY OF THE CENTRE TO MEET DAY TO DAY LOCAL NEEDS WILL BE UNDERMINED AND INCREASE THE NEED TO TRAVEL, OR WHERE THE PROPOSAL WILL LEAD TO A CONCENTRATION OF NON RETAIL USES IN A LOCALITY WHICH WILL DETRIMENTALLY IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITY. PROPOSALS FOR SUCH USES WILL BE CONSIDERED AGAINST THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:</u></i></p> <p><i><u>(i) THE CUMULATIVE IMPACT OF SUCH DEVELOPMENT, PARTICULARLY UPON THE AMENITY OF THE AREA AND TRAFFIC GENERATION, ESPECIALLY WHERE CONCENTRATIONS OF SUCH USES ALREADY EXIST,</u></i></p> <p><i><u>(ii) WHERE A PROPOSAL INVOLVES EVENING OPENING, ACCOUNT WILL BE TAKEN OF THE PROPOSAL IN RELATION TO THE PROXIMITY OF THE PREMISES (AND ASSOCIATED PARKING REQUIREMENTS), TO NEARBY RESIDENTIAL</u></i></p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Minor amendments to floorspace limits and further clarity on acceptable uses within local centres are not expected to affect the SA outcome as the expectations for the policy remain the same.</p>
--	-----------	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p><u>ACCOMMODATION, THE NATURE AND CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PARADE AND EXISTING NOISE LEVELS:</u></p> <p><u>(iii) THE AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT, CONVENIENT ON/OFF STREET CAR AND CYCLE PARKING PROVISION AND IMPACT ON HIGHWAY SAFETY, WHERE THERE IS INSUFFICIENT CAR PARKING OR WHERE TRAFFIC MOVEMENTS ARE SUCH AS TO CREATE A TRAFFIC HAZARD, PLANNING CONSENT IS LIKELY TO BE REFUSED.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY P4: SHOPPING PARADES & SMALL SCALE STAND ALONE FOOD STORES SERVING LOCAL NEIGHBOURHOODS AND COMMUNITIES</u></p> <p>LOCAL SERVICE FACILITIES, INCLUDING EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING RETAIL USES TO IMPROVE THEIR VIABILITY, WILL BE SUPPORTED</p> <p>WITHIN SHOPPING PARADES IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS, PROVIDING THAT THEY ARE OF A SIZE COMPATIBLE WITH THE SCALE AND FUNCTION OF THE SHOPPING PARADE, DO NOT COMPROMISE THE MAIN RETAIL FUNCTION OF THE PARADE TO SERVICE DAY-TO-DAY SHOPPING REQUIREMENTS, AND OTHER RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES.</p> <p>PROPOSALS FOR STAND ALONE FOR SMALL SCALE FOOD STORES UP TO 372 SQ M (4,000 SQUARE FOOT) GROSS WITHIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS, WILL BE ACCEPTABLE IN PRINCIPLE WHERE THERE IS NO LOCAL CENTRE OR SHOPPING PARADE WITHIN A 500 METRE RADIUS THAT IS CAPABLE OF ACCOMMODATING THE PROPOSAL WITHIN OR ADJACENT TO IT. CONSIDERATION WILL ALSO BE TAKEN OF THE NUMBER OF EXISTING SMALL STORES IN THE VICINITY TO AVOID CUMULATIVE IMPACT ON PARADES AND CENTRES.</p> <p>PROPOSALS FOR THE CHANGE OF USE OF EXISTING RETAIL UNITS TO NON RETAIL UNITS (INCLUDING RESTAURANTS, CAFES AND TAKE-AWAY HOT FOOD SHOPS) WILL BE RESISTED WHERE THE VITALITY AND VIABILITY OF THE RANGE OF SHOPS TO MEET DAY TO DAY LOCAL NEEDS WILL BE UNDERMINED AND INCREASE THE NEED TO TRAVEL OR WHERE THE PROPOSAL WILL LEAD TO A CONCENTRATION OF NON RETAIL USES IN A LOCALITY WHICH WILL DETRIMENTALLY IMPACT ON THE COMMUNITY. PROPOSALS FOR SUCH USES WILL BE CONSIDERED AGAINST THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>A minor administrative amendment which does not affect the intention or likely delivery of the policy.</p>
---	-----------	---

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>(i) THE CUMULATIVE IMPACT OF SUCH DEVELOPMENT, PARTICULARLY UPON THE AMENITY OF THE AREA AND TRAFFIC GENERATION, ESPECIALLY WHERE CONCENTRATIONS OF SUCH USES ALREADY EXIST,</p> <p>(ii) WHERE A PROPOSAL INVOLVES EVENING OPENING, ACCOUNT WILL BE TAKEN OF THE PROPOSAL IN RELATION TO THE PROXIMITY OF THE PREMISES (AND ASSOCIATED PARKING REQUIREMENTS), TO NEARBY RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION, THE NATURE AND CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PARADE AND EXISTING NOISE LEVELS;</p> <p>(iii) THE AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT, CONVENIENT ON/OFF STREET CAR AND CYCLE PARKING PROVISION AND IMPACT ON HIGHWAY SAFETY. WHERE THERE IS INSUFFICIENT CAR PARKING OR WHERE TRAFFIC MOVEMENTS ARE SUCH AS TO CREATE A TRAFFIC HAZARD, PLANNING CONSENT IS LIKELY TO BE REFUSED.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY P5: APPROACH TO ACCOMMODATING NEW FOOD STORES ACROSS LEEDS</u></p> <p>(I) FOOD STORES WILL BE DIRECTED TOWARDS THE TOWN AND LOCAL CENTRES IDENTIFIED IN POLICY P1.</p> <p>(II) SITES ON THE EDGE OF TOWN AND LOCAL CENTRES WILL BE CONSIDERED WHERE THERE ARE NO AVAILABLE, VIABLE OR SUITABLE SITES WITHIN CENTRES.</p> <p>(III) A NUMBER OF TOWN CENTRES COULD PERFORM MORE SUCCESSFULLY AS MAJOR LOCATIONS FOR WEEKLY SHOPPING NEEDS IF THEY INCLUDED A MAJOR FOOD STORE <i>INVESTMENT IN NEW FOOD STORE PROVISION AND</i> OR REDEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING FACILITIES TO EXPAND THEIR RETAIL OFFER OR EXPAND THEIR FUNCTION. APPROPRIATE PROVISION WITHIN CENTRE OR ON THE EDGE OF CENTRE, SUBJECT TO POLICY P8 (A) WILL BE ENCOURAGED, AND WILL BE SUPPORTED WHERE SITES CAN BE IDENTIFIED IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARMLEY • CHAPEL ALLERTON • CROSS GATES • DEWSBURY ROAD • FARSLEY • HEADINGLEY • HOLT PARK 	<p>No</p>	<p>The amendment provides broader definition of food store however the view was taken that this reinforces the expectation of the existing policy and therefore does not require further assessment.</p>
---	-----------	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HORSFORTH TOWN STREET • A NEW TOWN CENTRE IS PROPOSED IN THE RICHMOND HILL AREA, TO SUPPORT THE PROVISION AT HUNSLET, WHICH IS THE MAIN CENTRE FOR THE AIRE VALLEY ECO-SETTLEMENT. THE NEW CENTRE WILL MEET THE LOCAL DEFICIENCY IN CONVENIENCE GOODS SHOPPING AND IMPROVE THE PROVISION OF NON-RETAIL SERVICES AND LOCAL FACILITIES THAT CANNOT BE MET BY HUNSLET TOWN CENTRE. DELIVERY OF THIS CENTRE IS SUBJECT TO POLICY P7. • A SITE FOR CONVENIENCE RETAILING WILL BE SOUGHT IN THE HOLBECK AREA TO MEET AN EXISTING DEFICIENCY AND COMPLEMENT WIDER REGENERATION INITIATIVES. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY P6: APPROACH TO ACCOMMODATING NEW COMPARISON SHOPPING IN TOWN AND LOCAL CENTRES</u></p> <p>(i) IN ADDITION TO THE PRIMARY SHOPPING QUARTER OF THE CITY CENTRE, THE TOWN AND LOCAL CENTRES IDENTIFIED IN POLICY P1 ARE ACCEPTABLE LOCATIONS FOR COMPARISON GOODS PROVIDING THAT THEY ARE OF A SCALE COMPATIBLE WITH THE SIZE OF THE CENTRE, SUBJECT TO POLICY P8 (A).</p> <p>(ii) SITES ON THE EDGE OF TOWN AND LOCAL CENTRES WILL BE ACCEPTABLE IN PRINCIPLE WHERE THERE ARE NO SUITABLE SITES WITHIN CENTRES SUBJECT TO POLICY P8 (A)</p> <p><u>Sequential and Impact Assessments for <i>main</i> town centre uses and intensive leisure.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy Amended as follows <p><u>POLICY P8: SEQUENTIAL AND IMPACT ASSESSMENTS FOR TOWN CENTRE USES</u></p> <p>Leeds Council has adopted a centre first approach to town centre uses as set out in Policy P2. Proposals for town centre uses must accord with the following sequential and impact assessment requirements where appropriate:</p> <p>A) Any new proposals for town centre uses within a defined centre of a gross floor space of 10% or</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The amendments do not significantly impact on the intent of the policy and so it is not expected that it will affect the SA outcome.</p>
--	-----------	---

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

more of the total gross retail floor space in the centre will be subject to an impact assessment to ensure that the proposal would not undermine the vitality and viability of the centre in which it is located, or any centres within the catchment area, as a whole.

B) Proposals for edge of centre or out of centre A1 uses / stores within residential areas:

Total gross size of built development	Sequential Assessment	Impact Assessment	Catchment Area (radius) inbound off peak drive time
Below 200 square metres	NO	NO	N/A
200 – 372 square metres	YES	NO	500 metre walking
373 – 1,499 square metres	YES	NO*	5 minute inbound off peak drive time
1,500 square metres and above	YES	YES	10 minute inbound off peak drive time

* unless the gross floor space of the proposal is more than 10% of the total floor space of each of the centres within the catchment area, then a local impact assessment is required.

C) Proposals for edge of centre or out of centre A1 uses / shopping, outside residential areas:

Total gross size of built development	Sequential Assessment	Impact Assessment	Catchment Area (radius) inbound off peak drive time
0 – 1,499 square metres	YES	NO*	5 minute inbound off peak drive time
1,500 square metres and above	YES	YES	10 minute inbound off peak drive time

* unless the gross floor space of the proposal is more than 10% of the total floor space of each of the centres within the catchment area, then a local impact assessment is required.

D) Proposals for edge of centre or out of centre A2 – A5 (including bulky goods) and non-retail services within residential areas:

Total gross size of built development*	Sequential Assessment	Impact Assessment	Catchment Area (radius) inbound off peak drive time
0 – 1,499 square metres	YES	NO*	5 minutes

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

1,500 square metres and above	YES	YES	10 minutes and City Centre
* unless the gross floor space of the proposal is more than 10% of the total floor space of each of the centres within the catchment area, then a local impact assessment is required.			
E) Proposals for edge of centre or out of centre A2—A5 (including bulky goods), and non retail services outside residential areas:			
Total gross size of built development*	Sequential Assessment	Impact Assessment	Catchment Area (radius) inbound off peak drive time
0-1,499 square metres	YES	NO*	10 minutes and City Centre (including edge of)
1,500 square metres and above	YES	YES	15 minutes and City Centre (including edge of)
** unless the gross floor space of the proposal is more than 10% of the total floor space of each of the centres within the catchment area, then a local impact assessment is required.			
F) Proposals for edge of centre or out of centre intensive leisure and culture within residential areas			
Total gross size of built development*	Sequential Assessment	Impact Assessment	Catchment Area (radius) inbound off peak drive time
0-1,499 square metres	YES	NO*	10 minutes and City Centre (including edge of)
1,500 square metres and above	YES	YES	15 minutes and City Centre (including edge of)
* unless the gross floor space of the proposal is more than 10% of the total floor space of each of the centres within the catchment area, then a local impact assessment is required.			
G) Proposals for edge of centre or out of centre intensive leisure or culture outside of residential areas			
Total gross size of built development*	Sequential Assessment	Impact Assessment	Catchment Area (radius) inbound off peak drive time
0-1,499 square metres	YES	NO*	10 minutes and City Centre (including edge of)
1,500 square metres and above	YES	YES	15 minutes and City Centre (including edge of)
* unless the proposal is more than 10% of the total floor space of each of the centres within the			

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>catchment area, then a local impact assessment is required.</p> <p>H) Proposals for extensions of up to 200 square metres to existing units will not require sequential or impact assessments. Proposals for extensions to existing units above 200 square metres will be required to conduct sequential and impact assessments based on the gross floor space of the resulting unit in accordance with the thresholds set out above.</p> <p>I) Proposals for more than one unit will be required to carry out assessments based on their total gross floor area. Pre application discussions with Council officers will be required to agree a catchment search area for proposals for a mix of convenience and comparison units.</p> <p>J) All proposals will be required to accord with Policy T2 on accessibility standards.</p> <p><i>For clarification, in Policy P8 the total gross size of built development is based on a 65/35 split of net sales area to storage/back office area. Proposals for development with a greater split will be required to submit justification for why their operations needs require this and will be judged on the merits of the application. 500 metres easy walking distance equates to a 10 minute walk time, which takes into account gradient and barriers such as road, rail and waterways. The catchment area includes all centres located within it, including the City Centre if it falls within the catchment area. Off peak is between 10am and 2pm.</i></p>		
---	--	--

POLICY P8: SEQUENTIAL AND IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

FOR MAIN TOWN CENTRE USES* LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

HAS ADOPTED A CENTRES FIRST APPROACH TO MAIN

TOWN CENTRE USES* AS SET OUT IN POLICY SP2.

PROPOSALS MUST ACCORD WITH THE FOLLOWING

SEQUENTIAL AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS:

A) PROPOSALS FOR UP TO 200 SQM EXTENSIONS TO

EXISTING UNITS OR UP TO 200 SQM CHANGE OF USE WILL

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

NOT REQUIRE SEQUENTIAL OR IMPACT ASSESSMENTS.
THIS WILL NOT APPLY WHERE THE COUNCIL CONSIDERS
THAT A COMBINATION OF CONVERSIONS / EXTENSIONS
/ NEW BUILD IS BEING USED TO ATTEMPT TO AVOID THE
BELOW THRESHOLDS. PROPOSALS FOR EXTENSIONS OR
CHANGE OF USE TO EXISTING EDGE OR OUT OF CENTRE
UNITS ABOVE 200 SQM WILL BE REQUIRED TO CONDUCT
ASSESSMENTS BASED ON THE GROSS FLOORSPACE OF
THE RESULTING UNIT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE THRESHOLDS
SET OUT BELOW.

B) PROPOSALS FOR EDGE OF CENTRE
OR OUT OF CENTRE A1 WITHIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS:

<u>TOTAL GROSS SIZE OF BUILT DEVELOPMENT</u>	<u>SEQUENTIAL ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>IMPACT ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>CATCHMENT AREA (RADIUS)</u>
<u>BELOW 200 SQM</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>200 – 372 SQM</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>500 METRE WALKING</u>
<u>373 – 1,499 SQM</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>5 MINUTE INBOUND OFF PEAK DRIVE TIME</u>
<u>1,500+ SQM: CONVENIENCE</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>10 MINUTE INBOUND OFF PEAK DRIVE TIME</u>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p><u>1,500+ SQM: COMPARISON</u></p>	<p><u>YES</u></p>	<p><u>YES</u></p>	<p><u>10 MINUTE INBOUND OFF PEAK DRIVE TIME, AND IN ADDITION THE CITY CENTRE (AND EDGE OF), AND THE MAIN CENTRES OF NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES AS APPROPRIATE DEPENDING ON DISTANCE AND THE SCALE OF THE PROPOSAL</u></p>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

C) PROPOSALS FOR EDGE OF CENTRE OR OUT OF CENTRE A1 OUTSIDE RESIDENTIAL AREAS:

<u>TOTAL GROSS SIZE OF BUILT DEVELOPMENT</u>	<u>SEQUENTIAL ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>IMPACT ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>CATCHMENT AREA (RADIUS) INBOUND OFF PEAK DRIVE TIME</u>
<u>0 - 1,499 SQM</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>5 MINUTE</u>
<u>1,500+ SQM: CONVENIENCE</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>10 MINUTE</u>
<u>1,500+ SQM: COMPARISON</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>10 MINUTE INBOUND OFF PEAK DRIVE TIME, AND IN ADDITION THE CITY CENTRE (AND EDGE OF), AND THE MAIN CENTRES OF NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES AS APPROPRIATE DEPENDING ON DISTANCE AND THE SCALE OF THE PROPOSAL</u>

D) PROPOSALS FOR ALL OTHER EDGE OF CENTRE OR OUT OF CENTRE MAIN TOWN CENTRE USES*

<u>TOTAL GROSS SIZE OF BUILT DEVELOPMENT</u>	<u>SEQUENTIAL ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>IMPACT ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>WITHIN RESIDENTIAL AREA: CATCHMENT AREA (RADIUS) INBOUND OFF PEAK DRIVE TIME</u>	<u>OUTSIDE RESIDENTIAL AREA: CATCHMENT AREA (RADIUS) INBOUND OFF PEAK DRIVE TIME</u>
<u>A2, A3, A4, A5 0 - 1,499 SQM</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>5 MINUTE</u>	<u>10 MINUTE AND CITY CENTRE (INCLUDING EDGE OF)</u>
<u>A2, A3, A4, A5 1,500+ SQM</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>10 MINUTE AND CITY CENTRE</u>	<u>15 MINUTE AND CITY CENTRE (INCLUDING EDGE OF)</u>
<u>MAIN TOWN CENTRE USES EXCEPT CLASS A 0 - 1,499 SQM</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>10 MINUTE AND CITY CENTRE (INCLUDING EDGE OF)</u>	
<u>MAIN TOWN CENTRE USES EXCEPT CLASS A 1,500+ SQM</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>15 MINUTE AND CITY CENTRE (INCLUDING EDGE OF)</u>	

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

E) PROPOSALS FOR MORE THAN ONE UNIT WILL GENERALLY BE REQUIRED TO CARRY OUT ASSESSMENTS BASED ON THEIR TOTAL GROSS FLOOR AREA, UNLESS DISAGGREGATION IS MORE RELEVANT FOR THE SEQUENTIAL TEST. PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS WITH COUNCIL OFFICERS WILL BE REQUIRED TO AGREE A CATCHMENT SEARCH AREA FOR PROPOSALS FOR A MIX OF A1 CONVENIENCE AND COMPARISON UNITS.

F) ALL PROPOSALS WILL BE REQUIRED TO ACCORD WITH POLICY T2 ON ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS.

**** NPPF glossary identifies main town centre uses as retail development (including warehouse clubs and factory outlet centres); leisure, entertainment facilities, and the more intensive sport and recreation uses (including cinemas, restaurants, drive-through restaurants, bars and pubs, night-clubs, casinos, health and fitness centres, indoor bowling centres, and bingo halls); offices; and arts, culture and tourism development (including theatres, museums, galleries and concert halls, hotels and conference facilities).***

N.B. offices are also subject to Policy EC2.

Use Classes Order: Class A1 - shops, A2 – financial and professional services, A3 – restaurants and cafes, A4 – drinking establishments, A5 – hot food takeaways.

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY P10: DESIGN</u></p> <p>NEW DEVELOPMENT FOR BUILDINGS AND SPACES, AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING, SHOULD BE BASED ON A THOROUGH CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS TO AND PROVIDE GOOD DESIGN <i>THAT IS</i> APPROPRIATE TO ITS <i>LOCATION</i> SCALE AND FUNCTION.</p> <p>NEW DEVELOPMENT WILL BE EXPECTED TO DELIVER HIGH QUALITY INNOVATIVE DESIGN THAT HAS EVOLVED, WHERE APPROPRIATE, THROUGH COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND WHICH RESPECTS AND ENHANCES THE VARIETY OF EXISTING LANDSCAPES, STREETS, SPACES AND BUILDINGS ACCORDING TO THE PARTICULAR LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS AND WIDER SETTING OF THE PLACE, CONTRIBUTING POSITIVELY TOWARDS PLACE MAKING AND QUALITY OF LIFE AND BE ACCESSIBLE TO ALL. <i>INCLUSIVE DESIGN THAT HAS EVOLVED, WHERE APPROPRIATE, THROUGH COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND THOROUGH ANALYSIS AND UNDERSTANDING OF AN AREA. DEVELOPMENTS SHOULD RESPECT AND ENHANCE EXISTING LANDSCAPES, STREETS, SPACES AND BUILDINGS ACCORDING TO THE PARTICULAR LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS AND WIDER SETTING OF THE PLACE WITH THE INTENTION OF CONTRIBUTING POSITIVELY TO PLACE MAKING, QUALITY OF LIFE AND WELLBEING.</i></p> <p>PROPOSALS WILL BE SUPPORTED WHERE THEY ACCORD WITH THE FOLLOWING KEY PRINCIPLES;</p>	No	The amendments do not effect the SA outcome as they reinforce the intention of the Publication Draft policy.

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>(i) THE SIZE, SCALE, <i>DESIGN</i> AND LAYOUT OF THE DEVELOPMENT IS APPROPRIATE TO ITS LOCATION AND RESPECTS THE CHARACTER AND QUALITY OF THE EXTERNAL SPACES IS APPROPRIATE TO ITS <i>CONTEXT</i> AND RESPECTS THE CHARACTER AND QUALITY OF <i>SURROUNDING BUILDINGS; THE STREETS AND SPACES THAT MAKE UP THE PUBLIC REALM AND THE WIDER LOCALITY.</i></p> <p>(ii) THE DEVELOPMENT PROTECTS THE VISUAL, RESIDENTIAL AND GENERAL AMENITY OF THE AREA INCLUDING USEABLE SPACE, PRIVACY, NOISE, AIR QUALITY AND SATISFACTORY PENETRATION OF DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT, <i>AND</i> ENHANCES THE DISTRICT'S EXISTING, <i>HISTORIC</i> AND NATURAL ASSETS, IN PARTICULAR, HISTORIC <i>AND NATURAL SITE FEATURES AND LOCALLY IMPORTANT BUILDINGS, SPACES, SKYLINES AND VIEWS.</i></p> <p>(iii) THE DEVELOPMENT PROTECTS AND ENHANCE THE DISTRICT'S HISTORIC ASSETS IN PARTICULAR EXISTING NATURAL SITE FEATURES, HISTORICALLY AND LOCALLY IMPORTANT BUILDINGS, SKYLINES AND VIEWS, THE VISUAL, RESIDENTIAL AND GENERAL AMENITY OF THE <i>AREA THROUGH POSITIVE DESIGN THAT PROTECTS AND ENHANCES SURROUNDING ROUTES, USEABLE SPACE, PRIVACY, AIR QUALITY AND SATISFACTORY PENETRATION OF SUNLIGHT AND DAYLIGHT.</i></p> <p>(iv) CAR PARKING, CYCLE, WASTE AND RECYCLING STORAGE <i>SHOULD BE DESIGNED IN A POSITIVE MANNER AND BE</i> ARE INTEGRAL TO THE DEVELOPMENT,</p> <p>(v) THE DEVELOPMENT CREATES A SAFE AND SECURE ENVIRONMENT THAT REDUCE THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CRIME WITHOUT COMPROMISING COMMUNITY COHESION,</p> <p>(vi) THE DEVELOPMENT IS ACCESSIBLE TO ALL USERS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY P11: CONSERVATION</u></p> <p>THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT, CONSISTING OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS, HISTORIC BUILDINGS TOWNSCAPES AND LANDSCAPES,</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The amendments express in more detail the intention of the Publication Draft policy and the likely effect of the policy has not altered from the SA of the previous version.</p>
---	-----------	---

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>INCLUDING LOCALLY SIGNIFICANT UNDESIGNATED ASSETS AND THEIR SETTINGS, WILL BE CONSERVED <u>AND THEIR SETTINGS WILL BE CONSERVED, PARTICULARLY THOSE ELEMENTS WHICH HELP TO GIVE LEEDS IT DISTINCT IDENTITY:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>THE VICTORIAN AND EDWARDIAN CIVIC AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS, THEATRES, ARCADES, WAREHOUSES AND OFFICES WITHIN THE CITY CENTRE AND THE URBAN GRAIN OF YARDS AND ALLEYS.</u>• <u>THE NATIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INDUSTRIAL HERITAGE RELATING TO ITS TEXTILE, TANNING AND ENGINEERING INDUSTRIES, INCLUDING ITS FACTORIES, CHIMNEYS AND ASSOCIATED HOUSING.</u>• <u>ITS LEGACY OF PUBLIC PARKS, GARDENS AND CEMETERIES.</u>• <u>THE 19TH CENTURY TRANSPORT NETWORK, INCLUDING THE LEEDS AND LIVERPOOL CANAL.</u> <p>DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WILL BE EXPECTED TO DEMONSTRATE A FULL UNDERSTANDING OF HISTORIC ASSETS AFFECTED. HERITAGE STATEMENTS ASSESSING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ASSETS, <u>THE IMPACT OF PROPOSALS</u> AND MITIGATION MEASURES WILL BE REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED BY DEVELOPERS TO ACCOMPANY DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS.</p> <p>ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION AS PART OF DEVELOPMENT WILL BE ENCOURAGED AND INFORMATION GAINED SHALL BE USED TO ENHANCE THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RECORD.</p> <p>INNOVATIVE AND SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION WHICH INTEGRATES WITH AND ENHANCES THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT WILL BE ENCOURAGED.</p> <p><u>CONSERVATION-LED REGENERATION SCHEMES WILL BE PROMOTED. PRIORITIES FOR NEW SCHEMES WILL IN REGENERATION PRIORITY AREAS, BUT SCHEMES OUTSIDE THESE AREAS MAY BE IDENTIFIED WHERE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA ARE MET.</u></p> <p>THE COUNCIL MAINTAINS A BUILDINGS AT RISK REGISTER <u>REGISTER OF HISTORIC ASSETS</u> TO HELP IT PRIORITISE ACTION AND WILL SEEK TO IMPOSE PLANNING CONDITIONS OR OBLIGATIONS FOR THEIR REPAIR AND REFURBISHMENT WHERE APPROPRIATE. <u>WHERE APPROPRIATE,</u></p>		
---	--	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p><u>THE CITY COUNCIL WILL USE THE STATUTORY PROVISIONS OF THE PLANNING ACTS TO SECURE REPAIRS.</u></p> <p>ENABLING DEVELOPMENT MAY BE SUPPORTED IN THE VICINITY OF LISTED BUILDINGS AND IN CONSERVATION AREA AREAS WHERE LINKED TO THE REFURBISHMENT OR REPAIR OF HERITAGE ASSETS. THIS WILL BE SECURED BY PLANNING CONDITION OR PLANNING OBLIGATION.</p>		
---	--	--

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY T1: TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT</u></p> <p>TO COMPLEMENT THE PROVISION OF NEW INFRASTRUCTURE <u>AND PROPOSAL 11 OF THE LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN</u> THE COUNCIL WILL SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING MANAGEMENT PRIORITIES:</p> <p>(i) DEVELOP AND PROVIDE TAILORED, INTERACTIVE, READILY AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND SUPPORT THAT ENCOURAGES AND INCENTIVISES MORE SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL CHOICES ON A REGULAR BASIS.</p> <p>(ii) SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL PROPOSALS INCLUDING TRAVEL PLANNING MEASURES FOR EMPLOYERS AND SCHOOLS. FURTHER DETAILS ARE PROVIDED IN THE TRAVEL PLAN SPD AND THE SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION TRAVEL STRATEGY.</p> <p>(iii) PARKING POLICIES CONTROLLING THE USE AND SUPPLY OF CAR PARKING ACROSS THE CITY:</p> <p>a) TO ENSURE ADEQUATE PARKING FOR SHOPPERS AND VISITORS TO SUPPORT THE HEALTH AND VITALITY OF THE CITY AND TOWN</p>	No	The added detail and references now contained within the policy do not affect the SA outcome expected as the intent and implementation of the policy remains the same.

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>CENTRES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">b) DELIVERING STRATEGIC PARK AND RIDE FOR THE CITY WHICH SUPPORTS THE CITY CENTRE VISION AND PROVIDES GREATER TRAVELLER CHOICE.c) TO SUPPORT WIDER TRANSPORT STRATEGY OBJECTIVES FOR SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL AND TO MINIMISE CONGESTION DURING PEAK PERIODS.d) LIMITING THE SUPPLY OF COMMUTER PARKING IN AREAS OF HIGH PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACCESSIBILITY, SUCH AS THE CITY CENTRE. <p>FURTHER DETAILS WILL BE PROVIDED IN THE PARKING POLICY SPD.</p>		
--	--	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY G1: ENHANCING AND EXTENDING GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE</u></p> <p>WHERE A DEVELOPMENT IS CONSIDERED TO BE ACCEPTABLE WITHIN OR ADJOINING AREAS DEFINED AS GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE ON MAP 15 OR ON ANY FUTURE LDF ALLOCATION DOCUMENTS, DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SHOULD ENSURE THAT:</p> <p>(i) GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE/CORRIDOR FUNCTION OF THE LAND IS RETAINED AND IMPROVED, PARTICULARLY IN AREAS OF GROWTH;</p> <p>(ii) WHERE APPROPRIATE, THE OPPORTUNITY IS TAKEN TO EXTEND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE BY LINKING GREEN SPACES OR BY FILLING IN GAPS IN GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE CORRIDORS, INCLUDING (WHERE RELEVANT) EXTENDING THESE INTO LEEDS CITY CENTRE. STREET TREES AND GREEN ROOFS ARE PARTICULARLY ENCOURAGED;</p> <p>(iii) A LANDSCAPING SCHEME IS PROVIDED WHICH DEALS POSITIVELY WITH THE TRANSITION BETWEEN DEVELOPMENT AND ANY ADJOINING OPEN LAND;</p> <p>(iv) THE OPPORTUNITY IS TAKEN TO INCREASE APPROPRIATE SPECIES OF WOODLAND COVER IN THE DISTRICT.</p> <p>(v) <u>PROVISION FOR AND RETENTION OF BIODIVERSITY AND WILDLIFE:</u></p> <p>(vi) <u>OPPORTUNITIES ARE TAKEN TO PROTECT AND ENHANCE THE PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY (PROW) NETWORK THROUGH AVOIDING UNNECESSARY DIVERSIONS AND BY ADDING NEW INKS.</u></p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Extra criteria have been included however these reinforce the intent of the Publication Draft policy and do not affect the SA outcome.</p>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY G2: CREATION OF NEW TREE COVER</u></p> <p>DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD RESULT IN HARM TO, OR THE LOSS OF, ANCIENT WOODLAND AND VETERAN TREES WILL BE RESISTED.</p> <p>IN SUPPORTING THE NEED AND DESIRE TO INCREASE NATIVE AND APPROPRIATE TREE COVER, THE COUNCIL WILL, ON ITS OWN INITIATIVE AND THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS, INCLUDING DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS, WORK TOWARDS INCREASING APPROPRIATE SPECIES OF WOODLAND COVER IN THE DISTRICT. DELIVERY WILL INVOLVE PLANTING IN BOTH URBAN AND RURAL AREAS, AND PARTNERSHIP WITH THE FORESTRY COMMISSION, NATURAL ENGLAND AND LANDOWNERS. DEVELOPMENT IN THE URBAN AREA OF THE CITY, INCLUDING THE CITY CENTRE WILL <i><u>INCLUDE THE PLANTING OF STREET TREES IN APPROPRIATELY DESIGNED PITS</u></i> TO INCREASE THE AREA OF TREE CANOPY COVER.</p>	No	Minor amendments to the policy help to reinforce the existing intention of the Publication Draft policy and do not have significant effect on the SA outcome.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY G4: NEW GREENSPACE PROVISION</u></p> <p>ON SITE PROVISION OF GREENSPACE OF 80 SQUARE METRES PER RESIDENTIAL UNIT, WILL BE SOUGHT FOR DEVELOPMENT SITES OF 10 OR MORE DWELLINGS THAT ARE OUTSIDE THE CITY CENTRE AND IN EXCESS OF 720 METRES FROM A COMMUNITY PARK, AND <i><u>FOR THOSE</u></i> WHICH ARE LOCATED IN AREAS DEFICIENT OF GREENSPACE.</p> <p>IN AREAS OF ADEQUATE SUPPLY, CONTRIBUTIONS OF AN EQUIVALENT VALUE TOWARDS SAFEGUARDING AND IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING GREENSPACE WILL TAKE PRIORITY OVER THE CREATION OF NEW AREAS.</p>	No	A minor amendment to the text which does not effect the intent or expected SA outcome of the policy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as follows: <p><u>POLICY G5: OPEN SPACE PROVISION IN THE CITY CENTRE</u></p>	No	The amendments will reinforce but not affect the Publication Draft SA outcome.

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>HARM, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, ANY SITES DESIGNATED OF NATIONAL, REGIONAL OR LOCAL IMPORTANCE FOR BIODIVERSITY OR GEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE OR WHICH WOULD CAUSE ANY HARM TO INTERNATIONALLY DESIGNATED SITES, <u>OR WOULD CAUSE HARM TO THE POPULATION OR CONSERVATION STATUS OF UK OR WEST YORKSHIRE BIODIVERSITY ACTION PLAN (UK BAP AND WY BAP) PRIORITY SPECIES AND HABITATS.</u> IN CONSIDERING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS AFFECTING ANY DESIGNATED SITES <u>AND UK OR WY BAP PRIORITY SPECIES OR HABITATS.</u> THE NEEDS OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND THE REQUIREMENTS TO MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE BIOLOGICAL AND GEOLOGICAL DIVERSITY WILL BE EXAMINED.</p> <p>OTHER THAN THE ABOVE REQUIREMENT PARTICULAR ACCOUNT WILL BE TAKEN OF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• THE EXTENT AND SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL DAMAGE TO THE INTEREST OF ANY NATIONAL, REGIONAL OR LOCAL SITE, <u>OR UK OR WY BAP PRIORITY SPECIES OR HABITAT;</u> AND• DEMONSTRATION THAT THE NEED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OUTWEIGHS THE IMPORTANCE OF ANY NATIONAL, REGIONAL OR LOCAL SITE, <u>OR UK OR WY BAP PRIORITY SPECIES OR HABITAT;</u> AND• THE EXTENT THAT ANY ADVERSE IMPACT COULD BE REDUCED AND MINIMISED THROUGH PROTECTION, MITIGATION, ENHANCEMENT AND COMPENSATORY MEASURES IMPOSED THROUGH PLANNING CONDITIONS OR OBLIGATIONS AND WHICH WOULD BE SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATE MONITORING ARRANGEMENTS.		
---	--	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<p>Proposed Changes:</p> <p><u>POLICY EN1: CLIMATE CHANGE – CARBON DIOXIDE REDUCTION</u></p> <p>ALL DEVELOPMENTS OF 10 DWELLINGS OR MORE, OR OVER 1,000 SQUARE METRES OF FLOORSPACE, (INCLUDING CONVERSION WHERE FEASIBLE), WHETHER NEW-BUILD OR CONVERSION, WILL BE REQUIRED TO:</p> <p>(i) REDUCE TOTAL PREDICTED CARBON DIOXIDE EMISSIONS TO ACHIEVE 20% LESS THAN THE BUILDING REGULATIONS TARGET EMISSION RATE UNTIL 2016 WHEN ALL DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE ZERO CARBON; AND,</p> <p>(ii) PROVIDE A MINIMUM OF 10% OF THE PREDICTED ENERGY NEEDS OF THE DEVELOPMENT FROM LOW CARBON ENERGY.</p> <p>CARBON DIOXIDE REDUCTIONS ACHIEVED THROUGH IN MEETING CRITERIA (i) (ii) WILL CONTRIBUTE TO MEETING CRITERIA (ii) (i).</p> <p><u>CRITERIA (ii) WILL BE CALCULATED AGAINST THE EMISSIONS RATE PREDICTED BY CRITERIA (i) SO REDUCING OVERALL ENERGY DEMAND BY TAKING A FABRIC FIRST APPROACH WILL REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF RENEWABLE CAPACITY REQUIRED.</u></p> <p>IF IT CAN BE DEMONSTRATED THAT DECENTRALISED RENEWABLE OR LOW CARBON ENERGY GENERATION IS NOT PRACTICAL ON OR NEAR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT, IT MAY BE ACCEPTABLE TO PROVIDE A CONTRIBUTION EQUIVALENT TO THE COST OF PROVIDING THE 10%, WHICH THE COUNCIL WILL USE TOWARDS AN OFF-SITE LOW CARBON SCHEME. THE OPPORTUNITY TO AGGREGATE CONTRIBUTIONS TO DELIVER LARGER SCALE LOW CARBON PROJECTS WOULD BE IMPLEMENTED INDEPENDENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT. WHEREVER POSSIBLE, THE LOW CARBON PROJECTS WOULD BE LINKED WITH LOCAL PROJECTS THAT WOULD</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Changes to the Publication Draft policy provide further clarity and detail but this does not have the potential to change the SA outcome.</p>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>BRING LOCAL BENEFITS.</p> <p>IT IS LIKELY THAT THE APPROACH OF POOLING OFF-SITE CONTRIBUTIONS THROUGH PLANNING OBLIGATIONS WILL BE REPLACED BY CIL IN APRIL 2014.</p> <p>APPLICANTS WILL BE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT AN ENERGY ASSESSMENT WITH THEIR APPLICATION <i>BASED ON EXPECTED END USER REQUIREMENTS</i> TO DEMONSTRATE COMPLIANCE WITH THIS POLICY. <i>WHERE END USER REQUIREMENTS CHANGE SIGNIFICANTLY, AN UPDATED EA SHOULD BE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as follows <p><u>POLICY EN2: SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION</u></p> <p><i>TO REQUIRE DEVELOPMENTS OF 1,000 OR MORE SQUARE METRES OR 10 OR MORE DWELLINGS (INCLUDING CONVERSION) WHERE FEASIBLE TO MEET AT LEAST THE STANDARD SET BY BREEAM OR CODE FOR SUSTAINABLE HOMES AS SHOWN IN THE TABLE BELOW. A POST CONSTRUCTION REVIEW CERTIFICATE WILL BE REQUIRED PRIOR TO OCCUPATION.</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="241 951 1137 1206"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2016</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Leeds Code for Sustainable Homes requirement</td> <td>Code level 3</td> <td>Code level 4</td> <td>Code level 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Leeds BREEAM standard for non-residential buildings requirement</td> <td>Very Good</td> <td>Excellent</td> <td>Excellent</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as follows <p><u>POLICY EN4: DISTRICT HEATING</u></p>		2012	2013	2016	Leeds Code for Sustainable Homes requirement	Code level 3	Code level 4	Code level 6	Leeds BREEAM standard for non-residential buildings requirement	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>The policy has been amended to make it clear that the requirement is to be met where feasible. In assessing the original policy the assumption was made, in line with national guidance, that should a planning application establish that meeting the requirement wasn't feasible then this would be taken in to account. Therefore the amendment does not affect the SA outcome.</p> <p>The amendments reinforce the Publication Draft policy setting out in more detail how the policy is to achieve</p>
	2012	2013	2016											
Leeds Code for Sustainable Homes requirement	Code level 3	Code level 4	Code level 6											
Leeds BREEAM standard for non-residential buildings requirement	Very Good	Excellent	Excellent											

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>WHERE TECHNICALLY VIABLE, <u>APPROPRIATE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT, AND IN AREAS WITH SUFFICIENT EXISTING OR POTENTIAL HEAT DENSITY, DEVELOPMENT S OF 1,000 OR MORE SQUARE METRES OR 10 DWELLINGS OR MORE (INCLUDING CONVERSIONS WHERE FEASIBLE)</u> SHOULD PROPOSE HEATING SYSTEMS ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING HIERARCHY:</p> <p>(i) CONNECTION TO EXISTING <u>DISTRICT HEATING NETWORKS,</u></p> <p>(ii) USE <u>CONSTRUCTION OF A SITE WIDE DISTRICT HEATING NETWORK SERVED BY A NEW LOW CARBON HEAT SOURCE /COMMUNAL HEATING SYSTEM SUPPLIED WITH LOW CARBON HEAT WHERE TECHNICALLY VIABLE/FEASIBLE,</u></p> <p>(iii) <u>COLLABORATION WITH NEIGHBOURING DEVELOPMENT SITES OR EXISTING HEAT LOADS/SOURCES TO DEVELOP A VIABLE SHARED DISTRICT HEATING NETWORK,</u></p> <p>(iv) IN AREAS WHERE <u>DISTRICT HEATING IS CURRENTLY NOT VIABLE. BUT THERE IS NOT POTENTIAL FOR FUTURE DISTRICT HEATING NETWORKS</u> ALL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WILL NEED TO DEMONSTRATE HOW <u>SITES HAVE BEEN DESIGNED ARE FUTURE PROOFED TO ALLOW FOR CONNECTION TO A FUTURE AN AREA WIDE DISTRICT HEATING NETWORK.</u></p> <p><u>ALL MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS WILL BE EXPECTED TO CONTRIBUTE (EITHER FINANCIALLY OR IN-KIND) TOWARDS THE CREATION OF NEW OR ENLARGEMENT OF EXISTING, DISTRICT HEATING NETWORKS. SUCH CONTRIBUTIONS WILL BE SECURED THROUGH THE USE OF LEGAL AGREEMENTS AND SUBSEQUENTLY FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS THROUGH THE CIL ONCE INTRODUCED. CARBON SAVINGS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION ACHIEVED UNDER THIS POLICY WILL CONTRIBUTE TO EN1(i) AND EN1(ii).</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows <p><u>POLICY EN5: MANAGING FLOOD RISK</u></p> <p>THE COUNCIL WILL MANAGE AND MITIGATE FLOOD RISK BY:</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>its ambitions. This was built in to the original assessment of the policy and therefore does not affect the SA outcome.</p> <p>Changes to the policy provide increased detail but do not affect the intent or approach of the policy.</p>
--	-----------	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) AVOIDING OR <i>AVOIDING DEVELOPMENT IN FLOOD RISK AREAS BY APPLYING THE SEQUENTIAL APPROACH AND WHERE THIS IS NOT POSSIBLE</i>, MITIGATING DEVELOPMENT IN FLOOD RISK AREAS IN LINE WITH GUIDANCE IN PPS25 <i>BY MITIGATING MEASURES, IN LINE WITH THE NPPF</i>, BOTH IN THE ALLOCATION OF SITES FOR DEVELOPMENT AND IN THE DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS. (ii) PROTECTING AREAS OF FUNCTIONAL FLOODPLAIN AS SHOWN ON THE LEEDS SFRA FROM DEVELOPMENT (EXCEPT FOR WATER COMPATIBLE USES AND ESSENTIAL INFRASTRUCTURE). (iii) REQUIRING FLOOD RISK TO BE CONSIDERED FOR ALL DEVELOPMENT COMMENSURATE WITH THE SCALE AND IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND MITIGATED WHERE APPROPRIATE. (iv) REDUCING THE SPEED AND VOLUME OF SURFACE WATER RUN-OFF AS PART OF NEW BUILD DEVELOPMENTS. (v) MAKING SPACE FOR FLOOD WATER IN HIGH FLOOD RISK AREAS. (vi) REDUCING THE RESIDUAL RISKS WITHIN AREAS OF RAPID INUNDATION. (vii) ENCOURAGING THE REMOVAL OF EXISTING CULVERTING WHERE PRACTICABLE AND APPROPRIATE. (viii) THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LEEDS FLOOD ALLEVIATION SCHEME. 		
---	--	--

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

--	--	--

PROPOSED CHANGES	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy amended as follows <p><u>POLICY ID1: IMPLEMENTATION AND DELIVERY MECHANISMS</u></p> <p>THE COUNCIL WILL UNDERTAKE TO ENSURE THE DELIVERY AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CORE STRATEGY THROUGH A VARIETY OF MECHANISMS, INITIATIVES, AND INVESTMENT DECISIONS, INCLUDING:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PARTNERSHIP WORKING, • <u>WORKING WITH COMMUNITIES, INCLUDING THROUGH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING,</u> COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, • USE OF COUNCIL ASSETS, • SUPPORTING EVIDENCE, • FURTHER GUIDANCE AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT, • BIDDING FOR FUNDING SOURCES AND PROMOTING THE CITY FOR THIS PURPOSE, • THE USE OF INNOVATIVE FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES (SUCH AS TAX INCREMENTAL FINANCING TO HELP STIMULATE LOCAL INVESTMENT, BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS (BIDS), EUROPEAN DEVELOPMENT FUND, NEW HOMES BONUS, COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY, ASSET LEVERAGE - EITHER DIRECTLY USING CITY COUNCIL ASSETS OF THROUGH 	<p>No</p>	<p>The view was taken that the mechanisms used to implement the policies sets out the council approach policy implementation. It does not in itself have an impact on the SA outcome as it is assumed that the policies set out in the CS policies will achieve their intended aim.</p>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

<p>AN ASSET LIQUIDITY VEHICLE / JOINT VENTURE),</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• LINKING GREENFIELD AND BROWNFIELD DEVELOPMENT,• RECOGNISING THE NEED FOR CONTINGENCY PLANNING.• <u>ALLOWABLE SOLUTIONS</u>		
---	--	--

4. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED CHANGES SCREENED IN AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 ASSESSMENT OF SCREENED IN POLICIES

Where policies have been amended and were expected through the screening to effect the SA outcome a review has been undertaken against the 22 SA objectives. A summary of the effect relative to the Publication Draft Policy and recommendations are set out below.

SP8 – Economic Development Priorities

Economic

The significantly positive effect previously identified remains following the amendments.

Social

The recognition and support for development of leisure and tourism facilities has improved the score against SA objective 6 which looks to maintain and improve the availability of such activities. The Publication Draft policy did not recognise the important role of leisure and tourism for the local economy and in now doing so SP8 is expected to have significantly positive effect against SA objective 6.

Environmental

No change predicted to the effect on environmental objectives.

Conclusions

The changes made to SP8 have resulted in a significantly improved score against one of the social objectives. There have been no negative effects associated with this amendment and no further recommendations are made at this stage.

H2 – New Housing Development on Non Allocated Sites

Economic

No change predicted.

Social

No change predicted.

Environmental

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

An amendment ensures that if a green field site has intrinsic value as amenity space, recreation, nature conservation or makes a valuable contribution to the visual, historic or spatial character then development should be resisted. The use of the word 'or' instead of 'and' used in the Publication Draft provides increased protection as any of the features above should prevent its development. Assessment of the Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes policy therefore led to a slight positive score for SA10 (green space), SA19 (Landscape quality) and SA21 (historic environment) from a previous neutral.

Conclusions

SA of the policy showed that the changes will result in a positive effect in relation green space, landscape quality and the historic environment. This was achieved without any negative effects being predicted and the assessment did not suggest any further recommendations which could improve the policy further at this stage.

EC2 – Office Development

Economic

No change

Social

The introduction of a sequential approach, improved reference to accessible locations and support for rural areas is expected to have a significantly positive effect against SA8. This is predicted to be achieved through improved access to employment both in urban and rural locations and the associated potential income gained from this.

Environmental

The centres first approach promoted through sequential assessment is expected to reduce pressure on greenfield land and so scored significantly positive against SA11. The sequential approach also means that that is predicted there will be a reduced use of private vehicles which will have a significantly positive effect on pollution (SA18) which is an improvement from the CS Publication Draft policy which predicted only slight positive.

Conclusions

The amended policy now provides improved sustainability criteria which will ensure that future development is located in accessible locations and better supports both urban and rural communities.

G7 – Cemeteries and Burial Sites

Economic

The policy is not envisaged to have an effect on the economic objectives.

Social

The policy is not envisaged to have an effect on the social objectives

Environmental

The policy aims to provide new cemetery and burial space which is accessible by public transport, cycling and walking which will reduce the use of cars and associated emissions.

Conclusions

The policy is expected to have a slight positive effect through the provision of cemetery and burial space which is located in accessible locations. This could however be strengthened through amended wording to state that there should be good access by public transport, walking and cycling. This would provide more certainty that locations were in locations that would promote transport other than the private motor vehicle.

4.2 ALTERNATIVE TO POLICY G7

As a new policy, G7 was not considered at any previous stage of the Core Strategy. This therefore was the first opportunity for reasonable alternatives to be considered. The specific nature of the policy, development of new cemetery and burial space means that the only reasonable alternative was the 'do minimum' option which in this case was to not have the policy.

The 'do minimum' alternative would mean that any future proposal would rely on the existing policies within the Core Strategy and any other relevant local, regional and national guidance. This alternative would mean that the effect against the 22 SA objectives would be neutral. This is compared to the slight positive expectation for the proposed policy against SA objectives 10 and 15 (see appendix 2).

4.3 CONSIDERATION OF SECONDARY AND CUMULATIVE ISSUES/EFFECT

Relatively few of the changes made to the Core Strategy policies were shown to have a significant effect on the SA outcome. The changes that have been identified and assessed are generally isolated issues and the introduction of a new policy in G7 is so specific in its nature as to have limited interactions with other policies.

Policy G7, as stated above, is expected to operate largely in isolation. There is however the potential for some degree of interaction with other policies as the likely effect is dependant upon the sites which come forward. Dependant on which came forward then landscape and conservation policies (P11 and 12) as well as the suite of green space policies would be expected to ensure any potential issue relating to the on site environmental conditions was considered in a way which minimised any negative effects should a site be developed.

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

4.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

The changes made to the policies brought forward from the Core Strategy Publication Draft have improved their performance against the SA objectives.

Assessment of the amended policies did not highlight any issues or recommendations that need further consideration which highlights the effective use of the SA process in the development of the policies up to this stage.

Policy G7 is a new policy and therefore this was the first opportunity for it to be considered against the SA objectives. The results of the assessment showed no negative effects are predicted however assessment suggested that the policy could be improved through amendment to the access criteria which currently lacks definition. **This could be more effective if amended to state that there should be good access by public transport, walking and cycling.**

4.5 MONITORING

The amendments made to Publication Draft policies have not changed the overall intent of the policy. This ensures the previously developed monitoring framework published alongside the CS Publication Draft continues to be a relevant and effective tool. The only policy which will require further monitoring beyond the existing monitoring framework is G7. As a new policy the existing framework lacked a relevant indicator. On this basis it is recommended that indicator 7a_{ii} is amended as follows.

7a _{ii}	Accessibility of new employment, health, education, culture, leisure and retail uses & cemetery and burial facilities.
Purpose	<p>To identify how accessible new employment, health, education, culture, leisure and retail uses & cemetery and burial facilities.</p> <p>By measuring accessibility of new employment, health, education, culture, leisure and retail uses & cemetery and burial facilities, it provides a proxy measurement of how sustainable the locations for these new uses are.</p> <p>The more accessible a development is to services by walking or using public transport, the less need for journeys by car. Therefore accessibility is a measure of overall sustainability</p>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

APPENDIX 1 –THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA	INDICATORS	TARGETS FROM OTHER PPPs (Key to abbreviations at end of table.)
ECONOMIC OBJECTIVES			
<p>1. Maintain or improve good quality employment opportunities and reduce the disparities in the Leeds' labour market.</p>	<p>a. Will it maintain or improve current employment rates in Leeds? b. Will it help to raise average earnings? c. Will it support employment opportunities for people who live in or close to the area? d. Will it help develop the skills of people who live in or close to the area? e. Will it support equal employment opportunities? f. Will it reduce the disparities in employment rates between deprived and affluent parts of Leeds? g. Will it help to reduce the high rates of unemployment among black and ethnic minority groups? h. Will it improve access to affordable and quality childcare?</p>	<p>1. % of people who are in work 2. Total employment 3. Unemployment rates (%) 4. Worklessness rates (those claiming job seeker's allowance, income support, incapacity benefit) 5. Average gross weekly earnings for residents (£) 6. % of SOAs in the 20% most deprived nationally in the IMD employment domain 7. Difference in employment rates between the highest and lowest SOAs 8. Unemployment rates among BME groups (%) 9. Amount of land developed for employment by type 10. Amount of completed office development and % developed in town centres</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the number of Leeds' residents moving into work.(VFL2) • Create at least 50,000 new jobs (VFL2) • Reduce the difference between average earnings in Leeds and the national average. • Increase the number of people employed by companies which invest in developing skills (VFL2) • No ward in the city to have an unemployment rate 2.5% points higher than the city-wide average by 2005 (LNRS)
<p>2. Maintain or improve the conditions which have enabled business success, economic growth and investment.</p>	<p>a. Will it support existing businesses? b. Will it encourage investment? c. Will it improve productivity and competitiveness? d. Will it encourage rural diversification?</p>	<p>1. Gross Value Added (GVA) per capita 2. No. of VAT registered businesses 3. Amount of completed retail and leisure development 4. Employment land supply (ha)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the wealth created in Leeds and the region every year (VFL2) • Improve Leeds' productivity performance by at least 15%; (VFL2) • Increase the percentage of the workforce employed in high-tech or knowledge-based jobs. (VFL2)

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA	INDICATORS	TARGETS FROM OTHER PPPs (Key to abbreviations at end of table.)
SOCIAL OBJECTIVES			
3. Increase participation in education and life-long learning and reduce the disparity in participation and qualifications achieved across Leeds.	a. Will it provide accessible training and learning opportunities for adults and young people? b. Will it increase participation in education and qualifications in disadvantaged communities? c. Will it increase participation in education and qualifications among BME groups?	1. % of economically active adults with at least level 2 and level 3 qualifications 2. Educational qualifications: students achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades A*-C 3. Educational qualifications of those aged 16-49 by ethnicity 4. % of SOAs in the 20% most deprived nationally in the IMD Education, skills and training deprivation domain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the number of adults involved in life-long learning (VFL2) • 90% of 19 year olds to be qualified to NVQ level 2 or above (RPG) • 65% of 21 year olds to be qualified to NVQ level 3 or above (RPG) • At least 20% of pupils in schools in disadvantaged communities to achieve 5 or more GCSEs at grades A* - C by summer 2004. (LNRS)
4. Improve conditions and services that engender good health and reduce disparities in health across Leeds	a. Will it promote healthy life-styles, and help prevent ill-health? b. Will it improve access to high quality, health facilities? c. Will it address health inequalities across Leeds?	1. Life expectancy 2. Mortality rates from coronary heart disease and cancer 3. % of people of working age population with limiting long-term illness 4. % of people whose health was not good 5. Estimate of obesity % 6. No of people on incapacity benefits and severe disability allowance 7. % of SOAs in the 20% most deprived nationally in the IMD Health deprivation & disability domain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce mortality from heart disease by at least 40% in the under 75s and cancer by at least 20% by 2010 (UK) • By 2005, reduce by 20% the gap between the ward with the highest level of Coronary Heart Disease and the ward with the lowest (based on a 3 year aggregate), and by 50% by 2010. (LNRS & LHS)) • Halt the year-on-year rise in obesity among children under 11 by 2010. (UK)
5. Reduce overall rates of crime, and reduce the disparities in crime rates across Leeds.	a. Will it encourage crime reduction through design? b. Will it help address the causes of crime?	1. Crime survey trends in burglary and vehicle related thefts 2. Recorded crime (violent crime,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce city-wide crime levels and making sure that no individual community has crime levels more than twice as high as the

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA	INDICATORS	TARGETS FROM OTHER PPPs (Key to abbreviations at end of table.)
	<p>c. Will it help reduce the fear of crime? d. Will it help to reduce disparities in crime rates across Leeds?</p>	<p>robbery, domestic burglary, vehicle crime, criminal damage) 3. Fear of crime in residents surveys 4. % of SOAs in the 20% most deprived nationally in the IMD crime domain</p>	<p>city average (VFL2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce crime by 15% and further in high crime areas by 2007-8. (UK) • Make sure that no individual community has crime levels more than twice as high as the city average (VFL2) • Reduce racially motivated crimes and incidents (VFL2) • No ward to have a domestic burglary rate greater than 60 domestic burglaries per 1000 households by 2005 (3 times the current national average) and a minimum 40% reduction in higher crime areas (ie those beats with greater than 3 times the national rate). (LNRS)
<p>6. Maintain and improve culture, leisure and recreational activities that are available to all</p>	<p>a. Will it increase provision of culture, leisure and recreational (CLR) activities/venues? b. Will it increase non-car based CLR activities? c. Will it increase participation in CLR activities by (i) local people and (ii) tourists? d. Will it preserve, promote and enhance local culture and heritage?</p>	<p>1. Visitor statistics from major attractions 2. % participation in sport and physical activity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build at least three new high-quality cultural facilities (VFL2) • Increase participation in sport and physical activity to 70% of the population by 2020 (UK)
<p>7. Improve the overall quality of housing and reduce the disparity in housing markets across Leeds</p>	<p>a. Will it make housing available to people in need (taking into account requirements of location, size, type and affordability)? b. Will it reduce (the risk of) low housing demand in some parts of the city, and reduce the number of empty properties? c. Will it help improve the quality of the housing stock and reduce the number of unfit homes?</p>	<p>1. Housing completions (annual number) 2. Average house price 3. House price/earnings ratio 4. Annual completions of affordable housing 5. % of dwellings by tenure (owner-occupied, private rented and social rented)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1140 units of affordable housing to be built under PPG3, with 100% located in areas of high house prices, between April 2002 and April 2012. (LHS) • 500 homes per year to be developed in the city centre, of which 25 per year between 2004-7, and 30 per year between April 2007 and April 2012. (LHS) • 20% reduction (12,500) in surplus or

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA	INDICATORS	TARGETS FROM OTHER PPPs (Key to abbreviations at end of table.)
	<p>d. Will it improve energy efficiency in housing to reduce fuel-poverty and ill-health?</p> <p>e. Will it encourage the use of sustainable design and sustainable building materials in construction?</p>	<p>6. % of total dwellings that are vacant</p> <p>7. % of LA and RSL dwellings that are difficult to let</p> <p>8. % of LA, RSL and owner-occupied dwellings that are low demand</p> <p>9. % of total dwelling stock that is unfit</p> <p>10. % of LA dwellings that fall below the 'Decent Homes Standard'</p> <p>11. % of Fuel poor households</p> <p>12. Average energy efficiency rating of homes</p>	<p>obsolescent homes by April 2012. (LHS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reduction in the proportion of all homes empty to 1.5% by April 2012. (LHS) • Percentage rise in house prices in lowest-priced areas to be comparable to the city average between April 2002 and April 2012. (LHS) • The gap between the average house price in the lowest-priced postcode sector and the city average to be no more than 60% by April 2012. (LHS) • By 2010 bring all social housing into decent condition (UK&VFL2 & LHS) • 50% reduction in the number of unfit private homes to 7.5% of all homes by April 2012. (VFL2 & LHS) • All homes to achieve a SAP rating of at least 55 by April 2012. (LHS) • Percentage of households living in 'fuel poverty' reduced to 2.6% by April 2012. (LHS)
8. Increase social inclusion and active community participation	<p><i>Social inclusion</i></p> <p>a. Will it help to reduce poverty?</p> <p>b. Will it provide more services and facilities that are appropriate to the needs of ethnic minorities, older people, young people and disabled people?</p> <p>c. Does it enable less-well resourced groups to take part?</p> <p>d. Does it take steps to involve not yet reach groups?</p> <p><i>Community participation</i></p> <p>e. Will it give the community opportunities to participate in or towards making decisions?</p>	<p><i>Social inclusion</i></p> <p>1. % of SOAs in the 20% most deprived nationally in the IMD Income deprivation domain</p> <p>2. % of SOAs in the 20% most deprived nationally in the IMD Income deprivation affecting children index</p> <p>3. % of SOAs in the 20% most deprived nationally in the IMD Income deprivation affecting older people index</p> <p>4. Educational qualifications of African Caribbean, Pakistani and</p>	<p><i>Social inclusion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the number of children living in poverty (VFL2) • Increase the number of African Caribbean, Pakistani and Bangladeshi pupils achieving five or more GCSEs at A* to C grade to the same rate as Leeds as a whole; (VFL2) • Increase the numbers of lone parents and black and ethnic-minority residents receiving training; (VFL2) • Reduce the gap in unemployment rates between black and ethnic-minority communities and the white community every year; (VFL2)

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA	INDICATORS	TARGETS FROM OTHER PPPs (Key to abbreviations at end of table.)
	f. Will local community organisations be supported to identify and address their own priorities?	Bangladeshi pupils: students achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades A*-C compared to Leeds average 5. Unemployment rates among BME groups (%) <i>Community participation</i> 6. Civic participation - % who participated in civic affairs in the last 12 months 7. Turnout in local elections (%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase voluntary and community engagement, especially amongst those at risk of social exclusion. (UK)
9. Increase community cohesion	a. Will it build better relationships across diverse communities and interests? b. Will it increase people's feelings of belonging? c. Will it encourage communities to value diversity? d. Could it create or increase tensions and conflict locally or with other communities?	<i>Indicators to be included from Community Cohesion Action Plan when finalised</i>	<i>Targets to be included from Community Cohesion Action Plan when finalised</i>
ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTIVES			
10. Increase the quantity, quality and accessibility of greenspace	a. Will it increase the quantity of publicly accessible greenspace? b. Will it address deficiencies of greenspace in areas that are under-provided? c. Will it improve the quality and management of greenspace across Leeds? d. Will it improve the security of greenspace?	1. Quantity of greenspace 2. Quantity of greenspace per 1,000 population 3. % of eligible greenspace managed to green flag award standard 4. Accessibility of greenspace to residential areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyone in Leeds is able to walk, or have easy access, to a local open green area and be able to see a tree or green space wherever they are. (VFL2) • Provide 2.8ha of Local Recreational Areas within 400m and 12ha of Neighbourhood/District Parks within 800m of residential areas (UDP)
11. Minimise the pressure on greenfield land by efficient land use patterns that make good use of derelict and previously used sites & promote balanced development	a. Does it make efficient use of land by promoting development on previously used land, re-use of buildings and higher densities? b. Will it promote the development of communities with accessible services,	1. % of land developed for employment which is on previously developed land 2. % of new homes on previously developed land 3. % of new dwellings completed at	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% of new homes on previously developed land between 1998 and 2016 (VFL2) • Housing density to be between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare net (PPG3)

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA	INDICATORS	TARGETS FROM OTHER PPPs (Key to abbreviations at end of table.)
	employment, shops and leisure facilities?	less than 30 dwellings per hectare	
12. Maintain and enhance, restore or add to biodiversity or geological conservation interests	<p>a. Will it protect and enhance existing habitats, especially priority habitats identified in the UK and the Leeds Biodiversity Action Plan?</p> <p>b. Will it protect and enhance protected and important species? (Important species are those identified in the UK and the Leeds BAP.)</p> <p>c. Will it protect and enhance existing designated nature conservation sites?</p> <p>d. Will it provide for appropriate long term management of habitats?</p> <p>e. Will it make use of opportunities to create and enhance habitats as part of development proposals?</p> <p>f. Will it protect / mitigate ecological interests on previously-developed sites?</p> <p>g. Will it protect sites of geological interest?</p>	<p>1. Change in priority habitats by type</p> <p>2. Areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value inc. sites of international, national, sub-regional or local significance (SSSIs, SEGIs, LNRs, LNAs)</p> <p>3. Status/condition of SSSIs (favourable or recovering) (%)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribute to the targets for the priority species and habitats in the Leeds BAP • Reverse the decline in farmland birds by 2020 (UK) • Bring into favourable condition by 2010 95% of nationally important wildlife sites (UK) • The <i>List of Habitats and Species of Principal Importance for the Conservation of Biological diversity in England</i> issued by DEFRA under the CROW Act covers 47 habitats. • People living in towns and cities should have a Statutory Local Nature Reserves at a minimum level of one hectare per thousand population (EN)
13. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and thereby help to tackle climate change	<p>Will it reduce greenhouse gas emissions from:</p> <p>a. Households?</p> <p>b. Commercial and industrial activities?</p> <p>c. Transport</p> <p>d. Agriculture, landfill & mining?</p>	<p>1. Estimated CO₂ emissions (Total)</p> <p>2. Estimated CO₂ emissions (Industry/Commercial)</p> <p>3. Estimated CO₂ emissions (Domestic)</p> <p>4. Estimated CO₂ emissions (Road Transport)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions below 1990 levels by 2020 (UK, RPG & VFL2) • 60% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by 2050 (EWP) • Reduce greenhouse gasses emissions by 12.5% from 1990 levels by 2010 (UK) • No increase in CO₂ emissions from 2004/05 to 2010/11 (LTP2)
14. Improve Leeds' ability to manage extreme weather conditions including flood risk and climate change	<p><i>Flood Risk</i></p> <p>a. Will it prevent inappropriate development on flood plains and prepare for the likelihood of increased flooding in future?</p> <p><i>Other climate change effects</i></p> <p>b. Will it improve the capacity to cope with</p>	<p>1. No. of properties located within flood risk zones</p> <p>2. Number of incidences of internal property flooding per annum</p> <p>3. No. of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Future PPPs to be monitored for targets</i>

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA	INDICATORS	TARGETS FROM OTHER PPPs (Key to abbreviations at end of table.)
	<p>the increases in strong winds and storms?</p> <p>c. Will it improve the capacity to cope with higher temperatures?</p>	<p>the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds</p>	
<p>15. Provide a transport network which maximises access, whilst minimising detrimental impacts</p>	<p>a. Will it reduce the need to travel by increasing access to key services and facilities by means other than the car?</p> <p>b. Will it ease congestion on the road network?</p> <p>c. Will it provide/improve/promote information about alternatives to car-based transport?</p> <p>d. Will it reduce the number of journeys by personal motor transport?</p> <p>e. Will it make the transport/environment attractive to non-car users?</p> <p>f. Will it encourage freight transfer from road to rail and water?</p> <p>g. Will it encourage employers to develop green travel plans for staff travel to/from work and whilst at work?</p> <p>h. Will it reduce the causes of transport-related accidents?</p>	<p>1. AM peak period mode split to central Leeds</p> <p>2. Change in area wide road traffic</p> <p>3. Change in peak period traffic flows to central Leeds.</p> <p>4. Ease of pedestrian access to jobs, services, leisure etc (pedestrian counts)</p> <p>5. Peak period rail patronage</p> <p>6. Annualised index of cycling trips</p> <p>7. Distance of public transport stops/station to residential areas (desire lines distances between public transport facilities and residential areas)</p> <p>8. Total killed/seriously injured (KSI) casualties</p> <p>9. Child KSI casualties</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No more than a 5% increase in weekday traffic flows from 2003/04 levels by 2010/11 (LTP2) • Traffic growth in Leeds centre in the morning peak from 2003/04 to 2010/11 to be restricted to 3%. (LTP2) • Reduce the proportion of car-based trips into central Leeds from 57% to 55% by 2010/11 (LTP2) • A 5% increase in bus patronage by 2010/11 (LTP2) • Increase peak time rail patronage on local train services into Leeds by 20% to 2010/11 • A 10% increase in overall cycling levels by 2010/11 and a 20% increase in cycling trips to Leeds during the AM peak (LTP2) • Halt the overall long-term decline in journeys made on foot and increase the proportion of pedestrian journeys by children and young people (1998 to 2006). (WYLTP) • Increase the rail freight share of the market to 10% by 2010 (RPG) • 90% rural households within 800 metres of an hourly or better bus service. (WYLTP) • A 40% reduction in the no. of people KSI from 1994/98 average by 2010, stetched to a 40% reduction from 2002/04 average by 2010. (WYLTP2) • A 50% reduction in the no. of children KSI from the 1994/908 average to 2010,

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA	INDICATORS	TARGETS FROM OTHER PPPs (Key to abbreviations at end of table.)
			stretched to a 40% reduction from 2002-04 by 2010. (WYLTP2)
16. Increase the proportion of local needs that are met locally	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Will it support the use of more local suppliers for agriculture, manufacture, construction, retailing and other services? b. Will it ensure that essential services (e.g. employment, health services and shops) and resources to serve communities are within reasonable non-car based travelling distance? c. Will it provide appropriate housing for local needs? d. Will it support the vibrancy of city, town and village centres? e. Will it help facilitate improved ICT services and resources in isolated and disadvantaged communities? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. % of new residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of a GP, hospital, primary and secondary school, employment and a major health centre 2. % of new residential development within 800m (10 minutes walk) of: a GP premises, primary school, supermarket or convenience store, post office 3. Number of vacant units and % of vacant floorspace in town centres 4. Amount and % of completed retail, office and leisure development respectively in town centres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet targets for journey times to schools, further education colleges, GPs, hospitals, jobs and major shopping centres, once they are set in the Local Transport Plan.
17. Reduce the growth in waste generated and landfilled.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Will it minimise waste? b. Will it promote re-use, recovery and recycling of waste? c. Will it help to provide facilities for recycling and recovering waste? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Total household waste (kg per person) 2. Household waste recycled (%) 3. Amount of municipal waste arising, & managed by type, & the % each management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet government targets of 30% recycling / composting and 45% recovery by 2010 and 33% recycling and 67% recovery by 2016 (LIWS) • Reduce growth in waste to 2% (2006-2010); 1% for (2011-2015) and 0.5% (2016-2020) (LIWS)
18. Reduce pollution levels	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Will it promote the clean-up of contaminated land? b. Will it reduce air, water, land, noise and light pollution? c. Will it reduce the risk of pollution incidents and environmental accidents? d. Will it help to promote neighbourhood cleanliness? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Total area of contaminated land 2. No. of days when air pollution is moderate or high 3. Number of Air Quality Management Areas and areas of concern / no. of dwellings affected 4. Annual road traffic emissions of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All parts of Leeds to meet national air-quality standards (VFL2) • A 20% reduction in NOx from 2004/05 to 2010/11 • All rivers flowing through Leeds are rated as 'very good', 'good' or 'fair' (VFL2) • All surface water and ground water bodies to achieve 'good' status by 2015 with the

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA	INDICATORS	TARGETS FROM OTHER PPPs (Key to abbreviations at end of table.)
		<p>NOx across principal road network</p> <p>5. Water quality – length of rivers in good or fair chemical and biological quality</p> <p>6. Satisfaction with cleanliness of streets</p>	<p>exceptions specified in the Water Framework Directive. (WFD)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 10% reduction in NO₂ levels in the Leeds AQMAs. (LTP2)
19. Maintain and enhance landscape quality	<p>a. Will it maintain and enhance areas of high landscape value?</p> <p>b. Will it protect and enhance individual features such as hedgerows, dry stone walls, ponds and trees?</p> <p>c. Will it increase the quality and quantity of woodland features in appropriate locations and using native species?</p> <p>d. Will it protect and enhance the landscape quality of the City's rivers and other waterways?</p> <p>e. Will it take account of the geomorphology of the land?</p>	<p>1. Amount of development taking place in areas of high landscape value</p> <p>2. Area of woodland coverage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Future PPPs to be monitored for targets</i>
20. Maintain and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the built environment	<p>a. Will it ensure new development is well designed and appropriate to its setting?</p> <p>b. Will it ensure development is consistent with Leeds City Council design guidance for the built, natural and historic environment?</p> <p>c. Will it support local distinctiveness?</p> <p>d. Will it encourage local sourcing of materials?</p>	<p>1. Consistency of development with Leeds City Council design guidance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Future PPPs to be monitored for targets</i>
21. Preserve and enhance the historic environment	<p>a. Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value in urban and rural areas?</p> <p>b. Will it protect and enhance listed</p>	<p>1. No. of listed building of each grade, conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens</p> <p>2. No. & % of listed buildings at risk</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove at least 10 listed buildings at risk per year. (BARSR)

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA	INDICATORS	TARGETS FROM OTHER PPPs (Key to abbreviations at end of table.)
	buildings, conservation areas and other designated historic features and their settings?	3. No. of listed buildings demolished 4. No. & % of conservation areas with appraisals 5. Areas of known significant archaeological interest of national, regional or local interest	
22. Make efficient use of energy and natural resources and promote sustainable design.	a. Will it increase energy and water efficiency in all sectors? b. Will it increase energy from renewable sources? c. Will it promote the energy, water and resource efficiency of buildings? d. Will it increase sustainable urban drainage? e. Will it increase efficiency in use of raw materials? f. Will it minimise the loss of high quality agricultural land and soils? g. Will it support reduced resource use by business?	1. Domestic water consumption (litres/day/household) 2. Use of SUDS and interceptor measures 3. Renewable energy capacity installed by type 4. Agricultural land classification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support regional targets of electricity from renewable sources (VFL2) • At least 10% of energy generated from renewable sources by 2010 (RSS) • All public sector organisations and 50% of local businesses (with over 100 employees) are working towards adopting environmental management systems. (VFL2)

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS FOR PPPs

BARSR	Buildings at Risk Strategy and Register
EWP	UK Energy White Paper
LBAP	Leeds Biodiversity Action Plan
LHS	Leeds Housing Strategy
LNRS	Leeds Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy
LIWS	Leeds Integrated Waste Strategy
LTP2	West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2006-2011
PPG3	Planning Policy Guidance 3 – Housing

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

RES	Regional Economic Strategy
RPG	Regional Planning Guidance
UDP	Leeds Unitary Development Plan
UK	UK government national target
WFD	Water Framework Directive – EU 2002
VFL2	Vision for Leeds 2

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

APPENDIX 2 – G7 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

Core Strategy
Scoring: ++ major positive + slight positive O neutral ? uncertain - slight negative -- major negative D Depends

G7 – Cemeteries and Burial Space

	Short term	Medium term	Long term	Explanation
1. Maintain or improve good quality employment opportunities and reduce the disparities in the Leeds labour market	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.
2. Maintain or improve the conditions which have enabled business success, economic growth and investment	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.
3. Increase participation in education and life-long learning and reduce the disparity in participation and qualifications.	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.
4. Improve conditions and services that engender good health and reduce disparities in health across Leeds	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.
5. Reduce overall rates of crime, and reduce the disparities in crime rates across Leeds	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.
6. Maintain and improve culture, leisure and recreational activities that are available to all	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.
7. Improve the overall quality of housing and reduce the disparity in housing markets across Leeds	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.
8. Increase social inclusion and active community participation	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.
9. Increase community cohesion	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

	Short term	Medium term	Long term	Explanation
10. Increase the quantity, quality and accessibility of greenspace	+	+	+	<p>Access criteria included within the policy will ensure proposals for cemeteries and burial space are in locations that are accessible by public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>Recommendation: The access criteria currently lacks definition and could be more effective if amended to state that there should be good access by public transport, walking and cycling.</p>
11. Minimise the pressure on Greenfield land by efficient land use patterns that make good use of derelict and previously used site & promote balanced development	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.
12. Maintain and enhance, restore or add to biodiversity or geological conservation interests	D	D	D	The effect is dependant on site specifics.
13. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and thereby help mitigate against climate change	+	+	+	<p>Access by public transport, cycling and walking will reduce the use of cars and associated emissions.</p> <p>Recommendation: The access criteria currently lacks definition and could be more effective if amended to state that there should be good access by public transport, walking and cycling.</p>
14. Improve Leeds' ability to manage extreme weather conditions including flood risk and climate change	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.
15. Provide a transport network which maximises access, whilst minimising detrimental impacts	+	+	+	<p>Access by public transport, cycling and walking will reduce the use of the car.</p> <p>Recommendation: The access criteria currently lacks definition and could be more effective if amended to state that there should be good access by public transport, walking and cycling.</p>
16. Increase the proportion of local needs that are met locally	0	0	0	<p>The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.</p> <p>Recommendation: The policy includes criteria for appropriate scale but could also include a requirement for proposals to be permitted locally where there is local need.</p>
17. Reduce the growth in waste generated and landfilled	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.

Core Strategy Pre Submission Changes

	Short term	Medium term	Long term	Explanation
18. Reduce pollution levels	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.
19. Maintain and enhance landscape quality	D	D	D	The effect is dependant on site specifics
20. Maintain and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the built environment	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.
21. Preserve and enhance the historic environment	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.
22. Make efficient use of energy and natural resources and promote sustainable design	0	0	0	The policy is not envisaged to have an impact on this objective.