

DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL

6TH DECEMBER 2005

PRESENT Councillor A Carter in the Chair
Councillors D Blackburn, Blake, Cleasby
Harker, Leadley, Minkin (substitute for Councillor
Congreve) J Procter and Taggart

IN ATTENDANCE Councillors Campbell and Fox

28 Apologies for absence
Apologies were received from Councillor Congreve

29 Declarations of interest
Councillor Leadley declared a prejudicial interest for the purpose of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 13 of the Members Code of Conduct: - Local Development Framework – Annual Monitoring Report, as the Chair of the Scrutiny Commission (Flooding in Leeds) (minute 35 refers)

30 Minutes
RESOLVED - That the minutes of the meeting held on 4th October 2005 be agreed as a correct record

31 Leeds UDP Review – Overview report, response to the Inspector’s report and proposed modifications

Members received a report by the Director of Development setting out an overview of the Inspector’s report on the UDP Review and a Powerpoint presentation setting out the main recommendations. It was noted that a copy of the full report had been sent to all Elected Members, that it was available on the Council’s website and that the issues raised in the Inspector’s report would be debated over a series of meetings

Officers explained the ways in which the Council could respond to the Inspector’s report and the implications for the Authority in respect of these options

The main issues were highlighted relating to:

- Housing Strategy
- Affordable Housing
- Student Housing
- Protected Areas of Search (PAS)
- Policy E7 (Protection of Employment Land)
- Transport

following which the Panel discussed the report and sought further information from Officers

Members raised concerns about:

- the seeming focus of the Inspector on Government/National Guidance

rather than local expression

- the lack of support from the Inspector for the Council's attempt to tighten Policy E7, and that whilst some redundant brownfield sites could be accepted for residential use, it was important that the Authority's three planning panels had sufficient strength to resist residential use on brownfield sites in areas where employment land was needed

- the changes to the phasing of housing development within the plan period, and particularly the changes to the first phase from 2003-2011 to 2003-2008, and concerns that there would not be a chance to review the first phase before the commencement of the second phase

- PAS and the Inspector's rejection of the Council's rationale for putting PAS sites back into the Greenbelt, the need to retain the largest amount of greenspace possible and the damaging implications on communities where areas of land have been designated as PAS

- Student Housing and the Ashore Policy, its rejection by the Inspector and his view that problems created by a concentration of students could not be resolved through the planning process. Members discussed the effect on Headingley of a large student population in terms of loss of family housing, school closures etc and noted the impact that the large-scale purpose-built student accommodation which was emerging in other parts of the city could have for the Headingley area

RESOLVED – To note the recommendations contained in the Inspector's report, the Modification Process, the next steps to be taken in the process and the comments now made

32 Leeds UDP Review – Response to Inspector's report on Chapter 2 (Strategic Context) and Chapter 3 (Strategy)

Members considered a report from the Director of Development setting out the Inspector's recommendations for Chapter 2 (Strategic Concept) and Chapter 3 (Strategy) of the Leeds UDP Review

The Panel noted that at the Inquiry the Council had argued against the objection raised regarding the provision of bus passes at a fixed price and the Inspector had agreed with the Council

RESOLVED – To agree the report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter 2 & 3 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

33 Leeds UDP Review – Response to Inspector's report on Chapter 4, General Policies

Members considered a report from the Director of Development setting out the Inspector's recommendations for Chapter 4 General Policies of the Leeds UDP Review

The Panel noted the Inspector had suggested a slight amendment to the wording of the Chapter following an objection concerning the degree of community

involvement in the planning system and that officers were satisfied with the proposed amendments which were appended to the submitted report

RESOLVED – To agree the report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter 4 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

34 Leeds UDP Review – Response to the Inspector's report on Chapter 23 (West Leeds)

Members considered a report from the Director of Development setting out the Inspector's recommendations for Chapter 23 (West Leeds) of the Leeds UDP Review

The Panel noted there were 16 Proposed Alterations in this chapter, however only one site, this being at Viaduct Road, had been the subject of an objection on the grounds that it should be included as a brownfield housing allocation, which was considered at the Inquiry

The Panel noted the Council's view at the Inquiry that the site was not in a location which was considered suitable for a residential use and that the Inspector had supported the Council's position

RESOLVED – To agree the report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter 23 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course

35 Local Development Framework (LDF) – Annual Monitoring report (AMR)

Further to minute 27 of the meeting held on 4th October 2005, the Panel received a copy of the Authority's first LDF Annual Monitoring Report for consideration and recommendation to Executive Board and the submission to the Secretary of State by 31st December 2005

The Head of Planning and Economic Policy spoke to the report and advised the Panel of the two key elements of the report, these being policy monitoring issues and the progress made against the Local Development Scheme

Members discussed the report and commented on the following matters:

- the vacancy rates contained within the report and details of the rates for the Kirkstall Ward
- the size of households and the possible future use of population surveys to determine the size of properties needed
- the decrease in the stock of affordable or social housing
- flooding issues and climate change, the use of historic data regarding flooding now being used by the Environment Agency to inform debate and the Agency's willingness to engage with the planning process at an early stage

RESOLVED –

i) To recommend to Executive Board approval of the Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report, for submission to the Secretary of State pursuant to Regulation 48 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

ii) That officers provide Councillor Minkin with the information requested

36 Leeds Local Development Framework – Draft Supplementary Planning Document – City Centre Public Realm Contributions

The Panel considered a report setting out a draft SPD in respect of City Centre Public Realm Contributions concentrating on the way forward and specific methodology for assessing developer contributions to public realm improvements within the city centre. Appended to the report was a copy of the draft consultation document

Members were informed that as an indication of the levels of contributions which might be achieved, based on previous development rates in the city centre, the sum of £5m per year could be available for public realm use in the city centre

Members were informed of the definition of public realm as all parts of the built and natural environment where the public has free access and which would normally be owned and maintained by the City Council

Members discussed the report and officers were reminded that there were some areas of the city with the potential for public realm impact but that did not have public access, eg along train routes coming into the city

Whilst the Panel recognised the major issues within the city centre, for example the need to replace areas of Landmark Leeds, the possibility of extending public realm contributions to other parts of Leeds, eg Morley, Otley, Wetherby etc was also discussed and Members stated the importance of demonstrating the value of public realm to those developers being asked to make contributions

RESOLVED –

(i) To note the contents of the Draft City Centre Public Realm Contributions SDP for formal consultation commencing in January 2006

(ii) That the consultation document be sent to all Elected Members for their input into the process

**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL
DATE: 3 JANUARY 2006**

**SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON
CHAPTER 7 (HOUSING)**

Electoral Wards Affected:

ALL

Specific Implications for:

Ethnic Minorities

Women

Disabled People

Key Decision Major Decision Eligible for call in Not Eligible for call in
Significant Operational Decision Administrative Decision (details contained in the report)

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 7 Housing, regarding Alterations 7/001 – 7/009 and to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations.

2 BACKGROUND

Housing Land Strategy

- 2.1 The Housing Chapter is one of the key elements of the RDUDP. It sets out the housing land strategy for the period 2003-16, dealing with the requirement for housing land, the identification of land supply to meet this requirement, and measures to phase and manage the release of land in accordance with the overall strategy.

Affordable Housing – Targets for Strategic Sites

- 2.2 The City Council commissioned a housing need assessment in 2003 (published in November 2003) which identified 5 housing need zones – the Rural North, Outer Suburbs, Inner Suburbs, Inner Areas & City Centre – and calculated shortfalls of affordable dwellings for each zone. The Rural North, whilst not having the highest shortfall, had the least development opportunities for delivering affordable housing to meet local needs.
- 2.3 Affordable housing policy is set out in paras. 7.6.10-27 of the AUDP. Para. 7.6.19 states that on average some 15-25% of all new houses built should be “affordable”. The City Council proposed an alteration to extend para. 7.6.19 to include a 50% “indicative target” for affordable housing on the proposed Strategic Housing Sites of Thorp Arch and East of Otley. It was anticipated that around 1,000 dwellings of the 2100 total would be affordable, and that this would help meet the identified severe shortfall of affordable dwellings in the Rural North zone of Leeds.

2.4 The South East Otley Residents Association made strong representations against the proposals, and put forward a set of potential brownfield sites as an alternative means of securing affordable housing. A number of Members and other parties also objected, some of whom urged that a higher percentage of affordable housing be sought across Leeds.

Affordable Housing – Site Size Thresholds

2.5 Affordable housing policy is set out in paras. 7.6.10-27 of the AUDP. Para. 7.6.20 states, in accordance with Cr. 6/98, that affordable housing will not be sought on sites which fall below the general threshold size of 25 dwellings or 1ha. and that in rural areas of 3,000 population or less affordable housing will be sought according to local assessment of housing need and land supply.

2.6 For reasons of need and lack of “site availability, with the exception of the above two strategic sites, the City Council proposed to reduce the site size threshold upon which affordable housing would be sought in the Rural North zone from 25 to 10 dwellings.

2.7 Objectors claimed that the lower threshold was not justified.

Student Housing

2.8 The Adopted UDP had Policy H15 to control the development of student housing developments. It had 3 criteria that student housing should be more widely dispersed, that development should be resisted that increases existing concentrations of student accommodation in the inner urban areas, and that purpose built accommodation should be accepted in the immediate vicinity of the universities. This policy came under criticism for being vague, for not saying which areas of Leeds are a concern, and for inconsistency of treatment of purpose built accommodation.

2.9 In the UDP Review, the City Council proposed a new Policy H15 with a clearer objective to resist the development of further student bedspaces within the wider Headingley area, defined as the Area of Student Housing Restraint (ASHORE). The City Council hoped to justify a blanket style resistance to additional student bedspaces by presenting evidence of an excessive student population concentration in the ASHORE and evidence of associated amenity and other planning problems. If a strategic case could be made for the whole area, this would mean that individual planning applications could be decided on that strategic case, rather than having to assemble a local evidence base repeatedly. A separate Policy H15A was proposed to encourage provision of purpose built accommodation in other parts of Leeds, subject to criteria regarding transport connections and local suitability.

2.10 The overall proposals received widespread support from the local community as well as the universities, in principle. Landlords and some student housing developers objected to the principle of the policy claiming it was discriminatory against students.

2.11 Alteration 07/009 concerns consequential updates to text relating to Policies H18 & H19 concerning Houses in Multiple Occupation & supporting text.

3 INSPECTORS CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 The Inspector’s discussion of the Housing Chapter is wide-ranging and complex and there is not space to summarise it in any detail. However, some of his main conclusions and recommendations are noted below:

Housing Land Strategy

- Acceptance that the plan needs to provide for 1930 dwellings a year to 2016,
- Acceptance that the identified land supply to meet this need is “adequate both in quantity and quality”, and is soundly based on trend analysis and Urban Capacity Study
- Endorsement of the general strategy of relying on brownfield sites in the main urban area to meet most of the plan requirement
- Acceptance with modification of the definition of the main urban area
- Acceptance of the package of proposed allocations with the sole exception of the Thorp Arch Trading estate site which he recommends be deleted
- Introduction of a clear third phase before 2016
- The use of greenfield allocations primarily as a reserve land supply to be drawn on only if other more sustainable sources prove inadequate
- Revision to the phasing of greenfield allocation release – notably the demotion of the sites at East of Otley and Micklefield from phase 1 to phase 3, and of most of the East Leeds extension from phase 2 to 3 and its replacement in phase 2 by a small package of site formerly in phase 3. The general effect is further to postpone the release of greenfield land
- Endorsement of the use of trigger mechanisms to help manage the release of greenfield allocations when needed on supply grounds, and of their inclusion in the text rather than as supplementary guidance
- Acceptance of the intent of policy H4, subject to significant re-wording and simplification of the policy
- Rejection of policy H5 on the grounds of duplication with H4 and inappropriate reference to greenfield land
- Substantial changes in the presentation of policy and supporting text, and particularly the inclusion of more detail about the area, capacity and timing of the supply available from allocations and H4 land.

Affordable Housing – Targets for Strategic Sites

- 3.2 The Inspector says that there is no disputing the considerable scale of need for affordable housing in the Rural North zone of Leeds, but he is unconvinced that the Thorp Arch Trading Estate proposal is justified at all, or that the East of Otley site is justified as a first phase Strategic Housing site on the basis of such need.
- 3.3 He is critical of the City Council for
- failing to put its own policies into practice effectively and achieve sufficient provision of affordable housing on eligible sites
 - setting differential zonal targets that require no affordable housing on some eligible sites
 - its failure to examine how the considerable shortfall of affordable housing provision in the Outer Suburb zone could be addressed.
 - an overall incoherent policy approach which fails to understand the inter-relationship between the 5 identified housing need zones
- 3.4 The inspector recommends that the target proportion of affordable dwellings to be sought as part of eligible housing developments as set out in the last sentence of paragraph 7.6.19 of the UDP be changed from the range of 15-25% to a single figure of 25%.

Affordable Housing – Site Size Thresholds

- 3.5 The Inspector concluded that the Council had failed to adequately justify the lower threshold to satisfy the requirements of Circular 6/98. The Council’s 2003 Housing Need Assessment fell short of considering fully the factors listed in Circular 6/98 such

as the types of households in need and the different types of housing best suited to meeting needs, the supply of sites, existing provision of affordable housing and wider housing strategy & plan objectives. In particular, in the light of sites identified by South East Otley Residents Association in the Otley area, he lacks confidence that an accurate assessment of housing land supply had been undertaken for the whole of the Rural North zone. He also bemoans the lack of an assessment of the contribution that the rural exception policy could make to meeting local needs in small rural settlements. Rural exceptions policy allows for small groups of affordable housing alone (i.e. no private market housing) to be permitted on sites that would not be acceptable for private market housing, because of the over-riding need in the locality for affordable housing. Examples of such sites would include small green field sites within or adjoining villages.

- 3.6 The inspector recommends that the proposed lower threshold advanced in the Council's First Deposit Alteration be discarded.

Student Housing

- 3.7 The Inspector roundly condemns the policy as being discriminatory, and unjustifiable on that basis.
- 3.8 The inspector also rejects the alternative proposal put by HMO Lobby that restriction should be against HMOs rather than students. Under current planning definitions of HMO, such an approach would be ineffective at controlling the shared student house found extensively in Headingley.
- 3.9 He also identified practical problems concerned with definitions of "student houses", and difficulties of dealing with marginal and mixed households.
- 3.10 He noted that the future rate of increase of student numbers was anticipated to be much lower than in the past. The approximate doubling of numbers from the late 1980s to around 40000 to now, will not continue. With a much lower rate of growth anticipated between now & the end of the plan period, 2016, the Inspector felt that restrictive policy would not be successful.
- 3.11 Because the proposed policy would only impact on development that needs planning permission, and not impact on changes of occupation of houses (changing the occupation of a house from that of a family to that of 6 students sharing does not need planning permission), the Inspector felt that the effect of policy would be marginal. This provided further reason not to support the City Council's proposals.
- 3.12 In terms of *purpose built student accommodation*, the Inspector felt that restrictions will be counter-productive. Such accommodation provided by Universities or specialist providers will have positive effects by i) reducing the pressure the family housing stock (for conversion into shared student housing) ii) being subjected to management & maintenance regimes and iii) raising the standards of student housing itself .
- 3.13 The Inspector agreed with objectors that the ASHORE be extended, to take in Kirkstall Hill, Moor Grange, Lawnswood and Beckett Park Campus, but disagreed that Burley and Woodhouse should be deleted. As the nature of the area designation will be different (no longer blanket restriction against student bedspaces), the inspector recommends changing the name of the area to something like "Area of Housing Mix".
- 3.14 In terms of the UDP Review Policy to encourage dispersal of student accommodation to other parts of Leeds (Policy H15A), the Inspector supported the criteria based policy,

but agreed with objectors that, additionally, it ought to be more pro-active and identify areas well suited to student housing.

- 3.15 The inspector recommends a new policy H15 which is positively worded to allow extensions, alterations & redevelopments of student housing in the “Area of Housing Mix” on the following conditions: i) that the stock family accommodation should not be “unacceptably reduced” in terms of quantity & variety, ii) there would be no unacceptable loss of amenity by way of noise & disturbance from the proposal itself or in combination with existing accommodation, iii) the scale & character would be in keeping with the surrounding area, iv) satisfactory car parking, and v) the proposal would improve the quality & variety of student housing. He recommends a further element to the policy committing the City Council to work with stakeholders to develop a “Student Housing Strategy” for the area which would seek to manage the balance of new student accommodation with other types of housing, improve the student housing stock and identify opportunities for provision of new purpose built student accommodation.
- 3.16 As regards Policy H15A, the Inspector recommends more positive wording. Rather than merely “encouraging” provision of student accommodation in other areas, subject to criteria, he recommends that the City Council should work with the universities and other accommodation providers to promote and bring forward developments in defined locations and which satisfy criteria. The criteria recommended are broadly similar to those proposed by the City Council, namely that locations need to have good transport connections, be attractive to students and be acceptable in terms of impact on the existing community. However, the inspector prefers to split the latter criterion into one that expects integration into the area in terms of scale, character, services & facilities and another that seeks to protect the quality, quantity & variety of the existing housing stock. He also includes “contribution to regeneration” as a stand alone criterion, rather than as preference (as proposed by the City Council).
- 3.17 The Inspector recommends re-writing the explanatory text of the Plan to re-cast the purpose of the policies to achieve a better housing mix.
- 3.18 As regards Alteration 07/009 concerning consequential updates to text relating to Policies H18 & H19, the Inspector recommends modification in accordance with the proposed alteration.

4 CITY COUNCIL RESPONSE

Housing Land Strategy (Sections 7.1 – 7.3)

- 4.1 In general, the City Council accepts the Inspector’s analysis and recommendations and proposes to modify the plan accordingly. For the most part, recommendations are incorporated directly, but in a few cases, because of lack of clarity, duplication or internal inconsistencies, it has been necessary to apply recommendations with a degree of interpretation, rather than by rote. Substantial re-writing of the chapter has in any case been necessary, particularly in the sections dealing with the housing land strategy, and this often involves the drafting of text consistent with the Inspector’s advice, rather than the insertion of text written by him. **The full revised text of sections 7.1 – 7.3 is attached at the end of this report and should be read in conjunction with the schedule of responses to the Inspector’s individual recommendations.** The remainder of the text immediately following focuses on the aspects of the report requiring most interpretation.

- 4.2 The main aspects of the report that present difficulties of interpretation are the Inspector's recommendations relating to the definition of the main urban area and the implications for H4, the format of policy H3, and the mechanisms to manage land release. In these cases, it has been necessary to interpret the recommendations in ways that are both practical and appear to reflect the Inspector's intentions.
- 4.3 In the RDUDP the **main urban area** was defined as the urban core of Leeds together with service centres defined under policy S2. The Inspector recommends distinguishing between the Main Urban Area (the urban core of Leeds) and other centres, to be referred to as Smaller Urban Areas (SUAs). At the same time, he rejects the S2 rationale for defining SUAs, but without offering an alternative basis. However, he says that Otley and Wetherby - the two towns exemplified in RSS as market or coalfield towns – are SUAs, but that the S2 centres Garforth, Kippax and Boston Spa, are not. He invites the Council to provide a new explanation of the difference between the MUA and SUAs.
- 4.4 The practical importance of the MUA/SUA definition comes in policy H4, which governs development on unallocated sites. In this policy, there is no difference in the treatment of proposals in the MUA and the SUAs, which rather undermines the point of distinguishing between them. Some variation in the treatment of sites outside the MUA/SUAs appears to be contemplated by H4, but even here development would be acceptable, inter alia, on sites that are "otherwise in a demonstrably sustainable location". The Inspector's report does not offer any explicit guidance on how such locations might be defined.
- 4.5 The suggested response to these recommendations is to accept the distinction between the MUA and SUAs, and the recommended coverage of the latter, but in view of its policy insignificance, not to dwell at any length on the reasons for defining SUAs. Explanatory text is added to H4 to suggest where other "demonstrably sustainable locations" might be found. This draws on the Inspector's consideration of Alteration 18/006, which gives an idea of what constitutes a sustainable location.
- 4.6 Turning to **policy H3**, the main purpose of this is to define the phases and to show the sources of land and estimated capacity in each phase. In essence, each phase consists of site specific allocations, together with windfall capacity on sites brought forward under policy H4, split into sites in the MUA/SUAs and outside them.
- 4.7 Problems with the recommended wording are:
- i) allocations are split between sub-categories A and C in phases 1 and 2, which seems unnecessarily complicated, given that they are part of the same generic source of land,
 - ii) H4 windfall outside the MUA/SUAs is not given a sub category letter, although it is clearly a separate element of supply,
 - iii) the wording of the policy is repeated in each phase,
 - iv) capacity ranges are given for phase 2 allocations, but not for those in phase 1 or 3. The use of ranges for allocations complicates presentation and monitoring, and is unnecessary given that all capacities are merely indicative, as the Inspector emphasises elsewhere,
 - v) the wording of the clause relating to windfall outside the MUA/SUAs is inconsistent with the rest of the policy, as it is in the form of policy advice rather than a simple reference to an element of supply, like the rest of the policy,
 - vi) the final clause also refers to greenfield windfall, whereas it is quite clear from the discussion at 7.99 - 7.100 that the Inspector does not envisage any greenfield windfall coming forward.
- 4.8 The suggested response to these issues is to:

- i) standardise and streamline the specification of phase content so that it relates to three elements of supply – allocations, H4 land in the MUA/SUAs and H4 land elsewhere – in the same order in each phase. Where necessary, allocations are subdivided into sites carried over from earlier phases, strategic sites etc. Standardisation of presentation means that the policy wording does not have to be repeated for each phase,
- ii) re-wording of the policy to relate directly to the three sources of supply and to make it clear that H4 covers unallocated land both inside and outside the MUA/SUAs,
- iii) abandon the capacity ranges for phase 2 allocations to maintain consistency with the treatment of allocations elsewhere and reduce complexity. The lower end of the Inspector's range is taken as the indicative capacity of each phase 2 site. These capacities are slightly higher than those used in the RDUDP,
- iv) delete the reference to greenfield land to bring the policy in line with the Inspector's intentions in paragraphs 7.99-7.100 of his report.

- 4.9 The most complex issue is that of the **mechanisms to manage land release**. Following PPG3, the RDUDP included general undertakings to regulate the rate of housebuilding in defined circumstances. More detailed proposals to advance or defer the release of allocations and to deal with excessive over or under provision were put to the RDUDP Public Inquiry. Four states of supply and linked actions were defined, and the Inspector has endorsed these proposals with modifications, and recommended the addition of a fifth mechanism of his own.
- 4.10 Each mechanism consists of two elements: definitions of the circumstances which give rise to a related action; and the nature of that action itself. The essential problem with the Inspector's recommendations is that his additional mechanism either duplicates, supersedes or conflicts with aspects of the Council's original proposals. There is consequently no sense in retaining all five mechanisms, in fact to do so would be a cause of confusion.
- 4.11 The purpose of the Inspector's new mechanism is to determine the timing of release of the allocations in phases 2 and 3. When the conditions specified in the mechanism are satisfied, the allocations are released en bloc; until then, they remain in permanent suspense. The function of this mechanism is virtually the same as that of the Council's mechanisms for dealing with "normal" or moderate over or under supply, which proposed moving allocations back or forward as a response to supply conditions. With the Inspector's mechanism in place, these two original mechanisms are functionally redundant.
- 4.12 Moreover, the action originally proposed would no longer be possible in the light of the Inspector's phasing changes. The main action originally envisaged was to advance or defer the release of the old phase 2 allocation, the East Leeds Extension. This is no longer possible because the Inspector has demoted the ELE to phase 3. The package of sites available for release in phase 2 is now entirely different. Therefore the action attached to the Council's original proposals has been superseded, although this does not appear to have been noted by the Inspector.
- 4.13 There are also differences in the definition of the circumstances which identify the need for action. In the Council's proposals, the key identifiers of normal under supply were if completions in the last 3 years averaged 20% or more below the H1 rate, and outstanding planning permissions constituted less than a three year supply at this rate. Normal over supply occurred if the 3 year completion rate was 20% or more above the H1 rate and planning permissions exceeded a 3 year supply at the same rate. The Inspector endorses these definitions, except to change the completions element of the criteria for under supply to a rate 10% (instead of 20%) below the H1 requirement in the last 2 years (instead of 3).

- 4.14 The Inspector initially suggests that his additional mechanism could be “broadly along the same lines” (para 7.89) as the above proposals, but then seems to opt for a measure based on current land supply only. Phase 2 allocations would be released if the supply of land, consisting of carried forward allocations, permissions and anticipated windfall, was inadequate to meet housing needs for the next 2 years, later equated with a supply of less than 2 years at the RSS rate (paras 7.90, 7.91). Secondary indicators are also tentatively suggested (para 7.91), but are neither insisted upon, nor easily understood.
- 4.15 Difficulties with these recommendations are:
- Alternative mechanisms are endorsed that are functionally virtually the same, but rely on different definitions of the conditions indicative of the need for action, and in the case of the Council’s proposals, are linked to actions that are no longer capable of implementation,
 - By making no reference to past completions, it would be theoretically possible to build no houses at all under the Inspector’s recommended mechanism but still comply with requirements, if there was a current 2 year supply of land,
 - The Inspector’s definition of land supply is broader than the Council’s, including more speculative elements – outstanding allocations that might be indefinitely constrained, future windfall which is inherently uncertain. Planning permissions are readily verifiable facts, which confer a right to develop.
 - The conditions specified by the Inspector are likely to be harder to meet than those proposed by the Council, since the amount of land required to avoid the release of greenfield allocations is smaller (a 2 year supply instead of 3) and the definition of qualifying land is wider. The Inspector was presumably aware of this when making his recommendation and evidently considered it appropriate to tighten the criteria for the release of allocations.
- 4.16 Turning briefly to other mechanisms, the Council also proposed definitions of **severe** over and under supply, which the Inspector accepts almost without comment. The severe over supply mechanism is not affected by the Inspector’s new mechanism, but the severe under supply mechanism is effectively superseded. For this, the Council proposed the removal of all restraints on the release of allocations, but under the Inspector’s recommendations, allocations would already have been progressively released under his own mechanism, leaving no effective action left. The new mechanism therefore leaves no real role for severe under supply measures.
- 4.17 In the light of the above considerations, it is suggested that only two mechanisms are needed, one to help decide when phase 2 and 3 allocations should be released, and one to deal with severe over supply. The latter mechanism can be as originally proposed by the Council and endorsed by the Inspector. The form of the mechanism to control the release of allocations is harder to determine because of the conflicting nature of the Inspector’s recommendations.
- 4.18 The suggested conclusion is that the mechanism needs to combine references both to past output and current supply – a point accepted by the Inspector in his endorsement of the Council’s original proposals, but unaccountably omitted when he came to propose his additional mechanism. For this purpose, it is judged best to bring together the completions element of the original under supply mechanism as modified by the Inspector, with the basic elements of his own supply criteria. Thus the proposal is that the release of Greenfield allocations in phases 2 and 3 should be considered when completions in the last two years fall 10% or more below the H1 rate, and current supply is equivalent to less than 2 years’ worth of dwellings at the H1 rate.
- 4.19 It is proposed that the current supply be defined as surviving allocations from past and current phases together with outstanding planning permissions on sites for 5 or more

dwellings. In view of the reduction in the size of supply required, speculative elements such as possible future windfall or undetermined planning applications would be excluded from the supply definition. Allocations have to be included because otherwise, when phase 2 allocations were released, these would have no impact on the performance of the release mechanism.

Affordable Housing – Targets for Strategic Sites

- 4.20 It is considered that a single 25% target figure would be inappropriate for Leeds and that it would be better to keep the 15-25% target range of the Adopted UDP. This is because it would not be desirable to seek 25% affordable housing in certain parts of Leeds. This includes the City Centre Zone where disproportionately high construction costs relative to land costs mean that land values are typically unable to cover 25% provision of affordable housing. This was the conclusion of a viability study carried out in 2002 looking in detail at a number of city centre sites. It also includes the Inner Area Zone where the City Council is promoting regeneration. Private sector housing development is welcome investment, and the City Council will need to be cautious to avoid situations where the scale of affordable housing provision deters investment. In such areas, land values are often low, and cannot support the cost of substantial affordable housing provision.
- 4.21 The idea to change the target banding to a single 25% target across Leeds was not part of the UDP Review Proposals, and as such, has only been discussed within the confines of the UDP Review Inquiry Round Table Session. The matter was only considered on the basis of objector proposals, and was not therefore a central element of the Round Table discussions. As such, if a modification was advanced, as recommended by the Inspector, further objections and calls for a second public inquiry could be expected from landowners and developers who may be affected.
- 4.22 The criticism is noted that the UDP Review proposals lacked city-wide coherence because they focussed on the Rural North zone & the proposed Strategic Housing Sites at Thorp Arch & Otley, rather than the whole Leeds district. But this underlines the need for a thorough review for the whole of Leeds. Officers are planning to carry out a comprehensive review of affordable housing policy during 2006 with an assessment of need for affordable housing across the district based on recent good practice guidance from the Government. This review will be able to take account of new national policy guidance for affordable housing set out in Planning Policy Statement 3 currently out for consultation.
- 4.23 Hence, it is recommended that the 15-25% target wording be maintained, in order to deal with the varied nature of housing markets in Leeds, until a comprehensive policy review is carried out and its conclusions incorporated into the LDF.

Affordable Housing – Site Size Thresholds

- 4.24 It is disappointing that the Inspector gave little apparent weight to the trend based assessment of site availability for housing supply that the City Council relied upon for its evidence, regarding an assessment of brownfield site availability as more compelling. Nevertheless, he has clearly concluded that there is an insufficient case either in the Plan itself or presented as evidence to justify a lower threshold, and therefore, it is recommended to accept his recommendation.

Student Housing

Principle of Restraint

- 4.25 The issue was fully considered at the Public Inquiry and the Inspector was wholly unconvinced of the justification for the blanket policy of restraint (ASHORE). Hence, the City Council would be well advised to accept the Inspector's conclusions. If the City Council rejected his recommendations and persisted with the blanket policy of restraint, appeals into refused planning applications would inevitably be upheld, as appellants would rely upon this inspector's conclusions.
- 4.26 However, within the new policy context of "housing mix" that the Inspector recommends, there will be scope to decide planning applications on a case by case basis having regard to five criteria. Four of these criteria are essentially "protective" of the existing community and environment, and one concerns enhancement of the quality/variety of student accommodation. All five criteria have to be satisfied.
- 4.27 The first two criteria relate to the purpose that the City Council advanced the ASHORE policy in the first place, namely the balance of student/family housing and protection of residential amenity. So, whilst the Inspector remained unconvinced of the case for a blanket restriction, he accepts that proposals for new & extended student accommodation need to be judged against considerations of housing mix and residential amenity.
- 4.28 Hence, within the recommended policy context, it will be for the City Council to determine its approach to deciding individual planning applications for student housing proposals. The HMO Lobby has already written, accepting the Inspector's overall recommendation and suggesting some ideas for how planning applications are decided on a case by case basis, which will have to be explored. The City Council will need to consider how best to inform such decisions with up to date information on local mixes of family/student/other occupiers.

Purpose built student accommodation in the "Area of Housing Mix"

- 4.29 In his conclusions, the Inspector clearly sees the provision of purpose built accommodation as development that could improve the housing situation in Headingley. Nevertheless, he does not recommend any specific development control policy for purpose built accommodation; such proposals will have to be judged against the five criteria along with all other types of student housing proposals. He recommends the preparation of a "Student Housing Strategy" with stakeholders. As the City Council has employed such a strategy and action plan (known as the Student Housing Action Plan) since the early 1990s and intends to continue doing so, officers believe that the commitment would be better represented as supporting text rather than upper case policy. The strategy needs a multi-disciplinary and multi agency input to achieve the objectives, including those that go beyond the scope of planning control.
- 4.30 One of the Inspector's stated objectives is to identify opportunities for provision of purpose built student accommodation. The HMO Lobby has stated it disagrees with this objective as it is a) an unacceptable argument & b) would undermine Policy H15A. It should be noted that this objective only applies to the recommended preparation of a "Student Housing Strategy" & would not directly affect the deciding of planning applications. Also, the recommended wording states that the 3 objectives should be pursued "so far as is possible in planning terms". The Student Housing Strategy could explore potential locations for purpose built student accommodation with the stakeholders (universities, providers & communities). Whilst it may be that consensus could be reached to identify certain opportunities, for example sites close to or within the existing campuses, it may be that no such opportunities can be agreed upon.

Ultimately, it will be for the City Council to decide whether any locations are identified in a Student Housing Strategy, taking account of the facts and the views of all stakeholders.

4.31 Hence, outright rejection of this aspect of the Inspectors recommendations is considered unnecessary and premature. It would inevitably lead to objections from providers of purpose built accommodation, which could lead to calls for another public inquiry to debate the principle.

Policy H15A – Development of Student Housing in Other Areas

4.32 The Inspector's recommendations leave the development control criteria essentially unchanged in purpose, so this gives no cause for concern.

4.33 The recommendation to couch the policy as promotional, in the sense that the City Council will have to work with the universities & accommodation providers to identify & bring forward sites for development, is also acceptable. This City Council has already been working closely with the universities to identify appropriate locations.

4.34 However, the recommendation that locations should be named in the text of the Policy is of concern. Such a recommendation demands time to discuss options with the universities, accommodation providers and the local communities. Spending such time now does not make sense because it will delay adoption of the UDP Review. In any case, possibilities for student housing provision in other areas of Leeds are already being explored as part of preparation of the Local Development Framework. The City Centre Area Action Plan will shortly consider student housing on the fringe of the city centre as an option for consultation. Other Area Action Plans are likely to follow suit, where credible options for student housing provision exist.

4.35 The HMO Lobby recommend a revised form of wording to list locations which states "a) locations around the city centre, as designated in the City Centre Area Action Plan; b) locations elsewhere, as designated in the Area Action Plans for Aire Valley, East & SE Leeds, and West Leeds". Whilst this specific wording could not be recommended because the UDP Review cannot commit other statutory plans to particular outcomes, the overall intention is supported.

5 RECOMMENDATION

6 Members are asked to:

- i) agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendations in respect of Chapter 7 (Alteration 7/001-9),
- ii) to accept the Inspectors recommendations with limited qualifications in respect of Alterations 7/001-5, 7/007 and 7/009,
- iii) to reject the Inspectors recommendations in respect of Alterations 7/006 and 7/008
- iii) to recommend approval of these recommendations to Executive Board in due course.

<p>Prop. Alt. 7/001</p> <p>7/001/RD</p>	<p><u>PA 7/001</u> HOUSING - INTRODUCTION</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> That the UDP be modified</p> <p>1. in accordance with FD Alteration 7/001, subject to amending the last sentence of para. 7.1.7 to read: "It is anticipated that the strategy proposed here will maintain the rate of use of brownfield sites at a level in excess of Government targets throughout the Review Plan period."</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to modify the plan</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Addition of recommended text to the end of paragraph 7.1.6 A number of other wording changes are made to the introduction to improve the clarity of the text but without altering its sense. The reference in paragraph 7.1.3 to 29000 dwellings being required in the Review period to 2016, which referred to the 15 years 2001-16 is amended to 25090 dwellings, to refer to the period 2003-16 which was then and is now the period of the plan.</p>
<p>Prop. Alts. 7/002-5</p> <p>7/001RD -5RD</p>	<p><u>PA 7/002</u> PHASED RELEASE OF LAND FOR HOUSING</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> That the plan be amended</p> <p>2. in accordance with RD Alteration 7/001(sic, but actually 7/002) subject to</p> <p>a. amendment of the first sentence of the first bullet point to read:</p> <p>"Most of the City's housing land needs for the whole Review period to 2016 are likely to be met from existing brownfield land reserves within the Main Urban and Smaller Urban Areas as defined on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>b. deletion of Garforth, Kippax, Wetherby and Otley and the penultimate sentence from the first bullet point of para. 7.2.1 and</p> <p>c. explanation of the difference between the parts of the "Main and Smaller Urban Areas" designation;</p> <p>d. deletion of bullet point 4;</p> <p>e. rewording of bullet point 5 to reflect the recommendations relating to</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council generally accepts the thrust of the Inspector's recommendations, except in certain detailed respects. The need for 5 mechanisms to regulate land release is rejected, as the essential tasks can be managed by two. The reference to greenfield land coming forward under policy H4 is rejected because it is clearly at odds with the Inspector's intentions. Generally the text and presentation of policy has had to be substantially re-written to accommodate the Inspector's conclusions. Because of this, the schedule of proposed modifications that follows frequently refers to paragraphs in the new text which is attached at the end. The nature of the response – acceptance, conditional acceptance or rejection – is apparent from the summary of the action.</p> <p>Add the recommended text to the second bullet point of para 7.2.1</p> <p>Delete Garforth and Kippax from the list of locations within the Main Urban and Smaller Urban areas in the second bullet point. Otley and Wetherby are retained because these do form part of the combined areas as is clear from the Inspector's recommendation 9a.</p> <p>Addition of the text "together with the freestanding towns of Otley and Wetherby which are identified in RSS as urban areas" to the second bullet point in order to explain why these areas are added to the main urban core.</p> <p>Deletion of the following text: "provision for more specific additional developments may be needed in certain parts or localities within the District, reflecting local needs and circumstances"</p> <p>Replacement of the following text:</p>

<p>ELE;</p> <p>f. deletion of the last sentence of bullet point 6;</p> <p>g. rewording of H1 and inclusion of explanatory text as follows:</p> <p>H1 PROVISION WILL BE MADE FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE ANNUAL AVERAGE REQUIREMENT IDENTIFIED IN THE REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY [RSS].</p> <p>This is currently 1,930 dwellings per annum. The adequacy of completions, together with the number of dwellings with planning permission and the supply of sites allocated for development, will be monitored and assessed against the average annual requirement in RSS.</p> <p>h. insertion of a new Policy H2 to relate to monitoring as follows:</p> <p>H2 THE COUNCIL WILL UNDERTAKE REGULAR MONITORING OF THE ANNUAL COMPLETIONS OF DWELLINGS WITHIN THE DISTRICT, AS WELL AS THE NUMBER OF DWELLINGS WITH PLANNING PERMISSION AND THE SUPPLY OF SITES ALLOCATED FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.</p>	<p>“reflecting the sequential approach advocated in PPG3 and in RPG, the approach at that stage will need to focus on the scope to expand the main urban area of Leeds itself. Accordingly, the UDP proposes an extension of the main urban area in the north-eastern sector (adjacent to the Seacroft-Cross Gates areas). The wider regeneration and infrastructure implications of this development will be addressed and planned in a masterplan to be prepared for this development”</p> <p>with this new text:</p> <p>“A fifth Strategic Site, the East Leeds Extension, is identified in phase 3. This is a large greenfield urban extension in an area of Leeds where environmental constraints are less severe and where the coalescence of existing settlements can be avoided. It forms the largest component of the reserve of greenfield allocations identified in phase 3.”</p> <p>Deletion of this text so that the final bullet point reads: “Monitoring of development opportunities will be necessary throughout the Review period.”</p> <p>Some other additions are made to the text at para 7.2.1 – the function of which is to summarise the plan’s housing land strategy - in order to reflect the changes to this strategy which stem from the Inspector’s recommendations. These consist of the bullet points identifying the three phases of the plan, the key thrust of the plan to rely on windfall sites to meet requirements, with greenfield allocations held in reserve, and the role of Strategic sites.</p> <p>Text inserted at paras 7.2.2 – 7.2.3.</p> <p>Insertion of policy after para 7.2.3.</p>
--	---

i. Insertion of new explanatory text immediately following, and relating to, Policy H2. This should explain the purpose of monitoring which is to ensure that housing requirements are being met in line with the sequential approach set out in PPG3. It should include the factors to be monitored and outline the monitoring process, with a commitment to working with the development industry, including dialogue through meetings to discuss the results of monitoring.

j. Renumbering Policy H2 as H3 and rewording as follows:

H3 THE DELIVERY OF HOUSING LAND RELEASE WILL BE CONTROLLED IN THREE PHASES:

PHASE 1 : 2003-2008

PHASE 2 : AFTER PHASE 1, WHEN AND IF EXISTING HOUSING LAND SUPPLY IS DEMONSTRABLY SHORT OR 2008-2012

PHASE 3 : AFTER PHASE 2, WHEN AND IF EXISTING HOUSING LAND SUPPLY IS DEMONSTRABLY SHORT OR 2012-2016

PHASE 1: 2003 - 2008

THIS WILL COMPRISE:

A LAND ALLOCATED FOR HOUSING IN H3-1A [NB. MODIFIED TO INCLUDE SITES AT ALLERTON BYWATER, SHARP LANE, MIDDLETON AND HARE LANE PUDSEY];

B BROWNFIELD WINDFALL SITES WITHIN THE MUA; AND

C THE ALLOCATIONS AT HOLBECK URBAN VILLAGE AND HUNSLET RIVERSIDE;
ELSEWHERE (I.E. OUTSIDE THE DEFINED MAIN URBAN AREA AND ON GREENFIELD SITES) PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT WILL BE CONSIDERED AGAINST POLICY H4.

PHASE 2 : 2008 – 2012

THIS WILL COMPRISE

A ANTICIPATED CONTINUING CONTRIBUTION [IF ANY] FROM PHASE 1 ALLOCATIONS/COMMITMENTS.

B BROWNFIELD WINDFALL SITES WITHIN THE MUA; AND

C SITES BROUGHT FORWARD FROM H3-3 AS FOLLOWS:

Insertion of following text:

7.2.4 The purpose of monitoring is to assess whether H1 requirements have been met and can continue to be met in line with the sequential approach. Monitoring information will be used to help manage the phased release of land. In particular, it will provide indicators for a trigger mechanism (see below) which will help decide the need to release the reserve greenfield allocations in phases 2 and 3.

7.2.5 Monitoring information will be published twice yearly in Housing Land Monitors relating to the position at 31 March and 30 September. These documents will cover rates of house building; the stock of land available in outstanding planning permissions and allocations at the reference date; the brownfield: greenfield make-up of the stock; projections of future output in the light of these stocks and of past trends; and other matters relevant to the housing land supply. The Monitors will be posted on the Council web site and also be available on demand. Meetings to discuss the results of monitoring will be held with the development industry if appropriate.

These recommendations are broadly accepted within policy H3 of the plan, reworded as follows:
H3 THE DELIVERY OF HOUSING LAND RELEASE WILL BE CONTROLLED IN THREE PHASES:

PHASE 1 : 2003-2008

PHASE 2 : AFTER PHASE 1 (PROVISIONALLY 2008-2012), WHEN AND IF EXISTING HOUSING LAND SUPPLY IS DEMONSTRABLY SHORT

PHASE 3 : AFTER PHASE 2 (PROVISIONALLY 2012-2016), WHEN AND IF EXISTING HOUSING LAND SUPPLY IS DEMONSTRABLY SHORT

EACH PHASE WILL COMPRISE THREE COMPONENTS OF SUPPLY:

A : LAND ALLOCATED FOR HOUSING IN THIS PLAN

B: UNALLOCATED LAND (WINDFALL SITES) GIVEN PLANNING PERMISSION UNDER THE TERMS OF POLICY H4 IN THE MAIN AND SMALLER URBAN AREAS

C: UNALLOCATED LAND (WINDFALL SITES) GIVEN PLANNING PERMISSION UNDER THE TERMS OF POLICY H4 OUTSIDE THE MAIN AND SMALLER URBAN AREAS

THE ESTIMATED DWELLING YIELD FROM THESE SOURCES IN EACH PHASE IS SUMMARISED IN THE TABLE BELOW

[see text for this table]

TABLES SHOWING THE ALLOCATED SITES IN EACH PHASE, THEIR ESTIMATED CAPACITIES AND ASSUMED PERIODS OF DEVELOPMENT ARE GIVEN AT THE END OF THIS SECTION. THESE TABLES ARE PART OF POLICY H3.

[see text for this table]

The re-worded policy incorporates several presentational changes and some adjustments of sense. Chief of these, and the reasons for making them, are:

1. The references to phase periods in the early part of the policy are amended to make it clear that the periods are provisional, as anticipated by the Inspector, e.g. at para 7.53 of his report.
2. The sources of supply in each phase are listed in the same order, so that each

<u>SITE</u>	<u>AREA [HA]</u>	<u>CAPACITY</u>
GREENLEA ROAD, YEADON	1.06	30-45
GRIMES DYKE,WHINMOOR H4.8]	17.2	515-860
RED HALL [H4.6]	3.6	110-180
SEACROFT HOSPITAL	17.6	530-880
BRUNTCLIFFE ROAD, MORLEY	5.0	180-250
DAISY HILL, MORLEY	2.9	100-150
CHURCH LANE, ADEL	2.5	70-125
PUDSEY ROAD, SWINNOW	1.3	40-55
DELPH END, PUDSEY	1.4	40-55
POTTERY LANE, WOODLESFORD	2.5	105-175

ELSEWHERE (I.E. OUTSIDE THE DEFINED MAIN URBAN AREA, AND ON GREENFIELD SITES) PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT WILL BE CONSIDERED AGAINST POLICY H4

PHASE 3 : 2012-16

PHASE 3 SHOULD FOLLOW A SIMILAR PATTERN TO PHASES 1 AND 2 AND INCLUDE EAST LEEDS EXTENSION AND H3-3 SITES MODIFIED TO INCLUDE EAST OF OTLEY AND MICKLEFIELD SITES.

k. inclusion in the accompanying explanatory text of any necessary justification for the proposals in Phase 1 [including for the remaining Phase 1B sites of Hunslet Riverside and Holbeck Urban Village]. Reference should also be made to the preparation of planning briefs or other masterplans for their development.

l. inclusion for each Phase of a tabulation of the anticipated total, and annual number, of dwellings which each site and element of each Phase is expected to deliver.

3.

a. to include the lists of phased sites proposed to be within H3-1 to H3-3 and the table on p. 40 of RDUDP as part of recommended tabulations in recommended Policy H3. They should be modified to include, for each phase, details of each site area, dwellings capacity and/or numbers of dwellings permitted, and anticipated yield within the relevant phase of the Plan. The figures should be totalled and summarised [as in the table on p.40 of RDUDP] at the end of the explanatory text. It should be explained that the capacity figures given are not maxima but indicative only and that the numbers of dwellings built may vary.

b. to refer to the preparation of development briefs or masterplans for

subcategory A always refers to allocations, B to H4 windfall in the MUA/SUAs and C to H4 windfall elsewhere. Further subdivisions are used within category A, to distinguish particular sub-classes of allocations (e.g. Strategic Sites). This means that the components of supply in each phase can be specified just once, without having to be repeated under each phase.

3. The descriptions of the make-up of each category of supply are amended, particularly to make it clear that apart from allocations, all other land will come forward under the provisions of policy H4. The reference to greenfield sites in the final clause of the Inspector's recommendation is deleted, as it is clear from paras 7.99 – 7.100 of his report that the Inspector does not intend policy H4 to be construed as inviting applications for greenfield windfall development even on a small scale.
4. Summary tables of sources of supply and of individual allocations are incorporated into the policy to meet recommendations made elsewhere.
5. The capacity ranges proposed by the Inspector for the phase 2 allocations are discarded in favour of the lower end of his suggested ranges. This is for consistency with all other allocation capacities, and for ease of presentation and monitoring. All capacities are indicative only, as emphasised by the Inspector, e.g. in para 3a of his recommendations, so there is no harm in using a single working assumption for each site.

Justification for the strategic sites is given in paras 7.3.5 and 7.3.6 of the text. There is no need to refer to briefs or masterplans here. Any such requirements are dealt with in the Area chapters of the plan.

The summary table built into the text of policy H3 gives the assumed yield from each of the three sources of supply, by single years within each phase.

The above summary table is a revised version of that referred to by the Inspector, and fulfils his requirements. The separate listing of allocated sites gives site areas, estimated capacities and possible yields by single years as also required by this recommendation. Explanatory notes attached to the table, as well as para 7.2.6 make it clear that capacities are indicative only.

Any requirement for briefs or masterplans is dealt with in the Area chapters of the plan.

<p>certain sites [such as Hunslet Riverside, Holbeck Urban Village and the East Leeds Extension] in the explanatory text accompanying each phase.</p> <p>c. to include the sentence “In accordance with PPG3, the sites allocated in Policy H3 provide in excess of the 5 year land supply requirement” at the end of the explanatory text relating to the 3 Phases.</p> <p>4. to include the content of para. 7.3.4 amended to relate to a revised Policy H4 as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. Proposals for housing on land not specifically identified for that purpose in the UDP will be considered against Policy H4:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">H4: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON SITES NOT IDENTIFIED FOR THAT PURPOSE IN THE UDP BUT WHICH LIE WITHIN THE MAIN AND SMALLER URBAN AREAS AS DEFINED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, OR ARE OTHERWISE IN A DEMONSTRABLY SUSTAINABLE LOCATION, WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IS ACCEPTABLE IN SEQUENTIAL TERMS, IS CLEARLY WITHIN THE CAPACITY OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED INFRASTRUCTURE, AND COMPLIES WITH ALL OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES OF THE UDP.</p> <p>5. otherwise section 7.3 of the AUDP should be deleted without replacement by the remainder of Alteration 7/003.</p> <p><u>PA 7/004 JUSTIFICATION FOR HOUSING POLICIES</u></p> <p>6. in accordance with RD Alteration 7/004 subject to its amendment to reflect my specific recommendations, and in particular:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. addition of “and by RSS” to 7.4.1.1;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b. deletion of East of Otley, Thorp Arch Trading Estate and Micklefield in para. 7.4.1.4;</p>	<p>This text is inserted in para 7.2.7</p> <p>This text is inserted at para 7.2.13 The following additional explanatory text is also added: “7.2.14 In this policy, acceptability in sequential terms is a reference to the principles set out in paragraphs 29-34 of PPG3 “Housing” (March 2000 edition), particularly paragraph 32 which says that there is a presumption that previously-developed sites should be developed before greenfield sites except in exceptional circumstances. This criterion is expected to mean that only brownfield sites will normally be acceptable under the terms of H4.</p> <p>7.2.15 Although most H4 sites will be in the Main and Smaller Urban areas, proposals are also likely to be acceptable in other locations which are demonstrably sustainable. Judgements will be made on the basis of consideration of the availability and frequency of bus and train services to service centres, and on the range of services available locally, including shops, health facilities and schools. It is likely that proposals will be acceptable in S2 service centres not within the MUA/SUAs, as well as some other settlements with a lesser but still adequate range of facilities, provided the other provisions of H4 are also satisfied.”</p> <p>This text is added to help clarify the meaning of policy H4, which would otherwise stand alone. The first paragraph explains the meaning of a key clause of the policy which might not otherwise be readily understood by those unfamiliar with the expression “sequential terms” or its source. The second paragraph gives pointers to identifying other “demonstrably sustainable locations”, a phrase introduced by the Inspector but not further explained. It draws on his discussion of the factors which lead him to conclude that site H3-2A.7 (Church Lane, Adel) was in a sustainable location and hence appropriate for inclusion as a phase 2 allocation (Alteration 18/006).</p> <p>Section 7.3 is amended as specified above and any residual elements of Alteration 7/003 are discarded. However, additional material is inserted to explain the operation of policy H3 and to introduce the trigger mechanisms advised by the Inspector under recommendations 7 and 8. These are considered under recommendations 7 and 8 below.</p> <p>This section deals with the justification for the plan strategy, as distinct from an explanation of how the strategy is intended to work. It has had to be completely re-written, for reasons explained below, but first the Council’s response to the Inspector’s individual recommendations is set out.</p> <p>This phrase is added to the first sentence of para 7.3.1</p> <p>All references to strategic sites now exclude these sites</p>
---	--

<p>c. expansion of the justification, in terms of Government guidance, for Allerton Bywater and Sharp Lane Middleton being “Strategic Housing Sites”;</p> <p>d. renaming Holbeck Urban Village and Hunslet Riverside “Strategic Housing and Mixed-use Sites”;</p> <p>e. amendment of 7.4.1.5 to reflect my recommendations with regard to East Leeds Extension;</p> <p>f. amendment of the figures in para. 7.4.2 and text in 7.4.2a and b. to accord with my recommendations for modifications to housing allocations and to take into account the revised figures and table submitted as IC/009;</p> <p>g. including in para. 7.4.2 fuller explanation of the reasons for the generous provision of land, the fact that PMM will regulate its release, and clarification of how the residual requirement to be met in later phases follows on from allocations and windfall assumptions made at earlier stages in the process.</p> <p>h. deleting all after the first sentence in RD para. 7.4.6 and substituting: “Reflecting the sequential approach advocated by PPG3, a number of sites could be brought forward, if required, as sustainable urban extensions which could take advantage of existing physical and social infrastructure within the existing urban area, and have good access to public transport services, jobs, schools, shopping and leisure facilities. Their limited size would also enable development to take place at fairly short notice. In the longer term it will be necessary to consider a larger extension. The opportunities available to the north-east edge of the City, combined with the significant environmental constraints elsewhere and the need to prevent coalescence of existing settlements, indicate that this is in principle a suitable area for such an extension.”</p> <p>i. deleting “for a Phase 3 should this prove necessary” from para. 7.4.7.</p>	<p>Justification is included in para 7.3.7</p> <p>These sites are re-titled where relevant.</p> <p>The Inspector’s recommended references to this site are included in para 7.3.6</p> <p>The summary table that formed part of RDUDP 7.4.2 has been re-located to the body of policy H3, since it is just a more summarised version of the table which was called for under recommendation 2l. There seems no point in having two levels of summarised data. The figures in this summary table differ from those in RDUDP 7.4.2 because they reflect the Inspector’s recommended changes – notably, the deletion of the Thorp Arch proposal, the substitution of the Inspector’s capacities for the new phase 2 allocations (these are slightly higher than those used before), and the revised estimates of windfall given in IC/009. The explanatory text in RDUDP paras 7.4.2, 7.4.2a and 7.4.2b is replaced by a much shorter statement of the new basis of the figures in para 7.3.3</p> <p>An explanation of the “generous provision of land” is given in paras 7.3.4 and 7.3.5. The remainder of this recommendation is more concerned with explanation of the plan’s strategy and the operation of its policies, than with their justification, and is therefore dealt with in section 7.2 of the modified text. This additional expository material is considered under recommendations 7 and 8.</p> <p>The sense of this alteration, with minor wording changes to fit into the adjoining text, is included in para 7.3.6</p> <p>The essential point of this paragraph is now subsumed within paras 7.3.1 and 7.3.2.</p> <p>The whole of RDUDP section 7.4 has been re-written as section 7.3, both to incorporate the</p>
--	--

	<p>7. to include the phasing trigger mechanism as described in LCC/001, Ax. 2, “Guidelines for Controlling Housing Land Release” as a subsection of Policy H3 subject to:</p> <p>a. description of the three “criteria” for undersupply as indicators, rather than criteria, upon which a considered judgement would be made at each Monitoring Point after examining all the information in the HLMs, including the necessary lead-in times for the phased sites;</p> <p>b. explanation of the mechanism in the above terms;</p> <p>c. replacement in criterion i). in the sections on undersupply of 20% by 10% and reduction of the period from 3 to 2 years;</p> <p>d. rewording of criterion i). in relation to oversupply to read: “average completions during 3 years prior to the MP exceeding the average annual rate by 20%”;</p> <p>e. description of the two “criteria” for oversupply, as amended by d. above, as indicators rather than criteria upon which a considered judgement should be made at each Monitoring Point;</p> <p>8. to include a trigger mechanism to ensure that greenfield sites within Phase 2 are only released if the stock of available housing land, and anticipated brownfield windfall, are demonstrably inadequate to meet defined housing needs; together with the indicators to be used as a basis for a decision;</p>	<p>Inspector’s recommendations and to clarify the text. Much of the content is in any case superseded (the basis of the figures has changed, the summary table appears elsewhere in the text, references to phases are out of date). There is also scope for compression without loss of meaning. Although the text could theoretically be patched up without fundamental change, this would be at the cost of continuity and readability and is not a desirable option.</p> <p>The UDP housing land strategy and the role of the phasing trigger mechanisms in it are set out in paras 7.2.7 – 7.2.12 of the revised text. The Inspector conditionally endorses the mechanisms described in LCC/001, but adds a fifth mechanism to control the release of greenfield allocations in phases 2 and 3. The Council considers that this additional mechanism duplicates or supersedes three of the original mechanisms, and so retains only the Inspector’s mechanism, and a mechanism for dealing with severe over supply. The reasons for this decision are explained more fully in the covering report.</p> <p>Paras 7.2.10 and 7.2.12 explain that the measures are indicators of the probable need for action rather than criteria which irrevocably trigger the related action.</p> <p>As above, paras 7.2.10 and 7.2.12 cover this point.</p> <p>The undersupply measure is superseded by the Inspector’s new measure for controlling the release of greenfield allocations and is no longer required. However, this clause is incorporated in a modified version of the Inspector’s new mechanism.</p> <p>This measure is superseded by the Inspector’s new measure for controlling the release of greenfield allocations and is no longer required.</p> <p>This wording is used to describe the surviving measures defined in paras 7.2.10 and 7.2.12.</p> <p>This trigger mechanism is set out in para 7.2.10 and takes the following form. “The main indicators of shortage will be if the average completion rate in the two years preceding the Monitor is over 10% below the H1 requirement and if the supply of land – defined as unused allocations from the last phase plus outstanding permissions for dwellings on sites for 5 or more dwellings - amounts to less than a two years’ supply at the H1 rate.” The indicators are a combination of the Inspector’s recommendation for the treatment of completions in the Council’s original under supply proposals (recommendation 7c) with the current supply component of his new mechanism. The Inspector did not propose a completions clause in his new mechanism, but the Council considers this necessary because otherwise it would theoretically be possible to build no dwellings but still avoid the need to release allocations, if the current supply was adequate. The Inspector had endorsed reference to completions in the superseded measures originally proposed. The measurement of supply is also limited to readily verifiable sources of land, that is outstanding allocations and planning permissions. Although windfall will almost</p>
--	--	--

	<p>9. a. to include definition of “Main and Smaller Urban Areas” as defined on Plan M/096 but including Otley and Wetherby as Smaller Urban Areas and to exclude Garforth, Boston Spa and Kippax.</p> <p>b. consequent amendment of Main Urban Area to read “Main and Smaller Urban Areas”, where the name occurs.</p>	<p>certainly come forward in the future, estimating the amount is inherently speculative, and to include future windfall would reduce the transparency and objectivity of the release mechanism. It is also made clear that the mechanism will be used in phase 3 as well as phase 2 as clearly intended by the Inspector (see e.g. para 7.93 of his report) although not specifically said in his recommendation.</p> <p>This definition is included in the second bullet point of para 7.2.1.</p> <p>This change is made where the name occurs.</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 7/006</p>	<p><u>PA 7/006</u> <u>AFFORDABLE HOUSING (TARGETS FOR STRATEGIC SITES)</u></p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para 7.145, I recommend that the last sentence of para. 7.6.19 of the AUDP be modified to refer to 25% of all new houses being affordable.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council agrees with the Inspectors overall conclusion that 50% affordable housing targets for the two Strategic Housing Sites in the Rural North of Leeds are unjustified but rejects the Inspector’s recommendation to replace the affordable housing target range of 15-25% for the whole district with a single target figure of 25%. The target percentage for the delivery of affordable housing for the whole of Leeds was not part of the City Council’s UDP Review proposals, and the evidence put forward was never intended to justify change to that overall target range of 15 – 25%. The City Council believes that a comprehensive assessment of housing need and a comprehensive review of affordable housing policy should be the basis for changing the overall UDP target.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reverting to the original AUDP wording. Deleting the following from para 7.6.19, “For the strategic sites of East of Otley and Thorp Arch, indicative targets of 50% affordable housing are set. These are justified on the basis that housing need in the Rural North of Leeds exceeds potential supply by a large margin”. <p>The original and retained wording for para 7.6.19 is as follows:</p> <p>7.6.19 Despite the efforts of the Leeds Partnership Homes Scheme these recent trends suggest a growing problem. The scale of need for affordable housing can be expected to grow at a far greater rate than the increased need for housing generally throughout the District over the UDP period. Current levels provide a guide only of a minimum overall requirement for future provision. By expressing these figures as a proportion of overall housing need for the Plan period, a measure may be obtained of the "average" level of provision for affordable housing, District-wide, which should be sought from individual sites. Section 7.2 and 7.3 established the overall need for 28,500 dwellings in the period 1991 to 2006, of which 2,300 had already been built. A further 4,560 have planning permission (Policy H3A). This leaves 21,600 which will need to be built. As a reasonable target, if affordable housing is to be constructed by the end of the Plan period which at least matches the scale of the priority homeless categories indicated in Table 2, on average some 15 - 25 % of all new houses built should be "affordable".</p>

<p>Prop. Alt. 7/007</p>	<p><u>PA 7/007</u> <u>AFFORDABLE HOUSING (SITE DEVELOPMENT THRESHOLDS)</u></p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para. 7.156 I recommend that the UDP be not modified in accordance with FD Alteration 7/007</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 7.156 to modify the First Alteration of the UDP Review and revert to the wording of the Adopted UDP.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reverting to the original AUDP wording. Deleting from para 7.6.20 "except in the Rural North of Leeds (as defined on the Proposals Map) where affordable housing will not be sought on developments of less than 10 dwellings. This is justified on the basis that housing need in this area exceeds potential supply by a large margin, and that site availability, with the exception of the two strategic sites, is very limited" <p>The original and retained wording of para 7.6.20 will therefore read as follows:</p> <p>7.6.20 It is reasonable for consideration of the provision of affordable housing on all qualifying sites to relate to this "average" requirement as a starting point, or initial benchmark but the exact proportion of affordable housing to be provided on each site would be determined according to Policy H12. Affordable housing will not be sought on the smaller sites which fall below the general size thresholds of 25 dwellings or 1 ha. In rural areas of 3000 population or less affordable housing will be sought according to local assessment of housing need and land supply. Therefore:</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 7/008 7/008/RD</p>	<p><u>PA 7/008</u> <u>STUDENT HOUSING</u></p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 7.203, I recommend that the UDP be modified by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> incorporating paras. 7.6.28 – 7.6.30 of the supporting text of RD Alteration 7/008 subject to the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> updating the second sentence of para. 7.6.28 to reflect the latest available information on past growth in student numbers and future projections; deleting the final two sentences of para. 7.6.28 and substituting the following: "The fact that large numbers of properties in and around Headingley are let to students inevitably puts pressure on the housing stock available for other sectors of the population and reduces that suitable for families. This encourages the view that the population overall is out of balance and that action is needed to ensure a sustainable community." inserting the following at the end of para. 7.6.29: "It is not suggested that all these problems are solely 	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council rejects the Inspector's recommendations in part. The City Council accepts all of the Inspectors recommendations with the exception of the re-wording of Policy H15A involving listing the areas of Leeds where student housing developments will be promoted. The Council thinks that the process of identifying and agreeing such areas with stakeholders will take too long, will hold up adoption of the Plan, and would be better achieved through preparation of the Local Development Framework's Area Action Plans.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changing the purpose of the area policy (Policy H15) to that of managing provision of student housing development to maintain a diverse housing stock that will cater for all sectors of the population, including families Revising the wording of Policy H15 as recommended by the Inspector Revising the wording of the supporting text as recommended by the Inspector to reflect the purpose of Policy H15 and to update figures illustrating student housing growth Changing the wording of Policy H15A as recommended by the Inspector, with the exception of not listing areas of Leeds where student housing developments will be promoted Changing the title of Plan M/071 to "Area of Housing Mix" and amending the boundary to include Kirkstall Hill, Beckett Park Campus, Lawnswood and Moor Grange <p><u>The modified plan will read as follows:</u></p>

attributable to the presence of students, or that all students create such problems. Nor are the majority of them capable of being solved directly through planning powers. Nevertheless they are particularly associated with a high concentration of student occupancy, and planning has an important role in reducing and managing them through working to ensure that the community as a whole is well balanced and sustainable for the long term.”

2. deleting paras. 7.6.31 – 7.6.31b of the supporting text and inserting the following:

“Area of Housing Mix

Planning control over student housing is limited because a change from a family dwelling to one occupied by students living together as a household does not generally require planning permission. Accordingly it is only purpose-built student housing, extensions to existing properties occupied by students and changes of use that will require permission.

Within these limitations the Council will use its development control powers to manage provision of additional student housing as far as possible so as to maintain a diverse housing stock that will cater for all sectors of the population including families. It will also encourage proposals for purpose-built student housing, specifically reserved and managed for that purpose, that will improve the total stock of student accommodation, relieve pressure on conventional housing and assist in regenerating areas in decline or at risk of decline. This approach will apply within an Area of Housing Mix covering Headingley, Hyde Park, Burley and Woodhouse where students form a significant part of the population, together with the adjoining areas of Moor Grange and Lawnswood where pressure is likely for further student housing.

The Council will also work with the universities and with providers of student accommodation to agree a student housing strategy for the Area which will aim to strike a balance between this and other forms of housing; to set out Headingley’s role in terms of accommodating student housing and to progressively improve the student housing stock.”

3. deleting Policy H15 and inserting the following:

WITHIN THE AREA OF HOUSING MIX PLANNING
PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR HOUSING
INTENDED FOR OCCUPATION BY STUDENTS, OR FOR

Student Housing

7.6.28 Over the last decade there has been a city-wide increase in the private rented sector from 7 to 12% of total dwellings, but Headingley and adjoining areas have experienced a far greater increase than comparable inner areas of Leeds because of the growth in student numbers. The number of full time students in Leeds has risen from 22,000 in 1991 to 40,000 in 2005 and it is estimated that this will grow by another 5000 over the UDP Review period. This growth brings benefits to Leeds in terms of widening educational opportunity, injection of spending power into the local economy, enhancement of the City’s academic status and contribution to the City’s culture. However, the uneven distribution of the resulting student population poses a serious problem. Headingley has proved to be the most popular location for students because of proximity to Universities, location of existing halls of residence, shops, pubs and that it is perceived to be an attractive & safe area. The fact that large numbers of properties in and around Headingley are let to students inevitably puts pressure on the housing stock available for other sectors of the population and reduces that suitable for families. This encourages the view that the population overall is out of balance and that action is needed to ensure a sustainable community.

7.6.29 Problems associated with concentrations of student housing include:

- short term residency engenders a lack of community integration and creates problems of service delivery
- dwelling to dwelling noise from neighbours,
- late night street noise and disturbance from revellers returning home
- unsightliness of preponderance of to-let boards
- house appearances neglected by unconscientious landlords
- garden planting replaced by inert surfaces giving an unattractive appearance to streetscenes
- dumping of house clearance material at the end of term
- pressure for greater provision of establishments catering for night time entertainment and consequent detrimental impact on residential amenity
- gradually self-reinforcing unpopularity of area for families wishing to bring up children and consequent surplus of local school places
- transient population reduces the ability to self-police and avert crime

It is not suggested that all these problems are solely attributable to the presence of students, or that all students create such problems. Nor are the majority of them capable of being solved directly through planning powers. Nevertheless they are particularly associated with a high concentration of student occupancy, and planning has an important role in reducing and managing them through working to ensure that the community as a whole is well balanced and sustainable for the long term.

7.6.30 There has long been concern about the over-concentration of students living in the wider Headingley area and recognition that the issue of population imbalance as well as the various problems it generates need to be tackled in a multi-disciplinary way and in

<p>THE ALTERATION, EXTENSION OR REDEVELOPMENT OF ACCOMMODATION CURRENTLY SO OCCUPIED WHERE:</p> <p>i) THE STOCK OF HOUSING ACCOMMODATION, INCLUDING THAT AVAILABLE FOR FAMILY OCCUPATION, WOULD NOT BE UNACCEPTABLY REDUCED IN TERMS OF QUANTITY AND VARIETY;</p> <p>ii) THERE WOULD BE NO UNACCEPTABLE EFFECTS ON NEIGHBOURS' LIVING CONDITIONS INCLUDING THROUGH INCREASED ACTIVITY, OR NOISE AND DISTURBANCE, EITHER FROM THE PROPOSAL ITSELF OR COMBINED WITH EXISTING SIMILAR ACCOMMODATION;</p> <p>iii) THE SCALE AND CHARACTER OF THE PROPOSAL WOULD BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE SURROUNDING AREA;</p> <p>iv) SATISFACTORY PROVISION WOULD BE MADE FOR CAR PARKING; AND</p> <p>v) THE PROPOSAL WOULD IMPROVE THE QUALITY OR VARIETY OF THE STOCK OF STUDENT HOUSING.</p> <p>THE AREA OF HOUSING MIX IS IDENTIFIED UNDER POLICY R1 AS AN AREA POLICY INITIATIVE WHERE THE COUNCIL WILL WORK WITH THE UNIVERSITIES, PROVIDERS OF STUDENT ACCOMMODATION AND THE LOCAL COMMUNITY TO DRAW UP A STUDENT HOUSING STRATEGY. SO FAR AS IS POSSIBLE IN PLANNING TERMS THAT STRATEGY WILL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MANAGE PROVISION OF NEW STUDENT ACCOMMODATION SO AS TO MAINTAIN A REASONABLE BALANCE WITH OTHER TYPES OF HOUSING • SEEK PROGRESSIVE IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDENT HOUSING STOCK • IDENTIFY OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROVISION OF PURPOSE-BUILT AND MANAGED STUDENT HOUSING THAT WOULD REDUCE PRESSURE ON THE REST OF THE HOUSING STOCK. <p>4. incorporating para. 7.6.31c of the RD supporting text;</p> <p>5. deleting Policy H15A and inserting:</p>	<p>partnership with other relevant bodies. A number of Council services have a part to play particularly Environmental Health, Housing, Street Cleansing, Licencing and Planning, but also the Universities and landlords. The objective has to be better planning and management of the growth of students coming to study in Leeds. This section deals with planning policy to control the growth of the student population in the wider Headingley area and measures to disperse students to other appropriate parts of the City. In essence, the overall objective will be to achieve a more mixed population which is inclusive and sustainable. In addition, there is a commitment to address the problems associated with the concentration of students in the area identified in paragraph 7.6.29 above. This commitment is reflected generally in the second part of Policy H15 which provides a starting point for area based work to develop detailed proposals and projects in co-operation with stakeholders.</p> <p>Area of Housing Mix</p> <p>7.6.31 Planning control over student housing is limited because a change from a family dwelling to one occupied by students living together as a household does not generally require planning permission. Accordingly it is only purpose-built student housing, extensions to existing properties occupied by students and changes of use that will require permission.</p> <p>7.6.31a Within these limitations the Council will use its development control powers to manage provision of additional student housing as far as possible so as to maintain a diverse housing stock that will cater for all sectors of the population including families. It will also encourage proposals for purpose-built student housing, specifically reserved and managed for that purpose, that will improve the total stock of student accommodation, relieve pressure on conventional housing and assist in regenerating areas in decline or at risk of decline. This approach will apply within an Area of Housing Mix covering Headingley, Hyde Park, Burley and Woodhouse where students form a significant part of the population, together with the adjoining areas of Moor Grange and Lawnswood where pressure is likely for further student housing.</p> <p>7.6.31b The Council will also work with the universities and with providers of student accommodation to agree a student housing strategy for the Area which will aim to strike a balance between this and other forms of housing; to set out Headingley's role in terms of accommodating student housing and to progressively improve the student housing stock.</p> <p>POLICY H15</p> <p>WITHIN THE AREA OF HOUSING MIX PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR HOUSING INTENDED FOR OCCUPATION BY STUDENTS, OR FOR THE ALTERATION, EXTENSION OR REDEVELOPMENT OF ACCOMMODATION CURRENTLY SO OCCUPIED WHERE:</p> <p>i) THE STOCK OF HOUSING ACCOMMODATION, INCLUDING THAT AVAILABLE FOR FAMILY OCCUPATION, WOULD NOT BE UNACCEPTABLY</p>
--	---

	<p>STUDENT HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS WILL BE PROMOTED IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS, WHERE THE COUNCIL WILL WORK WITH THE UNIVERSITIES AND WITH ACCOMMODATION PROVIDERS TO IDENTIFY AND BRING FORWARD FOR DEVELOPMENT SITES THAT WOULD SATISFY THE CRITERIA SET OUT BELOW:</p> <p><i>Council to insert locations following discussions with the universities and accommodation providers.</i></p> <p>AND IN OTHER LOCATIONS, WHERE PROPOSALS WOULD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) HAVE GOOD CONNECTIONS BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT TO THE UNIVERSITIES, EITHER EXISTING OR TO BE PROVIDED TO SERVE THE DEVELOPMENT; OR BE CLOSE ENOUGH TO ENABLE EASY TRAVEL ON FOOT OR BY CYCLE; ii) BE ATTRACTIVE TO STUDENTS TO LIVE AND OF SUFFICIENT SCALE TO FORM A VIABLE STUDENT COMMUNITY, EITHER IN THEMSELVES OR IN ASSOCIATION WITH OTHER DEVELOPMENTS; iii) BE WELL INTEGRATED INTO THE SURROUNDING AREA IN TERMS OF SCALE, CHARACTER AND ASSOCIATED SERVICES AND FACILITIES; iv) CONTRIBUTE DIRECTLY TO THE REGENERATION OF THE SURROUNDING AREA, PREFERABLY AS PART OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROPOSALS; AND v) NOT UNACCEPTABLY AFFECT THE QUALITY, QUANTITY OR VARIETY OF THE LOCAL HOUSING STOCK. <p>6. incorporating Plan M/071, amended to include Kirkstall Hill, Beckett Park Campus, Lawnswood and Moor Grange [as shown in S/21770 etc.] and retitled "Area of Housing Mix".</p>	<p>REDUCED IN TERMS OF QUANTITY AND VARIETY;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) THERE WOULD BE NO UNACCEPTABLE EFFECTS ON NEIGHBOURS' LIVING CONDITIONS INCLUDING THROUGH INCREASED ACTIVITY, OR NOISE AND DISTURBANCE, EITHER FROM THE PROPOSAL ITSELF OR COMBINED WITH EXISTING SIMILAR ACCOMMODATION; iii) THE SCALE AND CHARACTER OF THE PROPOSAL WOULD BE COMPATIBLE WITH THE SURROUNDING AREA; iv) SATISFACTORY PROVISION WOULD BE MADE FOR CAR PARKING; AND v) THE PROPOSAL WOULD IMPROVE THE QUALITY OR VARIETY OF THE STOCK OF STUDENT HOUSING. <p>7.6.31c The area of housing mix is identified under policy R1 as an area policy initiative where the council will work with the universities, providers of student accommodation and the local community to draw up a student housing strategy. so far as is possible in planning terms that strategy will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • manage provision of new student accommodation so as to maintain a reasonable balance with other types of housing • seek progressive improvement of the student housing stock • identify opportunities for provision of purpose-built and managed student housing that would reduce pressure on the rest of the housing stock. <p>7.6.31d Outside of the Area of Housing Mix, students make up a small fraction of the population. This is beginning to change in the City Centre where a number of student accommodation schemes are materialising. Significant potential exists for further student housing provision in the City Centre and in locations elsewhere. To be successful, such provision will need to be well served by public transport connections to the Universities, have the potential to appeal to students and be capable of being assimilated into the existing neighbourhood without nuisance. The City Council will encourage and support pioneer developments in such locations to help establish a critical mass of student presence and, ultimately, generate alternative popular locations for students to live, other than the wider Headingley area. In order to boost the attractiveness of developments in new locations and counter negative perceptions of insecurity, there will be a need for good design, and measures such as good lighting, CCTV, secure parking, good visibility, and habitable room windows overlooking spaces to provide natural surveillance. Consideration should extend beyond the boundaries of the site to ensure that the development integrates into the neighbourhood and enhances security for all.</p> <p>Policy H15A</p> <p>THE COUNCIL WILL WORK WITH THE UNIVERSITIES AND WITH</p>
--	--	---

		<p>ACCOMMODATION PROVIDERS TO PROMOTE STUDENT HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS IN OTHER AREAS BY IDENTIFYING AND BRINGING FORWARD FOR DEVELOPMENT SITES THAT WOULD SATISFY THE CRITERIA SET OUT BELOW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) HAVE GOOD CONNECTIONS BY PUBLIC TRANSPORT TO THE UNIVERSITIES, EITHER EXISTING OR TO BE PROVIDED TO SERVE THE DEVELOPMENT; OR BE CLOSE ENOUGH TO ENABLE EASY TRAVEL ON FOOT OR BY CYCLE; ii) BE ATTRACTIVE TO STUDENTS TO LIVE AND OF SUFFICIENT SCALE TO FORM A VIABLE STUDENT COMMUNITY, EITHER IN THEMSELVES OR IN ASSOCIATION WITH OTHER DEVELOPMENTS; iii) BE WELL INTEGRATED INTO THE SURROUNDING AREA IN TERMS OF SCALE, CHARACTER AND ASSOCIATED SERVICES AND FACILITIES; iv) CONTRIBUTE DIRECTLY TO THE REGENERATION OF THE SURROUNDING AREA, PREFERABLY AS PART OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROPOSALS; AND v) NOT UNACCEPTABLY AFFECT THE QUALITY, QUANTITY OR VARIETY OF THE LOCAL HOUSING STOCK.
<p>Prop. Alt. 7/009</p>	<p>PA 7/009 POLICIES H18 AND H19</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para. 7.206 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration 7/009</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 7.206 not to modify the First Alteration of the UDP Review.</p> <p>Proposed Modification None</p>

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 Housing issues are amongst the most important, and certainly the most contentious, of those considered by the UDP. The UDP's key strategic aim here is:

SA3: to make adequate provision for the community's housing needs during the Plan period, ensuring that development is sustainable, and contributes through good design to the quality of the built environment. This will involve the identification of sufficient land for new dwellings in sustainable locations, targeting of provision for social housing need groups, and support for renewal of the existing stock.

7.1.2 Although the UDP cannot ensure directly that a certain number of houses are built or improved, it has a key role in enabling provision – by identifying land for house-building (sections 7.2 -7.3 below). Attention must also be given to the needs of special groups, such as elderly people, those on low incomes, students, travellers and travelling show people, who might not be adequately provided for by the operation of the housing market (section 7.6). A clear lead is also given by identifying the areas where renewal activities should be concentrated (section 7.7). The issues of houses in multiple occupation, residential institutions and standards in new housing developments are covered in section 7.8

Land for housing

7.1.3 The overall requirement for housing in Leeds has already been established in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for Yorkshire and the Humber (published originally as Regional Planning Guidance in October 2001, but elevated into RSS in September 2004). The RSS is part of the statutory development plan for Leeds and its housing provision policies are mandatory. RSS requires provision to be made in Leeds for an average of 1930 dwellings a year over the period 1998-2016. The scale of provision reflects both demographic forecasts and policy decisions about the required scale of development for each authority area in the Region. Over the period covered by the housing land policies of this plan (2003-16), this requirement equates to an aggregate need for 25090 dwellings. This is the main benchmark against which the adequacy of sources of housing land supply should be judged.

7.1.4 That said, the object of housing land policy is not simply to predict requirements and then provide land to meet them. PPG3 Housing now requires authorities to adopt the principles of “Plan, Monitor and Manage” – plan for a particular level of provision, monitor output and manage land release. The objects of management are to ensure not merely that sufficient land is released to meet development plan requirements, but also that previously developed (brownfield) land, if available, is always developed in preference to previously undeveloped (greenfield) land. This sequential approach means that the release of sites (particularly greenfield) can be advanced or delayed in accordance with the results of regular monitoring. This is the approach adopted in this Plan.

- 7.1.5 Guidance on applying the new approach is in PPG3 and the supporting good practice advice notes “Tapping the Potential” and “Planning to Deliver”. The first of these recommends that planning authorities undertake Urban Capacity Studies to help identify the potential for development on re-cycled land. RSS also focuses on the importance of prioritising the use of brownfield land, setting local authority specific targets. An Urban Capacity Study has now been carried out for Leeds, and will be kept under review. Its conclusions have been taken into account in the strategy for the release of housing land contained in the UDP, which reflect the substantial potential that the Urban Capacity Study reveals.
- 7.1.6 In addition to following the advice given by national and regional guidance, the City Council has also shown its commitment to maximising the proportion of housing achieved on brownfield sites by signing a “Local Public Service Agreement” with the Government to achieve so-called “stretched targets” (higher than expected) for the rate of brownfield use in the period to 2004/5. It is anticipated that the strategy proposed here will maintain the rate of use of brownfield sites at a level in excess of Government targets throughout the Review plan period.

7.2 PHASED RELEASE OF LAND FOR HOUSING

7.2.1 Reflecting these considerations, the following general principles form the basis of the UDP Review strategy:

- The release of land will be managed in three phases running provisionally from 2003-8, 2008-12 and 2012-16. Precise timings will depend on how much land comes forward under policy H4.
- Within these phases most of the City's housing land needs are likely to be met from existing brownfield land reserves, within the Main Urban and Smaller Urban areas, as defined on the Proposals Map. This area consists of the main urban core of Leeds, including Morley, Rothwell, Pudsey, Horsforth and Airborough, together with the freestanding towns of Otley and Wetherby which are identified in RSS as urban areas. Together these areas are the most appropriate locations for development because of their generally good access to shops, work and other facilities and services, and the quality of their public transport links. Historically, they have accounted for over 90% of brownfield development opportunities
- concentration on the main urban areas, combined with phasing to limit opportunities elsewhere and delivered through a "plan, monitor and manage" approach, will result in delivery of brownfield windfall sites consistent with PPG3 advice, and promote sustainable development and urban regeneration;
- assimilation of most housing development in these urban areas will require:
 - very careful consideration of design issues (including appropriate densities of development) as advised through supplementary planning guidance, "Neighbourhoods for Living";
 - the integration of development with transport infrastructure and capacity;
 - the need to maintain and enhance the City's greenspaces, and take full account of the interests of nature conservation;
 - close inter-relationship with the outcomes of regeneration initiatives, as defined elsewhere in the UDP;
- Most development will be on windfall sites not specifically allocated in the plan, but phase 1 also includes site allocations which will be available for development at any time. A number of greenfield allocations are included in phases 2 and 3. These sites form a reserve of land which will only be released if and when monitoring indicates that the housing requirement cannot be met from alternative brownfield sources.
- Strategic Sites are identified in phase 1 at Holbeck Village, Hunslet Riverside, Sharp Lane and Allerton Bywater. These are of key importance in securing local regeneration.
- A fifth Strategic Site, the East Leeds Extension, is identified in phase 3. This is a large greenfield urban extension in an area of Leeds where environmental constraints are less severe and where the coalescence of existing settlements can be avoided. It forms the largest component of the reserve of greenfield allocations identified in phase 3.

- monitoring of development opportunities will be necessary throughout the Review period.

7.2.2 The policies which will implement this strategy are set out below.

H1 PROVISION WILL BE MADE FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE ANNUAL AVERAGE REQUIREMENT IDENTIFIED IN THE REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY [RSS].

7.2.3 This is currently 1,930 dwellings per annum. The adequacy of completions, together with the number of dwellings with planning permission and the supply of sites allocated for development, will be monitored and assessed against the average annual requirement in RSS.

H2 THE COUNCIL WILL UNDERTAKE REGULAR MONITORING OF THE ANNUAL COMPLETIONS OF DWELLINGS WITHIN THE DISTRICT, AS WELL AS THE NUMBER OF DWELLINGS WITH PLANNING PERMISSION AND THE SUPPLY OF SITES ALLOCATED FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.

7.2.4 The purpose of monitoring is to assess whether H1 requirements have been met and can continue to be met in line with the sequential approach. Monitoring information will be used to help manage the phased release of land. In particular, it will provide indicators for a trigger mechanism (see below) which will help decide the need to release the reserve greenfield allocations in phases 2 and 3.

7.2.5 Monitoring information will be published twice yearly in Housing Land Monitors relating to the position at 31 March and 30 September. These documents will cover rates of housebuilding; the stock of land available in outstanding planning permissions and allocations at the reference date; the brownfield:greenfield make-up of the stock; projections of future output in the light of these stocks and of past trends; and other matters relevant to the housing land supply. The Monitors will be posted on the Council web site and also be available on demand. Meetings to discuss the results of monitoring will be held with the development industry if appropriate.

H3 THE DELIVERY OF HOUSING LAND RELEASE WILL BE CONTROLLED IN THREE PHASES:

PHASE 1 : 2003-2008

PHASE 2 : AFTER PHASE 1 (PROVISIONALLY 2008-2012), WHEN AND IF EXISTING HOUSING LAND SUPPLY IS DEMONSTRABLY SHORT

PHASE 3 : AFTER PHASE 2 (PROVISIONALLY 2012-2016), WHEN AND IF EXISTING HOUSING LAND SUPPLY IS DEMONSTRABLY SHORT

EACH PHASE WILL COMPRISE THREE COMPONENTS OF SUPPLY:

A : LAND ALLOCATED FOR HOUSING IN THIS PLAN

B: UNALLOCATED LAND (WINDFALL SITES) GIVEN PLANNING PERMISSION UNDER THE TERMS OF POLICY H4 IN THE MAIN AND SMALLER URBAN AREAS

C: UNALLOCATED LAND (WINDFALL SITES) GIVEN PLANNING PERMISSION UNDER THE TERMS OF POLICY H4 OUTSIDE THE MAIN AND SMALLER URBAN AREAS

THE ESTIMATED DWELLING YIELD FROM THESE SOURCES IN EACH PHASE IS SUMMARISED IN THE TABLE BELOW

Phase and Year	ALLOCATIONS	H4 DEVELOPMENT		TOTAL
		in Main & Smaller Urban areas	Outside Main & Smaller Urban areas	
PHASE 1				
2003-4	500	1900-1910	350	2750-2760
2004-5	449	2340-2430	330-340	3119-3219
2005-6	692	1340-1500	210-230	2242-2422
2006-7	1163	960-1140	230-260	2353-2563
2007-8	1110	1020-1230	240-270	2370-2610
Sub total	3914	7560-8210	1360-1450	12834-13574
PHASE 2				
2008-9	1126	1030-1240	230-270	2386-2636
2009-10	946	1040-1250	230-270	2216-2466
2010-11	801	1050-1270	170-200	2021-2271
2011-12	746	1250-1470	170-210	2166-2426
Sub total	3619	4370-5230	800-950	8789-9799
PHASE 3				
2012-13	901	1210-1430	180-210	2291-2541
2013-14	920	1140-1370	180-210	2240-2500
2014-15	906	1150-1380	180-210	2236-2496
2015-16	912	1160-1390	180-220	2252-2522
Sub total	3639	4660-5570	720-850	9019-10059
ALL PHASES	11172	16590-19010	2880-3250	30642-33432
After 2016	2175			

TABLES SHOWING THE ALLOCATED SITES IN EACH PHASE, THEIR ESTIMATED CAPACITIES AND ASSUMED PERIODS OF DEVELOPMENT ARE GIVEN AT THE END OF THIS SECTION. THESE TABLES ARE PART OF POLICY H3.

- 7.2.6 The capacities and timings in both the summary table above, and the table of allocations below are benchmark planning assumptions, not fixed or enforceable programmes of development. Individual site capacities are neither targets, minima nor maxima, but current working assumptions. Actual output will depend largely on the actions of private developers and on many other trends and factors which cannot be predicted. Further information about the basis of the output estimates is given after the allocations table. Notwithstanding the uncertainties, however, the estimates are considered to represent a sound basis for planning in the light of the available evidence base.
- 7.2.7 The strategy of the plan is to meet the majority of the H1 land requirement from brownfield windfall sites brought forward under policy H4. Around two thirds of the requirement is expected to be met in this way. However, in accordance with PPG3, sites allocated in policy H3 provide in excess of a 5 year supply at the H1 rate.
- 7.2.8 The allocations identified in phase 1 of policy H3 are for the most part brownfield sites and can be developed at any time within phase 1 or later. The allocations in phases 2 and 3 are on greenfield sites and these represent a reserve of land to be drawn on as and when other sources of supply become demonstrably insufficient to maintain output at the H1 rate. This means that the timing of release of phase 2 and 3 allocations is not fixed (although phase 3 cannot overtake phase 2). The phase 2 allocations will only be released when supply conditions require, and it is quite possible that they would not be released until after 2012, if alternative land sources were still adequate. Once the phase 2 allocations have been released, the phase 3 allocations will become the reserve and will be released in their turn when it is judged that they are needed to meet the H1 rate.
- 7.2.9 The phase 2 and phase 3 allocations are complete packages of sites which will be released in their entirety if conditions warrant. Once released, component sites will not be returned to the reserve. However, the release of the East Leeds Extension, which forms part of phase 3, is also subject to the specific policies in Chapter 15 of the plan, which could have additional implications for the timing of release of the site.
- 7.2.10 The packages will be released when supply is demonstrably short. The adequacy of supply will be assessed twice a year in the Housing Land Monitors referred to above. The main indicators of shortage will be if the average completion rate in the two years preceding the Monitor is over 10% below the H1 requirement and if the supply of land – defined as unused allocations from the last phase plus outstanding permissions for dwellings on sites for 5 or more dwellings - amounts to less than a two years' supply at the H1 rate. Although strongly suggestive of shortage, these indicators are not to be treated as determinative criteria that will automatically trigger the release of greenfield allocations. There may be other factors which temper the message of the indicators – for example, there could be a large stock of planning applications awaiting determination which, if approved, could be expected to

rapidly restore the ability to meet the H1 target. A final decision will be taken after considering all the information in the Monitors.

7.2.11 The actual scale of development that occurs will depend to a large extent on how successful developers are in bringing forward sites under the provisions of policy H4. If they are very successful, construction could exceed the H1 rate by a considerable margin. While some degree of over-run is acceptable, it would be against the principles of Plan, Monitor and Manage to allow this to go completely unchecked. Indicators are therefore needed to define an unacceptable level of over supply.

7.2.12 Over supply will become a cause for concern if the average completion rate in the 3 years preceding the monitoring point is 40% above the H1 requirement and if the stock of outstanding permissions for dwellings on sites for 5 or more dwellings exceeds a six years' supply at the H1 rate. If severe over supply is identified, there will be an immediate embargo on new planning permissions under policy H4 and a review of the plan. As with the indicators for releasing greenfield allocations, these are strong pointers to the need for the specified action rather than determinative criteria which automatically trigger it. A final decision will be made after considering all other information in the Housing Land Monitors.

7.2.13 Proposals for housing on land not specifically identified for that purpose in the UDP will be considered against Policy H4:

H4: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON SITES NOT IDENTIFIED FOR THAT PURPOSE IN THE UDP BUT WHICH LIE WITHIN THE MAIN AND SMALLER URBAN AREAS AS DEFINED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, OR ARE OTHERWISE IN A DEMONSTRABLY SUSTAINABLE LOCATION, WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IS ACCEPTABLE IN SEQUENTIAL TERMS, IS CLEARLY WITHIN THE CAPACITY OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED INFRASTRUCTURE, AND COMPLIES WITH ALL OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES OF THE UDP.

7.2.14 In this policy, acceptability in sequential terms is a reference to the principles set out in paragraphs 29-34 of PPG3 "Housing" (March 2000 edition), particularly paragraph 32 which says that there is a presumption that previously-developed sites should be developed before greenfield sites except in exceptional circumstances. This criterion is expected to mean that only brownfield sites will normally be acceptable under the terms of H4.

7.2.15 Although most H4 sites will be in the Main and Smaller Urban areas, proposals are also likely to be acceptable in other locations which are demonstrably sustainable. Judgements will be made on the basis of consideration of the availability and frequency of bus and train services to service centres, and on the range of services available locally, including shops, health facilities and schools. It is likely that proposals will be acceptable in S2 service centres not within the MUA/SUAs, as well as some

other settlements with a lesser but still adequate range of facilities, provided the other provisions of H4 are also satisfied.

7.3 **JUSTIFICATION FOR UDP HOUSING STRATEGY**

- 7.3.1 The UDP housing land strategy is in full conformity with the sequential approach advocated in PPG3 and in RSS. Throughout the plan period, most requirements will be met from brownfield sites brought forward under the provisions of policy H4. In phase 1, this source is supplemented by additional allocations which are also predominantly brownfield. Remaining greenfield allocations are held in reserve for development in phases 2 and 3 if and when the supply of alternative brownfield land becomes deficient, thus ensuring that greenfield land is not developed unless it is absolutely necessary
- 7.3.2 In addition, the strategy will maximise the use of land within the Main and Smaller Urban Areas, which are the most sustainable locations by virtue of their access to services and facilities and the availability of infrastructure. Development in these areas gives ready access to shops, employment, leisure and community facilities, and will help maintain the viability of these services. It will make the most of existing utilities and transport infrastructure and should help minimise growth in the number and length of commuting trips by private car. Urban development will also assist regeneration by encouraging the remediation of contaminated sites and by bringing back into use vacant or derelict land and buildings. Finally it will reduce pressure for the release of greenfield land or future changes to Green Belt boundaries.
- 7.3.3 Around two thirds of the land supply is expected to come from windfall sites not identified in the plan. The yield from these sources is estimated using trend data relating to the period 1991-2003. These data are reported in the Housing Land Monitors and are believed to be a robust basis for estimation. The general scale of the potential for windfall urban development is supported by the Urban Capacity Study undertaken by the Council in accordance with the guidelines in "Tapping the Potential". This Study identified a potential discounted capacity for 33700 dwellings over the period 2002-16, within the survey area alone. This capacity itself exceeds the equivalent H1 requirement and compares with the assumed windfall yield in this plan of up to 22300 dwellings in all locations in the slightly shorter period 2003-16.
- 7.3.4 On the face of it, the estimates of capacity summarised in policy H3 suggest that the strategy could lead to over provision of land when measured against the H1 requirement. If allocations are developed as planned, and H4 yields the capacity estimated, land could be developed at an average annual rate of between 2360 and 2570 dwellings instead of the 1930 p.a. required by H1. It has to be remembered, however, that two thirds of this capacity is expected to come from windfall sites not identified in the plan, and is subject to a degree of uncertainty. In these circumstances, an element of over provision is advisable to guard against the risk of H4 yields falling below the level assumed. The phase 2 and 3 greenfield allocations – which together have capacity for 7500 dwellings – provide this insurance.
- 7.3.5 However, the plan contains provisions to ensure that this contingency reserve will not be drawn upon unless it is required. So long as the H1

requirement can be met from phase 1 allocations and the H4 yield, the reserve of greenfield allocations will not be released. Indeed it is possible that requirements for the whole UDP period could be met without having to break into the greenfield reserve. The strategy is thus designed to minimise the use of greenfield land.

- 7.3.6 The greenfield allocations identified in phases 2 and 3 are for the most part consistent with the sequential approach advocated by PPG3. They consist largely of sustainable urban extensions which could take advantage of existing physical and social infrastructure within the existing urban area, and have good access to public transport services, jobs, schools, shopping and leisure facilities. Their limited size would also enable development to take place at fairly short notice. In the longer term it will be necessary to consider a larger extension. The opportunities available to the north-east edge of the city, combined with the significant environmental constraints elsewhere and the need to prevent coalescence of existing settlements, indicate that this is in principle a suitable area for such an extension. It is for these reasons that the East Leeds Extension has been identified as a strategic housing site in phase 3.
- 7.3.7 All the other strategic sites in phase 1 of the plan are identified because of their significant regeneration function. The strategic housing and mixed use sites at Holbeck Village and Hunslet Riverside will encourage the redevelopment of former industrial and commercial areas which have fallen into decay. A mix of housing and other modern uses will breathe much-needed new life into these sustainable inner city locations. The site at Allerton Bywater will revive a former mining village blighted by the closure of the colliery two decades ago, and will form a flagship Millennium Village project. The Sharp Lane site will consolidate redevelopment in this part of south Leeds and underpin the enhancement of Middleton District Centre which will bring benefits to a much wider local community.

H3A HOUSING ALLOCATIONS PHASE 1 2003-8

		ESTIMATED DWELLING CAPACITY							
Reference	Location	Area(h)	Total	2003-4	2004-5	2005-6	2006-7	2007-8	Phase 2
A Allocations									
H3-1A.1	BACK LANE, GUISELEY	1.34	62	32	30	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.2	WAKEFIELD ROAD, DRIGHLINGTON	0.10	10	0	0	0	10	0	0
H3-1A.3	STATION ROAD, DRIGHLINGTON	0.84	5	5	0	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.4	CHURCH STREET, GILDERSOME	0.22	10	0	0	0	0	10	0
H3-1A.5	CHAPEL STREET, MORLEY	0.62	40	25	15	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.6	WESTERTON ROAD, WEST ARDSLEY	0.39	7	0	2	2	3	0	0
H3-1A.7	WOOLIN CRESCENT, WEST ARDSLEY	2.43	55	0	30	10	15	0	0
H3-1A.8	DUNSTARN LANE, ADEL	2.74	28	0	0	0	0	0	28
H3-1A.9	MEANWOOD PARK HOSPITAL	7.55	88	60	28	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.10	HOUGH SIDE ROAD, PUDSEY	4.07	110	0	0	60	50	0	0
H3-1A.11	THE LANES, PUDSEY	0.74	18	0	0	0	0	0	18
H3-1A.12	MAIN STREET, CARLTON	0.50	15	0	0	0	0	15	0
H3-1A.13	MATTY LANE, ROBIN HOOD	0.63	20	0	10	10	0	0	0
H3-1A.14	HALF WAY HOUSE, ROBIN HOOD	0.44	19	19	0	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.15	ALMA ST/POTTERY LANE, WOODLESFORD	1.34	20	0	0	0	10	10	0
H3-1A.16	PRIMROSE LANE, BOSTON SPA	1.25	28	8	10	10	0	0	0
H3-1A.18	THE GLENSDALES, RICHMOND HILL	0.52	25	0	0	0	0	0	25
H3-1A.19	RING ROAD, MIDDLETON	2.36	30	30	0	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.20	LINGWELL ROAD, MIDDLETON	4.26	73	0	0	0	0	0	73
H3-1A.21	WEST LEA FARM, YEADON	1.21	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.22	OAK TREE DRIVE/THORN SCHOOL, GIPTON	2.42	100	0	0	0	0	30	70
H3-1A.23	WATERLOO SIDINGS, OSMONDTHORPE	7.26	140	0	0	0	0	0	140
H3-1A.24	MANOR FARM, CHURWELL	8.41	330	30	75	75	75	75	0
H3-1A.25	CHAPEL ALLERTON HOSPITAL, HAREHILLS LANE	4.53	35	35	0	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.26	CHURCHWOOD AVENUE, WEST PARK	6.88	198	70	68	0		60	0

H3A HOUSING ALLOCATIONS PHASE 1 2003-8

		ESTIMATED DWELLING CAPACITY							
Reference	Location	Area(h)	Total	2003-4	2004-5	2005-6	2006-7	2007-8	Phase 2
H3-1A.27	SHADWELL BOYS SCHOOL, SHADWELL LANE, MOORTOWN	5.65	78	60	18	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.28	SWALLOW DRIVE, POOL IN WHARFEDALE	5.73	54	35	19	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.29	MICKLETOWN ROAD, MICKLETOWN	2.34	7	7	0	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.31	MOUNT CROSS, BRAMLEY	1.08	30	0	0	0	0	0	30
H3-1A.32	BLUE HILL LANE, WORTLEY	1.33	61	30	31	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.33	BOWCLIFFE ROAD, BRAMHAM	2.11	30	0	0	0	0	15	15
H3-1A.34	REIN ROAD, MORLEY	2.65	13	13	0	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.35	EAST MOOR, TILE LANE, ADEL	5.60	70	0	0	0	35	35	0
H3-1A.36	FORMER THORNHILL SCHOOL, UPPER WORTLEY ROAD, WORTLEY	2.77	53	40	13	0	0	0	0
H3-1A.37	KILLINGBECK HOSPITAL, KILLINGBECK	10.43	350	0	0	50	100	100	100
H3-1A.38	ST GEORGES HOSPITAL, ROTHWELL	7.53	230	0	30	100	100	0	0
H3-1A.39	WESTBROOK LANE/BROWNBERRIE LANE, HORSFORTH (PART)	1.23	30	0	0	15	15	0	0
H3-1A.40	BUTCHER LANE, ROTHWELL	0.30	10		0	0	0	10	0
H3-1A.41	HARE LANE, PUDSEY	0.37	10	0	0	10	0	0	0
Strategic Sites									
H3-1A.42	STATION ROAD, ALLERTON BYWATER	14.77	520	0	70	150	150	150	0
H3-1A.43	SHARP LANE, MIDDLETON	40.37	900	0	0	0	150	150	600
Strategic Housing & Mixed Use sites									
H3-1A.44	HOLBECK URBAN VILLAGE	26.00	900	0	0	200	200	200	300
H3-1A.45	HUNSLET RIVERSIDE	62.00	1000	0	0	0	250	250	500
H3-1A TOTALS		255.31	5813	500	449	692	1163	1110	1899

H3A HOUSING ALLOCATIONS PHASE 2 2008-12							
Reference	Location	Area(h)	Estimated Dwelling Capacity				
			Total	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Phase 1 allocations carried forward							
H3-1A.8	DUNSTARN LANE, ADEL	2.74	28	14	14	0	0
H3-1A.11	THE LANES, PUDSEY	0.74	18	0	0	18	0
H3-1A.18	THE GLENSDALES, RICHMOND HILL	0.52	25	0	0	0	25
H3-1A.20	LINGWELL ROAD, MIDDLETON	4.26	73	0	0	35	38
H3-1A.22	OAK TREE DRIVE/THORN SCHOOL, GIPTON	2.42	70	70	0	0	0
H3-1A.23	WATERLOO SIDINGS, OSMONDTHORPE	7.26	140	0	0	70	70
H3-1A.31	MOUNT CROSS, BRAMLEY	1.08	30	0	0	0	30
H3-1A.33	BOWCLIFFE ROAD, BRAMHAM	2.11	15	15	0	0	0
H3-1A.37	KILLINGBECK HOSPITAL, KILLINGBECK	10.43	100	100	0	0	0
H3-1A.42	SHARP LANE, MIDDLETON	40.37	600	150	150	150	150
H3-1A.43	HOLBECK URBAN VILLAGE	26.00	300	150	150	0	0
H3-1A.44	HUNSLET RIVERSIDE	62.00	500	200	200	100	0
SubTotals		159.93	1899	699	514	373	313
Phase 2 Greenfield Allocations							
H3-2A.1	GREENLEA ROAD , YEADON	1.06	30	7	8	7	8
H3-2A.2	GRIMES DYKE, WHINMOOR	17.16	515	128	129	129	129
H3-2A.3	RED HALL LANE	3.57	110	27	28	27	28
H3-2A.4	SEACROFT HOSPITAL	17.73	530	132	133	132	133
H3-2A.5	BRUNTCLIFFE ROAD, MORLEY	7.14	180	45	45	45	45
H3-2A.6	DAISY HILL, MORLEY	2.86	100	25	25	25	25
H3-2A.7	CHURCH LANE, ADEL	2.56	70	17	18	17	18
H3-2A.8	PUDSEY ROAD,S WINNOW	1.36	40	10	10	10	10
H3-2A.9	DELPH END, PUDSEY	1.42	40	10	10	10	10
H3-2A.10	POTTERY LANE, WOODLESFORD	4.52	105	26	26	26	27
Phase 2 TOTALS			1720	427	432	428	433

H3A HOUSING ALLOCATIONS PHASE 3 2012-16

Reference	Location	Area(h)	Estimated Dwelling Capacity				Later
			Total	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	
Allocations							
H3-3A.1	VICTORIA AVENUE, HORSFORTH	0.42	15	4	4	4	3
H3-3A.2	WHITEHALL ROAD, DRIGHLINGTON	1.28	35	9	9	9	8
H3-3A.3	REEDSDALE GARDENS, GILDERSOME	0.39	15	4	4	4	3
H3-3A.4	HAIGH MOOR ROAD, WEST ARDSLEY	3.57	19	4	5	5	5
H3-3A.5	FALL LANE, EAST ARDSLEY	0.22	10	2	3	2	3
H3-3A.6	SILK MILL DRIVE, COOKRIDGE	0.4	20	5	5	5	5
H3-3A.7	CHERRY TREE DRIVE, FARSLEY	0.44	10	2	3	2	3
H3-3A.8	CHERRY TREE CRESCENT, FARSLEY	0.42	15	4	4	4	3
H3-3A.9	NETHERFIELD ROAD, GUISELEY	3.23	90	22	23	22	23
H3-3A.10	LUMBY LANE, PUDSEY	0.3	10	2	3	2	3
H3-3A.11	ROBIN LANE, PUDSEY	0.84	20	5	5	5	5
H3-3A.12	CHARITY FARM, WOODHALL	3.23	50	12	13	12	13
H3-3A.13	MAIN STREET, MICKLETOWN	0.26	10	2	3	2	3
H3-3A.14	KESWICK LANE, BARDSEY	0.34	10	2	3	2	3
H3-3A.15	MOSES SYKE, SCARCROFT	0.67	15	4	4	4	3
H3-3A.16	WEST GRANGE ROAD, BELLE ISLE	0.88	35	9	9	9	8
H3-3A.17	URN FARM, BELLE ISLE	3.32	100	25	25	25	25
H3-3A.18	THROSTLE GROVE, MIDDLETON	4.04	140	35	35	35	35
H3-3A.19	WESTBROOK LANE/BROWNBERRIE LANE, HORSFORTH (PART)	2.69	75	18	19	19	19
H3-3A.20	QUEEN STREET, WOODEND, ALLERTON BYWATER	4.1	110	27	28	27	28
H3-3A.21	RUMPLECROFT, OTLEY	5.17	135	33	34	34	34
H3-3A.22	VILLAGE FARM, HAREWOOD	1.4	40	10	10	10	10
H3-3A.23	BAGLEY LANE, FARSLEY	1.67	50	12	13	12	13
H3-3A.24	WOODACRE GREEN, BARDSEY	1.2	35	8	9	9	9

H3-3A.25	CHURCH FIELDS, BOSTON SPA	8.57	165	41	42	41	41	
H3-3A.26	THORNER LANE, SCARCROFT	2.9	30	7	8	7	8	
H3-3A.27	SELBY ROAD/NINELANDS LANE, GARFORTH	3.03	85	21	22	21	21	
H3-3A.28	MILNER LANE/LEEDS ROAD, ROBIN HOOD	2.26	60	15	15	15	15	
H3-3A.29	BARROWBY LANE, GARFORTH	1.13	35	8	9	9	9	
H3-3A.30	EAST OF OTLEY	30.92	550	137	138	137	138	
H3-3A.31	SOUTH OF MICKLEFIELD	6.09	150	37	38	37	38	
H3-3A.32	MANOR FARM MICKLEFIELD	12.00	300	75	75	75	75	
Strategic Site								
H3-3A.33	EAST LEEDS EXTENSION	196.00	3375	300	300	300	300	2175
PHASE 3 TOTALS		303.38	5814	901	920	906	912	2175

NOTES TO H3 SUMMARY AND ALLOCATIONS TABLES

The capacity figures for allocated sites are actual figures from planning permissions where these exist or estimates of capacities achievable in the light of PPG3 density guidance. Some sites were under construction on the plan base date of 31 March 2003, and in these cases, the capacity is the number of uncompleted dwellings outstanding at that date. The capacities are working assumptions, not targets, maxima or minima.

Site areas are a mixture of gross (i.e including land unlikely to form part of the net housing area) and net in the sense defined in Annex C of PPG3, and relate to the whole site, whether or not any of it is complete. Capacities cannot therefore be combined with site areas to estimate density.

Phase 1 allocations can be developed at any time, but it is expected that some phase 1 capacity will be carried over into phase 2. The timings shown are best estimates and in no sense prescriptive. The timing of phase 2 and phase 3 development is unknown, since it depends on when other sources of supply run short. The available capacity has therefore been spread out evenly over the notional time-spans of the two phases.

The estimates of H4 development included in the summary table are largely trend based. The lower end of the range assumes that sites will continue to come forward at the average rate of the period 1991-2003; the upper end assumes that the higher rates of release observed since the publication of PPG3 in 2000 will be maintained. Separate assumptions about City Centre development are made, taking account of local circumstances and experience elsewhere. Generally the estimation method follows the model explained more fully in the Housing Land Monitors.

**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL
DATE: 3 JANUARY 2006**

**SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON
POLICY N34 (PROTECTED AREAS OF SEARCH AND LONG TERM
GROWTH)**

Electoral Wards Affected:

ALL

Specific Implications for:

Ethnic Minorities

Women

Disabled People

Key Decision Major Decision Eligible for call in Not Eligible for call in
Significant Operational Decision Administrative Decision (details contained in the report)

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 5 – Environment, regarding Alterations 5/001, 5/002 and 7/005 (Policy N34, Protected Areas of Search (PAS) and long term growth) and to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Paragraph 5.4.9 of the Adopted UDP lists 40 sites where, under Policy N34, development is to be restricted to existing and temporary uses so as not to prejudice the possibility of long-term development. Alteration 5/002 of the UDP Review (and consequent changes 5/001 and 7/005 regarding changes to the supporting text explaining the reasons for the proposed changes) proposes to delete the list of sites, the Policy and the supporting text. As part of the UDP Review, site specific changes relating to Policy N34 are also covered in the appropriate area chapters. The response to the Inspectors recommendations on these sites will be covered in separate reports to Development Plan Panel. The focus of this report therefore, is to consider the strategic issues associated with Policy N34 and the Inspectors recommendations. It should be noted also that the City Council’s response to housing land and phasing issues will be covered in a separate Panel report.
- 2.2 The Proposed Alterations for Policy N34 as part of the Review, were promoted by the City Council on the basis of changes to planning policy following the introduction of Planning Policy Guidance 3 – Housing (PPG 3). The broad thrust of this guidance is to give priority to brownfield (rather than greenfield land) for development. Linked to this, the City Council identified a sufficiency of housing and employment land, well beyond the end of the Plan period, which in the Council’s view meant that it was no longer necessary to safeguard PAS land for long term development. Other than the PAS sites associated with the East Leeds Extension (Alterations 15/015, 15/018,

15/020, 15/025, 15/026, 15/027 and 16/016), the City Council therefore proposed to reallocate the majority of the PAS sites as Green Belt.

3.0 INSPECTORS REASONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 In considering the representations made in respect of the UDP Review proposed Alterations for Policy N34, the Inspector has considered national planning policy guidance, housing capacity, employment and in particular the issue of the 'exceptional circumstances' required to justify changing Green Belt boundaries. Following this analysis, he concludes that neither national advice published since the last UDP Inquiry (PPG 3), nor the identified sufficiency of land available for development within urban areas justify the abandonment of the approach to PAS land under Policy N34. The inspector concludes also that PPG 3 does not change the approach to Green Belt in Planning Policy Guidance 2 (PPG 2) and specifically the importance in "permanence" of establishing long term Green Belt boundaries and the inclusion of land within it, which fulfils its purpose. The Inspector therefore recommends that the UDP should not be modified in accordance with First Deposit Alterations 5/001, 5/002 and 7/005 and that paragraph 5.4.8 and section 7.5 are deleted and replaced with substitute paragraphs. These replacement paragraphs reaffirm the Green Belt boundaries defined as part of the Adopted UDP (2001) and specify the role of PAS in safeguarding land to provide "some flexibility for growth and development".
- 3.2 Within the context of the Inspector's recommendations on strategic PAS issues, he notes that six sites were not subject to objection and therefore did not come before him as part of the Inquiry. The six sites are:
- a) N34.2 - Canada Road, Rawdon (1.13 ha.)
 - b) N34.21 – Leeds Road, Collingham (6.7 ha.)
 - c) N34.30 – Mickletown Road, Methley (9.7 ha.)
 - d) N34.31 – Low Moor Side, New Farnley (5.6 ha.)
 - e) N34.35 – West Park, Boston Spa (4.1 ha.)
 - f) N34.36 – Chapel Lane, Clifford (1.4 ha.)

In respect of these sites, the Inspector notes (para. 5.2 of his report) that, whilst it is a matter for the City Council to determine the approach to them, he concludes that the overarching policy considerations are such that they should be treated consistently with his recommendations on PAS (para.5.40 of his report). Within the context of the Area Chapters in which these sites are located, it is therefore recommended that these six sites are also returned to PAS in the UDP Review.

4.0 THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE

- 4.1 As with many of the Inspectors recommendations, his conclusions on Policy N34 are a direct reflection of national planning policy guidance, rather than an interpretation of national guidance in the light of local circumstances and strategic objectives. Consequently, the overall package of policies at the heart of the UDP Review (including housing and PAS) have either been rejected or readjusted by the Inspector, in favour of an approach, which is a close expression of national policy. Within this context the Inspector has made an emphatic decision in respect of PAS Policy which is not in accordance with the City Council's own judgement in terms of both overall strategy and conclusions regarding the Green Belt merits of individual sites. However, it is accepted that the Inspector has conducted a thorough appraisal of PAS policy and whilst his conclusions do differ from the Council's own analysis, his recommendations are accepted.

- 4.2 Whilst the Inspectors recommendations on PAS are a very disappointing outcome for the City Council, the decision does at least perhaps give the Council some longer term flexibility in the event of changing and unforeseen circumstances. The response to such circumstances would need to be addressed through the Local Development Framework. This process will enable the role and necessity of PAS sites to be considered in the future. In considering the merits of these sites and in the preparation of LDF documents to address these issues, it will be necessary to undertake sustainability appraisals, development a detailed evidence base and complete extensive public and stakeholder consultation, in advance of developing any further policies and proposals.
- 4.3 With regard to the PAS sites listed in para. 3.2 above, such is the logic of the Inspector's approach and the emphatic nature of his recommendations, it would be illogical and difficult to take an alternative view to the Inspectors overarching recommendations. However, for further clarity, officers have sought further legal advice on this matter as a basis to consider the most appropriate way to proceed. Within this context, counsel's opinion is that there are two basic options open to the City Council.
- (i) The first would be for the City Council to reject the Inspectors recommendation. Given the Inspector's reasoning, it is felt that this approach may require a further Public Inquiry to be held although there are arguable grounds to maintain such a position. In considering this option Members will need to be aware of the public policy requirement that Plans are adopted as soon as practically possible to ensure reasonable certainty under the provisions of Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 .
- (ii) The second option would be for the City Council to support the Inspector's suggested approach and apply the PAS policy conclusions to the six sites which were not before him at the Inquiry. This is clearly his intention following a strategic assessment of PAS policy. Given the Inspectors emphatic recommendations on PAS however, this would be a more sustainable position to take and to facilitate early adoption of the Plan as recommended in Government Guidance.
- 4.4 On balance, counsel's opinion was to favour the latter option (option ii) as a more robust planning stance given the unilateral and comprehensive nature of the Inspectors recommendation. Should Members wish to revisit the issues in due course it would be preferable to do so under the Local Development Framework when objectors to, and supporters of, any proposals which the Council may subsequently wish to put forward may be considered by an Inspector under the new regime.

5.0 RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Members are asked to:

- i) agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendations and in respect of Chapter 5 (Alteration 5/001, 5/002 and 7/005),
- ii) to accept the Inspectors recommendations in respect of Alteration 5/001, 5/002 and 7/005),
- iii) to recommend approval of these recommendations to Executive Board in due course.

<p>Prop. Alt. 5/001</p>	<p><u>PA 5/001, 5/002 and 7/005</u></p> <p>POLICY N34 (PROTECTED AREAS OF SEARCH AND LONG TERM GROWTH)</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendations</u></p> <p>Para. 5.40. I recommend that the UDP be not modified in accordance with FD Alterations 5/001, 5/002 and 7/005.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.4.8 be deleted and the following substituted:</p> <p>"The Regional Spatial Strategy does not envisage any change to the general extent of Green Belt for the foreseeable future and stresses that any proposals to replace existing boundaries should be related to a longer – tern time-scale that other aspects of the development plan. The boundaries of the Green Belt around Leeds were defined with the adoption of the UDP in 2001, have not been changes in this limited review and are currently expected to remain broadly unchanged.</p> <p>To ensure the necessary long-term endurance of the Green Belt, definition of its boundaries was accompanied by designation of Protected areas of Search to provide land for longer – term development needs. Given the emphasis in the UDP on providing for new development within urban areas it is not currently envisaged that there will be a need to use any such safeguarded land during the Review period. However, it is retained both to maintain the permanence of Green Belt boundaries and to provide some flexibility for the City's long-term development. The suitability of the protected sites for development will be comprehensively reviewed as part of the preparation of the Local Development Framework, and in the light of the next Regional Spatial Strategy. Meanwhile it is intended that no development should be permitted on this land that would prejudice the possibility of longer term development, and any proposals for such development will be treated as departures from the Plan."</p> <p>Section 7.5 be deleted and the following substituted:</p> <p>"When the UDP was adopted it was envisaged, on the basis of population projections then current, that there would be a net increase of some 50, 000 households in Leeds between 1991 and 2016. The Plan provided land for some 28, 500 dwellings to 2006, leaving about 21, 500 households to be accommodated thereafter. Taking into account the proportion of the need that was expected to be met within existing urban areas, it was estimated that 430 hectares of land was required to meet long term needs through the actual area of land safeguarded under Policy N34 is now about 352 hectares.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u></p> <p>The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u></p> <p>Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) and Proposals Map by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substituting deleted paragraph 5.4.8 and reinstate the wording of Policy N34 to read as follows: <p>"The Regional Spatial Strategy does not envisage any change to the general extent of Green Belt for the foreseeable future and stresses that any proposals to replace existing boundaries should be related to a longer – tern time-scale that other aspects of the development plan. The boundaries of the Green Belt around Leeds were defined with the adoption of the UDP in 2001, have not been changes in this limited review and are currently expected to remain broadly unchanged.</p> <p>To ensure the necessary long-term endurance of the Green Belt, definition of its boundaries was accompanied by designation of Protected areas of Search to provide land for longer – term development needs. Given the emphasis in the UDP on providing for new development within urban areas it is not currently envisaged that there will be a need to use any such safeguarded land during the Review period. However, it is retained both to maintain the permanence of Green Belt boundaries and to provide some flexibility for the City's long-term development. The suitability of the protected sites for development will be comprehensively reviewed as part of the preparation of the Local Development Framework, and in the light of the next Regional Spatial Strategy. Meanwhile it is intended that no development should be permitted on this land that would prejudice the possibility of longer term development, and any proposals for such development will be treated as departures from the Plan."</p> <p>N34: WITHIN THOSE AREAS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP UNDER THIS POLICY, DEVELOPMENT WILL BE RESTRICTED TO THAT WHICH IS NECESSARY FOR THE OPERATION OF EXISTING USES TOGETHER WITH SUCH TEMPORARY USES AS WOULD NOT PREJUDICE THE POSSIBILITY OF LONG TERM DEVELOPMENT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within the context of the Inspectors recommendations in paragraph 5.40 and the Inspectors recommendations in relation to Proposed Alterations 15/023, 15/024, 15/025, 15/026 and 15/027 (which delete PAS sites and reallocate them as housing sites in Phase 3 of the Review as part of the East Leeds Extension, 15/015), reinstating Paragraph 5.4.9 from the Adopted UDP to read as follows: <p>"The following sites are protected under Policy N34 as Protected Areas of Search:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Breary Lane East, Bramhope Canada Road, Yeadon Haw Lane Yeadon Selby Road, Garforth
--------------------------------	---	--

This area of land remains undeveloped and, given the greater emphasis now on development on brownfield land within existing urban areas, and the capacity identified there for such development, it is likely to provide a very generous reserve for possible long-term development. However, it is unnecessary to seek to quantify now with any precision the area that might be needed after the Review period as the primary purpose of safeguarded land is to provide some flexibility for growth and development within Green Belt boundaries that will endure for the foreseeable future.”

10. Pit Lane, New Micklefield
11. Scholes Park Farm
12. Moorgate, Kippax
13. Low Moor Farm, Morley
14. Tingely Station
15. Spring Gardens, Drighlington
16. New Lane, East Ardsley
17. Bradford Road East Ardsley
18. Lane Side Farm, Churwell
19. Owlars Farm, Morley
20. Manor House Farm, Churwell
21. Moseley Bottom, Cookridge
22. Church Lane, Adel
23. West of Pool in Wharfedale
24. Hill Foot Farm, Pudsey
25. Calverley Lane, Farsley
26. Kirklees Knowl, Farsley
27. Greenland Farm, Oulton
28. Royds Lane, Rothwell
29. Pitfield Road, Carlton
30. Mickleton Road, Methley
31. Low Moor Side, New Farnley
32. Green Lane/Grove Road, Boston Spa
33. Leeds Road, Collingham
34. Spofforth Hill, Wetherby
35. West Park, Boston Spa
36. Chapel Lane, Clifford
37. The Ridge, Linton
38. Red Hall Lane/Skelton Lane, Whinmoor
39. Wood Lane, Scholes
40. Park Lane, Allerton Bywater”

Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:

- Deleting section 7.5 and substituting with :

LONG TERM GROWTH

“When the UDP was adopted it was envisaged, on the basis of population projections then current, that there would be a net increase of some 50, 000 households in Leeds between 1991 and 2016. The Plan provided land for some 28, 500 dwellings to 2006, leaving about 21, 500 households to be accommodated thereafter. Taking into account the proportion of the need that was expected to be met within existing urban areas, it was estimated that 430 hectares of land was required to meet long term needs through the actual area of land safeguarded under Policy N34 is now about 352 hectares.

This area of land remains undeveloped and, given the greater emphasis now on

		<p>development on brownfield land within existing urban areas, and the capacity identified there for such development, it is likely to provide a very generous reserve for possible long-term development. However, it is unnecessary to seek to quantify now with any precision the area that might be needed after the Review period as the primary purpose of safeguarded land is to provide some flexibility for growth and development within Green Belt boundaries that will endure for the foreseeable future.”</p>
--	--	--

**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL
DATE: 3 JANUARY 2006**

**SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON
CHAPTER 8 (LOCAL ECONOMY)**

Electoral Wards Affected:

ALL

Specific Implications for:

Ethnic Minorities

Women

Disabled People

Key Decision Major Decision Eligible for call in Not Eligible for call in
Significant Operational Decision Administrative Decision (details contained in the report)

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 8 - Local Economy - in relation to Proposed Alteration 8/001, which proposed changes to UDP Policy E7. This report also determines the appropriate responses to the Inspector’s recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 In promoting Proposed Alteration 8/001 the Council sought to strengthen the operation of UDP Policy E7, which sets out the criteria that must be met before allocated or existing employment land and buildings can be released for other uses like housing, retail or leisure.

2.2 The Alterations proposed that a specific definition of “locality” be stipulated in the Policy, using 30-minutes’ walking time as the standard. This was to assist the Council in assessing the supply of alternative employment sites in the locality. The Alterations also introduced two extra criteria with the aim of ensuring that employment uses were considered as part of any redevelopment scheme on allocated or existing employment land.

2.3 Objections were received to the Proposed Alterations included in the First Deposit version of June 2003 and the Revised Deposit of Feb 2004, which the Inspector considered under four issues:

- Would proposed Policy E7 be unduly restrictive or inflexible in expecting mixed-use development? Would it accord with PPG3 as revised by the inclusion of paragraph 42(a)?
- Is it necessary to define “locality” in clause iii. of Policy E7?

- Should any areas (of the city) be exempt from Policy E7?
- Should a further policy be introduced to resist employment use of greenfield land or adopt a sequential approach to employment development as for residential development?

- 2.4 During the course of the Review, Government guidance in relation to the release of employment land for housing became significantly more prescriptive. A consultation document about proposed changes to PPG3 (Housing) was issued by ODPM in July 2003, which the Council opposed and made representations accordingly. The revisions to PPG3 came into effect in Jan 2005, while the Public Inquiry was still open.
- 2.5 These included a new paragraph 42a of PPG3. This introduced the presumption that proposals for housing or mixed uses on employment land or buildings no longer needed for that purpose should receive favourable consideration, unless the need for the site to remain as employment land can be demonstrated clearly or the proposal fails to reflect other policies within PPG3 or the proposal would undermine the housing strategy within the Development Plan.

3.0 INSPECTOR'S REASONING AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.1 As noted above, the introduction of a new paragraph 42a into PPG3 in January 2005 brought a more prescriptive approach in national planning guidance under the heading of "Supporting the Delivery of New Housing". Accordingly, the Inspector attached great weight to the new guidance and concluded that the Alterations proposed by the Council (i.e. the extra criteria v and vi) were more restrictive than national guidance and, therefore, should not form part of the Revised UDP. The Inspector noted that the proposed requirements to consider mixed uses and to market employment sites for 6 months had no support in national guidance and that there was no evidence of local circumstances that would justify a more restrictive approach by the Council.
- 3.2 Concerning the proposed definition of locality by reference to 30 minutes travel on foot, the Inspector concluded that this would lead to the use of areas which were "unrealistically small and unsuitable to inform the necessary judgement in terms of PPG3 guidance." Accordingly, the Inspector did not support the Council's proposed definition of localities and recommended that no change be made to the supporting text on this count, but advised that areas should be defined which were meaningful "in the context of local strategy".
- 3.3 Several objectors argued that some parts of the city, where extensive regeneration schemes are emerging, should be exempt from the operation of Policy E7. However, the Inspector concluded that there was no case for such an exemption from what was designed to be a city-wide policy.
- 3.4 Arising from the objectors' evidence, the Inspector agreed that existing employment allocations should not constrain proposals in emerging Action Area Plans being prepared as part of the LDF. As a result, the Inspector recommended that a new paragraph to this effect be inserted in the supporting text and that the text should affirm that E7 applies to the consideration of planning applications and not the formulation of Development Plans.
- 3.5 The Inspector also considered objector proposals for new policies resisting employment development on greenfield sites and imposing a sequential test for

employment land. He argued that it would be contradictory to resist the development of allocated employment land and that there is no specific support in national guidance for the sequential test suggested by the objectors. Accordingly, the Inspector made no recommendation to alter the UDP in the light of these suggestions.

- 3.6 Some important views were expressed by the Inspector on the Council's arguments on employment land policy:
- Even though the majority of housing land needs to 2016 can be met from brownfield reserves and the RSS housing requirement is being exceeded annually, these factors do not exempt the Council from following national guidance;
 - Leakage of employment land to housing in west and north-west Leeds is to be expected, given the emphasis of housing land policy on brownfield land, and the level of leakage is not so severe as to justify the policy changes proposed. PPG3 paragraph 42(a) offers the necessary safeguards.
 - The changes would be likely to reduce the supply of brownfield land available for housing, in conflict with the Council's own and national policy.
- 3.7 The Inspector's overall view is that the Council is somewhat over-cautious in its approach to the stock of employment land and in the light of this he recommended that the existing UDP Policy E7 be replaced with one that is expressed in more positive terms and consistent with revised PPG3 guidance.

4.0 THE COUNCIL'S RESPONSE

- 4.1 The Inspector's views are disappointing. Not only does he not find favour with the proposed changes, he also recommends that the existing policy should be changed.
- 4.2 The principal underpinning of the Inspector's conclusions is the newly updated PPG3 paragraph 42(a) from Jan 2005. Consequently, there is little scope for the Council to oppose his recommendations. As noted above, this guidance is more prescriptive than before and was formulated and released during the progress of the Review of the UDP.
- 4.3 The Council's response has taken into account the fact that Policy E7 applies city-wide, across all non-employment sectors and not solely to housing. Consequently, specific reference to the new national guidance in PPG3 42(a) is now introduced into the text of the Policy in the form of a qualification relating to applications for housing on employment sites. By doing this, the existing E7 policy can still apply to proposals that do not include housing.
- 4.4 PPG3 paragraph 42(a) does indicate the tests to be applied on allocated employment sites i.e. favourable consideration of applications unless it can be demonstrated that there is a realistic prospect of the site being taken up for employment use within the plan period; or, that its take-up for housing would undermine regional and local economic and regeneration strategies. These tests are to a great extent embedded in the four criteria of the existing Policy E7 and are therefore in accord with the new guidance.
- 4.5 However, PPG3 paragraph 42(a) does not give such clear advice in connection with unallocated land or buildings in employment use, which are no longer needed for this purpose. There is no test of "need" stipulated in the guidance and the Inspector

indicated that it is for the Council to determine how this will be done. But, the Inspector is helpful in clarifying that in his opinion:

"The assessment of need extends further than that made by site owners/applicants; it is not simply a matter of whether they no longer need it, but whether there is a planning need for the site to be retained for that purpose." (Inspector's Report Para 8.26)

- 4.6 The Council's response is that the four criteria of the existing policy seek to establish the planning need for the site to remain in employment use and, therefore, can be used in the context of the new guidance. Accordingly, the proposed text of the revised policy includes a statement to this effect.
- 4.7 The Inspector recommends the inclusion of additional supporting text to cast a more positive light on the operation of the policy and to emphasize that it applies to the consideration of planning applications and not plan-making processes. Paragraphs 8.5.13 to 8.5.15 are proposed in order to meet this recommendation. The final paragraph (8.5.15) reflects directly the Inspector's proposed wording and, for the avoidance of doubt, includes an explicit reference to the policy where special policy areas are listed (R1 in Ch 11).

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Members are asked to agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendations with respect to Chapter 8 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.

CHAPTER 8 – The Local Economy

<p>Prop. Alt. 8/001</p>	<p><u>PA 8/001</u> POLICY E7 – PROPOSALS FOR NON-EMPLOYMENT USES</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para 8.27 I recommend that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. no modification be made to the UDP in accordance with Alteration 8/001 but that Policy E7 and its supporting text be modified to accord with PPG3, para. 42 (a); and 2. the supporting text of Policy E7 be modified to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. make clear that the Policy refers only to proposals made in planning applications and not those which may be made for future plans, such as the AAP for AVL; and b. include a new paragraph as follows: <p>“Within areas designated as special policy areas it is important that regeneration proposals should be developed through Area Action Plans [AAPs] and that the proposals should be developed free from the constraint of existing employment designation, although the objective of providing for sufficient employment opportunities will be a significant constituent of such AAPs.”</p> 	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in paragraphs 8.2 to 8.26 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector’s recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adding new paragraphs 8.5.13 to 8.5.15 inclusive as detailed below <p>8.5.13 It is vital that land is used and reused as efficiently as possible. This is reflected in national guidance which promotes the reuse of previously developed land as a priority over the development of greenfield land. This is acknowledged in Ch.7 (Housing), where the delivery of windfall housing is a pivotal element of the housing strategy. The economic strategy within the UDP must support this by ensuring that windfall housing sites are delivered effectively without undermining regional and local strategies for economic development and regeneration.</p> <p>8.5.14 The purpose of Policy E7 below, therefore, is to set the criteria for the release of land from employment allocations and the release of land or buildings at present or last in employment use, whilst maintaining safeguards for the supply of employment land and premises where the need is clear.</p> <p>8.5.15 The policy applies to the consideration of planning applications rather than the process of formulating Development Plans. In particular, within areas designated as special policy areas in Policy R1 (Ch 11 paragraph 11.3.6) it is important that regeneration proposals should be developed through Area Action Plans [AAPs] and that the proposals should be developed free from the constraint of existing employment designation, although the objective of providing for sufficient employment opportunities will be a significant constituent of such AAPs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacing the text of Policy E7 with the following: <p>E7: WITH THE EXCEPTIONS OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON LAND NO LONGER NEEDED FOR EMPLOYMENT USE AND OF ANCILLARY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORTING EMPLOYMENT USES ON THE PROPOSAL SITE, APPLICATIONS FOR USES OUTSIDE THE B USE CLASSES WILL NOT BE PERMITTED ON LAND IDENTIFIED FOR EMPLOYMENT PURPOSES UNDER POLICIES E3 AND E4, AND ON LAND OR FOR PREMISES CURRENTLY OR LAST IN EMPLOYMENT USE, UNLESS ALL THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA CAN BE MET:</p> <p>I. THE SITE IS NOT RESERVED FOR SPECIFIC TYPES OF EMPLOYMENT USE</p>
--------------------------------	--	--

		<p>UNDER POLICIES E8 AND E18 ;</p> <p>II. SUFFICIENT ALTERNATIVE EMPLOYMENT SITES EXIST DISTRICT WIDE, READILY AVAILABLE IN TERMS OF QUALITY AND QUANTITY SO AS NOT TO PREJUDICE THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE EMPLOYMENT LAND STRATEGY THROUGH POLICIES E1 AND E2;</p> <p>III. WITHIN THE LOCALITY THERE ARE SUFFICIENT ALTERNATIVE EMPLOYMENT SITES AVAILABLE IN TERMS OF QUALITY AND QUANTITY SO AS NOT TO PREJUDICE OPPORTUNITIES FOR LOCAL EMPLOYMENT USES;</p> <p>IV. THE PROPOSAL WOULD NOT RESULT IN ENVIRONMENTAL, AMENITY OR TRAFFIC PROBLEMS.</p> <p>THIS POLICY WILL BE APPLIED HAVING REGARD TO THE ADVICE CONTAINED IN PPG3 PARAGRAPH 42a (JAN 2005). THEREFORE, FOR APPLICATIONS THAT PROPOSE HOUSING, OR MIXED USES WITH A HOUSING COMPONENT, CRITERIA (I) TO (IV) ABOVE WILL BE USED TO ESTABLISH THE PLANNING NEED FOR THE SITE TO BE RETAINED FOR EMPLOYMENT USE. WHERE NO PLANNING NEED IS ESTABLISHED AND PROPOSALS MEET THE OTHER REQUIREMENTS SET OUT IN PPG3(42A), SUCH APPLICATIONS WILL BE CONSIDERED FAVOURABLY, SUBJECT TO COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER UDP POLICIES AND BEING ACCEPTABLE IN ALL OTHER RESPECTS.</p>
--	--	---

**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLANS PANEL
DATE: 3 JANUARY 2006**

**SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON
CHAPTER 11 (AREA BASED INITIATIVES & REGENERATION)**

Electoral Wards Affected:
ALL

Specific Implications for:
Ethnic Minorities
Women
Disabled People

Key Decision Major Decision Eligible for call in Not Eligible for call in
Significant Operational Decision Administrative Decision (details contained in the report)

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 11 (Area Based Initiatives & Regeneration) to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations.

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The City Council proposed a new chapter to the UDP to update the approach to regeneration in the city and to introduce other area based initiatives. The Inspector considered objections to:
- The Introduction (11/001)
 - Policy R1 (11/002)
 - Regeneration Policy Principles (11/003)
 - Policy R2 – Compulsory Purchase (11/004), and
 - Policy R3 – Use of General Improvement Powers (11/005)

3 THE INSPECTOR’S RECOMMENDATIONS

The Introduction (11/001)

- 3.1 The Inspector agreed that the City Council’s changes to the text of the bullet point “practically orientated” advanced in the Revised Deposit had overcome objections that the text failed to take full account of developers input to regeneration plans.

Policy R1 (11/002)

- 3.2 Policy R1 lists the areas of Leeds which will be subject to regeneration and other area based initiatives. The Inspector considered a number of objections, most concerned with either adding additional areas or deleting, extending or modifying those proposed

by the Council. Other objections concerned whether a form of simplified planning should apply to the Aire Valley.

- 3.3 In terms of the list of area initiatives, the Inspector does not agree to any of the additions or extensions urged by objectors, with the exception of “Thorp Arch Trading Estate” as a new community which he recommends for deletion and his support for both “Central Headingley” and “Far Headingley & West Park” which the Council proposed as additions in the Revised Deposit Plan.
- 3.4 As regards the simplification of planning policy for the Aire Valley, the Inspector agrees with objectors that the regeneration of Aire Valley by way of an Area Action Plan (under the Local Development Framework) should not be overly constrained by UDP policy, particularly Policy E7 concerning protection of employment land. He was persuaded that to deal with the infrastructure costs of Aire Valley effectively, the necessary comprehensive planning approach would not be possible if existing employment land has to be maintained in its current scale & form.
- 3.5 Hence, the Inspector proposes reworded paragraphs and a reworded Policy R1 which explain that the policies of the UDP will remain in force in the areas affected by Area Action Plans (AAPs) until the AAPs are adopted. In the absence of an LDF Core Strategy, the AAPs should be drawn up to accord with the UDP’s strategy in Chapter 3, but not necessarily any of the detailed policies of the UDP. Also, for clarification, the Inspector recommends splitting Policy R1 into two policies. Policy R1 would list only those comprehensive neighbourhood renewal areas for which the Council intends to prepare AAPs. A new Policy R2 would list all the other areas. As a consequence, Policies R2, R3 & R4 as proposed in the First Deposit would need to be renumbered R3, R4 and R5 respectively.

Regeneration Policy Principles (11/003)

- 3.6 Issues raised by objectors are responded to by the Inspector as follows:
- 3.7 i) Should the references to resisting development which would undermine the role of centres and the loss of viable employment land uses be deleted and replaced with more positive ones? Here the Inspector concludes that the bullet points (which seek to resist development that would undermine the role of city/town centres and seek to protect viable employment land, particularly land in and accessible to regeneration areas) accord well with national policy and should be retained. In the case of the bullet point concerning employment land, as part of consideration of Alteration 11/002 above, the Inspector concluded that an additional line of clarification should be added to say that Policy E7 should not be a constraint on the preparation of Area Action Plan, but that this does not imply that any UDP employment land allocations will necessarily change.
- 3.8 ii) Should “town centre regeneration” be added to the list of linked strategies referred to in paragraph 11.5.1.? The Inspector rejects this suggestion since the “linked strategies” were part of the corporate priorities & are not therefore open to change through the UDP Review.
- 3.9 iii) Should there be an additional bullet point under “Employment” in para. 11.5.3 which recognises the significant employment contribution that uses outside B1, B2 and B8, such as retail and leisure development, can make to the town centre and local economy generally? The Inspector found this proposal unnecessary and inappropriate as national policy would expect retail & leisure development to be located within city/town centres using their available land development capacity.

- 3.10 iv) Under “Focus on Existing Centres” should an additional bullet point be added supporting mixed-use redevelopments on key city centre sites which have wide strategic regeneration benefits, not only for the city centre, but also for the local economy generally? Does RD Alteration 11/003 adequately cover the point made? Here, the Inspector concludes that the RD Alteration adequately meets the objection by covering the point that appropriate mixed use development would be supported within centres.
- 3.11 v) Under “Conservation/Listed Buildings” should an additional bullet point be added to the effect that a flexible approach will be taken in relation to new uses for listed buildings and conservation areas in so far as Government guidance allows? The Inspector concludes that the bullet point should not be changed or qualified as it may undermine the principle of protecting & enhancing historic fabric.
- 3.12 vi) Should the Regeneration Policy Principles acknowledge the benefit of new retail developments in areas with poor access to such facilities, as does Policy S6 of the Adopted UDP? The inspector dismisses the need for such acknowledgement, as this is already covered by Policy S6, which relates specifically to areas of inadequate retail provision.

Compulsory Purchase Orders (11/004)

- 3.13 Objectors asked for the policy to clarify that CPOs will only be used as the last resort and that arrangements will be made to minimise disruption to landowners/businesses and to list criteria for the use of CPOs. The Inspector concluded that the only change needed was to clarify in the supporting text of the Plan that there needs to be “...an overriding public interest...” in pursuing a CPO. This would bring the policy more into line with national guidance.

General Improvements (11/005)

- 3.14 Objectors suggest that Policy R3 should give particular emphasis to provision of land for recreation & biodiversity. The Inspector disagrees on the basis that there may be instances of sites where other land use priorities would be more appropriate. He notes that the references to emerging legislation in 2004 need to be updated in the supporting text.

4 THE COUNCIL’S RESPONSE

Introduction (11/001)

- 4.1 The Inspector’s conclusion makes common sense, so is supported.

Policy R1 (11/002)

- 4.2 The City Council needs to be conscious of availability of resources to put into practice the regeneration and area initiatives listed in Policy R1 to make sure initiatives are deliverable rather than a “wish list”, so the Inspector’s conclusion not to expand the list is to be welcomed.

- 4.3 In terms of the Aire Valley, the Inspector’s recommendations will make for appropriate clarification of the status of UDP policy as Area Action Plans are prepared. It is considered that the splitting of Policy R1 into two, one Policy to deal with areas subject to Area Action Plan preparation and another for the remaining area initiatives would be acceptable.

Regeneration Policy Principles (11/003)

- 4.4 The Inspector has reinforced the principles. His conclusions are considered particularly welcome in strengthening the role of city/town centres, safeguarding

employment land for regeneration purposes and valuing the role of conservation & protection of historic assets in regeneration initiatives.

Policy R2 – Compulsory Purchase Orders (11/004)

- 4.5 The Inspector's recommended modification would bring the policy more closely into line with national guidance, so is supported.

Policy R3 – General Improvement

- 4.6 The Inspector's conclusion makes common sense, so is supported.

5 RECOMMENDATION

- 5.1 Members are asked to agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter 11 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.

<p>Prop. Alt. 11//001 & 11/001RD</p>	<p>PA 11/001 INTRODUCTION TO CHAPTER 11</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 11.3, I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with RD Alteration 11/001.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council agrees with the Inspectors recommendation.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> None</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 11/002 & 11/002RD</p>	<p>PA 11/002 POLICY R1 – PROPOSED AREA BASED INITIATIVES</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para. 11.35 I recommend that the UDP be modified by RD Alteration 11/002 subject to:</p> <p>1. amendment of paras. 11.3.2 - 3 and Policy R1 as follows:</p> <p>Para. 11.3.2</p> <p>Reflecting the principles discussed early in this Chapter the form of the area- based initiative will differ in each case. The Comprehensive Neighbourhood Renewal Areas are established corporately through the Neighbourhood and Community Partnership and represent priorities for concerted action to achieve improvements in housing and environment, health and wellbeing, employment and business, education and skills, and community safety. The Comprehensive Neighbourhood Renewal Areas are designated as special policy areas where policies will be developed through Area Action Plans [AAPs] prepared in accordance with the UDP's strategy in Chapter 3 but their preparation will not be restricted by other policies in the Plan.</p> <p>Para. 11.3.3</p> <p>The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 was enacted on 13 May 2004. Many of the area-based initiatives identified in Policy R1 will therefore be taken forward through the new system, under which the UDP will be replaced by the Local Development Framework (LDF). Policy R1 anticipates the new system in identifying areas where further, more detailed work is currently to be given priority.</p> <p>Para. 11.3.4</p> <p>PPS12: Local Development Frameworks (September 2004) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 both refer to Area Action Plans [AAPs] at paragraphs 2.17 - 2.19 and Section 7 respectively. AAPs will be Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and subject to examinations and binding reports by an independent Inspector. Amongst other purposes it is clear that AAPs are intended to include planning frameworks for areas of</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 11.5 – 11.34 to modify the First and Revised Deposit Alterations of the UDP Review. The Council believes that the Inspector's recommendations will make for appropriate clarification of the status of UDP policy as Area Action Plans are prepared and that the splitting of Policy R1 into two will aid understanding the purpose of the policy. Deletion of the Thorp Arch Trading Estate as a New Community is a logical step to conform with the Inspector's recommendations elsewhere concerning housing land supply.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewording paragraphs 11.3.2 – 6 • Splitting Policy R1 into two Policies, R1 dealing with the areas which will deal with the comprehensive neighbourhood renewal of Aire Valley, Harehills and Gipton, and a new R2 dealing with the remainder of the area initiatives • Deletion of the Thorp Arch Trading Estate as a New Community from renumbered Policy R2. <p><u>The modified plan will read as follows:</u></p> <p>11.3.2 Reflecting the principles discussed early in this Chapter the form of the area- based initiative will differ in each case. The Comprehensive Neighbourhood Renewal Areas are established corporately through the Neighbourhood and Community Partnership and represent priorities for concerted action to achieve improvements in housing and environment, health and wellbeing, employment and business, education and skills, and community safety. The Comprehensive Neighbourhood Renewal Areas are designated as special policy areas where policies will be developed through Area Action Plans [AAPs] prepared in accordance with the UDP's strategy in Chapter 3 but their preparation will not be restricted by other policies in the Plan.</p> <p>11.3.3 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 was enacted on 13 May 2004. Many of the area-based initiatives identified in Policy R1 will therefore be taken forward through the new system, under which the UDP will be replaced by the Local Development Framework (LDF). Policy R1 anticipates the new system in identifying areas where further, more detailed work is currently to be given priority.</p> <p>11.3.4 PPS12: Local Development Frameworks (September 2004) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 both refer to Area Action Plans [AAPs] at paragraphs 2.17 - 2.19 and Section 7 respectively. AAPs will be Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and subject to examinations and binding reports by an independent Inspector. Amongst other purposes it is clear that AAPs are</p>

significant change. They will include such matters as the distribution of uses and site specific allocations. They will focus on the implementation and delivery of area-based regeneration initiatives and should deliver planned growth areas, stimulate regeneration, protect areas particularly sensitive to change and resolve conflicting objectives in areas subject to development pressures. A number of the areas identified below will require AAPs on this basis and Policy R1 provides the locus for progressing this work under the LDF system.

Para. 11.3.5

The existing policies and proposals of the Plan both at a strategic and site specific level, including those currently applying within a Policy R1 area, will be considered when AAPs are being prepared, to assess whether or not they remain appropriate for application within the area of each AAP. It should be noted that the reference to “areas of significant change” and “site allocations” means that the AAPs may, where appropriate, advance new and different allocations to those currently identified R1 areas on the Proposals Map. It is not the Council’s intention that within the Aire Valley existing identified employment areas should be restricted by Policy E7 in the opportunities they present to secure comprehensive regeneration and redevelopment. Existing allocations will remain in force until an AAP is adopted.

Para. 11.3.6

Some initiatives will be accomplished by preparation of plans or frameworks which will be adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). SPD will be prepared in accordance with policies of the Plan, and amended in the light of public consultation, following the procedures set out in Government guidance. Once adopted SPD will be a material consideration in determining planning applications. At this stage, an initial indication of the particular route to be followed is given, but this may change, since it will depend to a large extent on the outcome of the planning process in each case. Accordingly:

POLICY R1

THE FOLLOWING AREAS ARE DESIGNATED AS SPECIAL POLICY AREAS FOR THE PURPOSE OF SECURING COMPREHENSIVE NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL:

- AIRE VALLEY
- GIPTON
- HAREHILLS

WITHIN THOSE SPECIAL POLICY AREAS, AREA ACTION PLANS

intended to include planning frameworks for areas of significant change. They will include such matters as the distribution of uses and site specific allocations. They will focus on the implementation and delivery of area-based regeneration initiatives and should deliver planned growth areas, stimulate regeneration, protect areas particularly sensitive to change and resolve conflicting objectives in areas subject to development pressures. A number of the areas identified below will require AAPs on this basis and Policy R1 provides the locus for progressing this work under the LDF system.

11.3.5 The existing policies and proposals of the Plan both at a strategic and site specific level, including those currently applying within a Policy R1 area, will be considered when AAPs are being prepared, to assess whether or not they remain appropriate for application within the area of each AAP. It should be noted that the reference to “areas of significant change” and “site allocations” means that the AAPs may, where appropriate, advance new and different allocations to those currently identified R1 areas on the Proposals Map. It is not the Council’s intention that within the Aire Valley existing identified employment areas should be restricted by Policy E7 in the opportunities they present to secure comprehensive regeneration and redevelopment. Existing allocations will remain in force until an AAP is adopted.

11.3.6 Some initiatives will be accomplished by preparation of plans or frameworks which will be adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). SPD will be prepared in accordance with policies of the Plan, and amended in the light of public consultation, following the procedures set out in Government guidance. Once adopted SPD will be a material consideration in determining planning applications. At this stage, an initial indication of the particular route to be followed is given, but this may change, since it will depend to a large extent on the outcome of the planning process in each case. Accordingly:

POLICY R1

THE FOLLOWING AREAS ARE DESIGNATED AS SPECIAL POLICY AREAS FOR THE PURPOSE OF SECURING COMPREHENSIVE NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL:

- AIRE VALLEY
- GIPTON
- HAREHILLS

WITHIN THOSE SPECIAL POLICY AREAS, AREA ACTION PLANS [AAPs] WILL BE PREPARED TO SECURE REGENERATION. AAPs WILL ACCORD WITH THE UDP’S STRATEGY IN CHAPTER 3 BUT THEIR PREPARATION WILL NOT BE RESTRICTED BY THE APPLICATION OF OTHER POLICIES OF THE PLAN.

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS THAT DO NOT ACCORD WITH THE PROVISIONS OF AN ADOPTED AAP WILL NOT BE SUPPORTED.

UNTIL AN AAP HAS BEEN ADOPTED, ALL RELEVANT POLICIES OF THE PLAN SHOULD BE APPLIED FOR DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PURPOSES

[AAPS] WILL BE PREPARED TO SECURE REGENERATION. AAPS WILL ACCORD WITH THE UDP'S STRATEGY IN CHAPTER 3 BUT THEIR PREPARATION WILL NOT BE RESTRICTED BY THE APPLICATION OF OTHER POLICIES OF THE PLAN.

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS THAT DO NOT ACCORD WITH THE PROVISIONS OF AN ADOPTED AAP WILL NOT BE SUPPORTED.

UNTIL AN AAP HAS BEEN ADOPTED, ALL RELEVANT POLICIES OF THE PLAN SHOULD BE APPLIED FOR DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PURPOSES.

2. renumbering the remainder of Policy R1 as Policy R2, with the amendments consequent upon the identification of the special policy areas [including BEESTON/HOLBECK] and to incorporate the recommendation under Alteration 07/008; and renumbering subsequent Policies R2 and R3 accordingly.

3. deleting Thorpe Arch Trading Estate from the list under New Communities

POLICY R2

AREA-BASED INITIATIVES WILL BE UNDERTAKEN WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE POLICIES AND PROPOSALS IN THE UDP, IN ORDER TO ADDRESS AREA, NEIGHBOURHOOD AND COMMUNITY ISSUES. THE FOLLOWING AREAS ARE IDENTIFIED BELOW, AND ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, FOR ACTION:

OTHER NEIGHBOURHOOD REGENERATION

BEESTON & HOLBECK
SEACROFT
SWARCLIFFE
EAST BANK
HUNSLET
LITTLE LONDON

AREA POLICY

WIDER HEADINGLEY AREA OF HOUSING MIX
CITY CENTRE STRATEGIES - HOUSING, ENVIRONMENT
WATERFRONT STRATEGY
WYKEBECK VALLEY

TOWN CENTRES

OTLEY
MORLEY
WETHERBY
ARMLEY
PUDSEY
GARFORTH
HOLT PARK
SEACROFT
ROTHWELL
MIDDLETON
HALTON
HEADINGLEY
HORSFORTH

LOCAL COMMUNITIES

EAST KESWICK
BRAMHOPE
POOL
BARDSEY
ABERFORD
OTLEY
THORP ARCH VILLAGE
ALLERTON BYWATER

		<p>MICKLEFIELD CENTRAL HEADINGLEY FAR HEADINGLEY AND WEST PARK</p> <p><u>NEW COMMUNITIES</u> HOLBECK URBAN VILLAGE</p> <p><u>HERITAGE REGENERATION SCHEMES</u> MORLEY HOLBECK CHAPELTOWN</p> <p>THIS LIST WILL BE KEPT UNDER REVIEW, AND ADDITIONAL AREAS WILL BE ADDRESSED AS PRIORITIES AND RESOURCES PERMIT.</p> <p>DETAILS OF THE INITIATIVE ARE PROVIDED IN THE AREA AND SITE STATEMENTS IN SECTION III, WHICH IN EACH CASE IDENTIFY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PROPOSED APPROACH - ISSUES TO BE COVERED - MAIN PARTNERS - INTENDED PURPOSE - PROCESS ENVISAGED - LIKELY TIMESCALE
<p>Prop. Alt. 11/003 & 11/003RD</p>	<p><u>PA 11/003</u> REGENERATION POLICY PRINCIPLES</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 11.48, I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with RD Alteration 11/003 subject to adding to bullet point 4 of para. 11.5.3:</p> <p>"Policy E7 will not be applied as a constraint or to restrict preparation of appropriate land uses in AAPs, although this does not imply that these existing employment allocations or uses will necessarily change."</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council agrees with the Inspectors conclusions in paragraphs 11.37 – 47 for re-affirming the proposed regeneration policy principles and clarifying the role of Policy E7 in the context of preparation of Area Action Plans.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> To add a sentence for bullet point 4 of para 11.5.3 to clarify the role of Policy E7 in the context of preparation of Area Action Plans.</p> <p><u>The modified plan will read as follows:</u></p> <p>11.5.3....</p> <p><u>Employment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure that there is a range of employment sites, of the right size and quality, and in the right areas, to attract investment and create jobs • maintain a strong relationship between the location of homes and jobs, ensuring that new employment is easily accessible by modes other than the car, • foster concentrations of employment in and around existing centres and key nodes of public transport accessibility. • resist the loss of viable employment land uses, particularly those in and accessible to regeneration and renewal areas through the application of Policy E7. Policy E7 will not be applied as a constraint or to restrict preparation of appropriate land uses in AAPs, although this does not imply that these existing employment allocations or uses will necessarily change. • strengthen the links between the development process and employment and training

		opportunities.
Prop. Alt. 11/004	<p>PA 11/004 POLICY R2 – COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDERS</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para 11.51, I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with Alteration 11/004 with the second sentence of para. 11.6.1 amended to read as follows:</p> <p>“CPOs can be used to improve the social, economic or environmental wellbeing of an area, providing that there is an overriding public interest in the proposed acquisition, and that compulsory purchase is pursued as a last resort after attempts to acquire land through mutual agreement have proven impractical.”</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council agrees with the Inspectors conclusions in paragraph 11.50. His recommended rewording will bring the text more closely into line with national guidance.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Reword the second sentence of para 11.6.1</p> <p><u>The modified plan will read as follows:</u></p> <p>The use of Compulsory Purchase Orders</p> <p>11.6.1 The Council can make an important contribution to the regeneration of the District by using its legal powers to acquire land and property either on its own behalf or in partnership with a developer. CPOs can be used to improve the social, economic or environmental wellbeing of an area, providing that there is an overriding public interest in the proposed acquisition, and that compulsory purchase is pursued as a last resort after attempts to acquire land through mutual agreement have proven impractical. It is recognised that to enable regeneration activity to take place and to deal with neglected land and buildings which blight an area, it will sometimes be necessary for the City Council and other empowered agencies to pursue CPOs. They will be appropriate in the context of the regeneration strategy for the locality, which explains the rationale for the use (and acquisition) of land and they should be pursued in a transparent manner involving consultation with affected parties and justifications clearly set out, and the Council should do its best to mitigate disruption to landowners and businesses.</p>
Prop. Alt. 11/005	<p>PA 11/005 POLICY R3 – GENERAL IMPROVEMENTS</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para 11.54, That no modification be made to the UDP other than for updating purposes.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council agrees with the Inspectors conclusion in para 11.53 that the Plan paragraph 11.6.3 needs to be updated to take account of the progression of national legislation since the First Deposit was written.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Reword para 11.6.3 to explain the latest national advice & legislative position with regard to the disposal of land at less than best consideration by local authorities.</p> <p><u>The modified plan will read as follows:</u></p> <p>General Improvement</p> <p>11.6.2. The Council has opportunity to pursue a range of local initiatives and improvements in order to enhance the “wellbeing” of the people of Leeds under the Local Government Act 2000. This aims to encourage innovation and looser joint working between local authorities and their partners to improve communities' quality of life. In pursuance of wellbeing, the Act enables local authorities to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. incur expenditure, b. give financial assistance to any person, c. enter into arrangements or agreements with any person, d. co-operate with, or facilitate or co-ordinate the activities of any person,

- e. exercise on behalf of any person any functions of that person, and
- f. provide staff, goods, services or accommodation to any person.

11.6.3. In August 2003, the government gave a general consent to local authorities for the disposal of certain land at less than the highest price where an authority considers the purpose for which that land is to be disposed is likely to contribute to the achievement of the promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well-being of its area, provided the 'discount' does not exceed £2m..

REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLANS PANEL
DATE: 3RD JANUARY 2006

SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON CHAPTER 14 (AIREBOROUGH, HORSFORTH AND BRAMHOPE)	
Electoral Wards Affected: Guiseley & Rawdon, Horsforth, Otley & Yeadon and Adel & Wharfedale	Specific Implications for: Ethnic Minorities <input type="checkbox"/> Women <input type="checkbox"/> Disabled People <input type="checkbox"/>
Key Decision <input type="checkbox"/> Major Decision <input type="checkbox"/> Eligible for call in <input type="checkbox"/> Not Eligible for call in <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Operational Decision <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Decision <input type="checkbox"/> (details contained in the report)	

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendation for Chapter 14 (Aireborough, Horsforth and Bramhope) and to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 There were 19 Proposed Modifications in Chapter 14. Eight Proposed Alterations were subject to objections, although five were considered at the Inquiry by the Inspector. The objections to the remaining three were withdrawn following revisions to the wording which was accepted by the objectors prior to the inquiry taking place.

Protected Areas of Search

2.2 Two of the sites considered at the inquiry (land at Breary Lane East, Bramhope and Haw Lane, Yeadon) concerned land allocated in the Adopted UDP as Protected Areas of Search (PAS), which were proposed to be returned to the Green Belt. These two sites are site-specific examples of the key strategic issues which have been set out in the separate report on PAS policy which has been presented to the Panel. In that report, the Inspector’s clear recommendation to retain all PAS sites in the Plan, with the exception of those sites comprising the East Leeds Extension, has been explained. Whilst the Inspector’s conclusions concerning the Green Belt merits of individual sites is not in accord with the Council’s judgement, his recommendations at both a strategic and site specific level, have been accepted.

2.3 An additional PAS site at Canada Road, Rawdon was not subject to objections and was therefore not considered by the Inspector at the Inquiry. However, in paragraph 5.2 of the Inspector’s Report, he concludes that the overarching policy

considerations are such that the PAS sites which were not considered by him at the Inquiry, such as Canada Road, should be treated consistently with his recommendations on PAS. Given this clear advice it is recommended that the Canada Road site will be retained as a PAS site.

- 2.4 It is therefore recommended that the Breary Lane, Haw Lane and Canada Road sites are duly retained as PAS in the UDP Review and that Modifications are made to the Deposit Plan to reflect the Council's acceptance of the Inspector's strategic recommendation on PAS in Chapter 5.

Greenlea Road, Yeadon

- 2.5 The site at Greenlea Road, Yeadon concerns a housing allocation which was placed in Phase 3 of the UDP Review. As a consequence of the Inspector's recommendations relating to the distribution and phasing of housing land release in Chapter 7, the site is recommended to be placed in Phase 2.

Westbrook Lane / Brownberrie Lane, Horsforth

- 2.6 This greenfield housing allocation falls within Trinity and All Saints College and was proposed to be split into two phases in the UDP Review. The eastern side of the site was placed in Phase 2 in recognition of an extant planning permission for residential development, whilst the remaining area of the site was placed into Phase 3 given its greenfield status. The Inspector did not accept the objector's case that there were special circumstances for bringing forward the site which was not subject to the planning permission before 2011 to provide student accommodation. The Inspector recommended that this area of the site should remain in Phase 3.

A660/A65

- 2.7 This concerned an objection to the deletion of criteria iv of paragraph 14.1.3 of Volume 1 of the Adopted UDP to reflect the earlier deletion of Policy T2A in the Proposed Modifications to the draft UDP in 2000. Policy T2A had sought to control housing development on sites not allocated for housing in the A660/A65 corridor. The Inspector did not support the objection as Policy T2A no longer exists within the UDP and that the alteration was a consequential modification to the plan, in order to bring it into line with the Adopted UDP.

Leeds Bradford International Airport

- 2.8 There were three Proposed Alterations relating to the Airport at First and Revised Deposit stages which were all related to airport safety issues and objections were received to all three at First Deposit stage.
- 2.9 Two of the Proposed Alterations comprised new policies required by Government to be included in Development Plans. These are the Public Safety Zones, one at each end of the runway, under new Policy T30B (Alt 14/018) and the Aerodrome Safeguarding Area under Policy T30C (Alt 14/019). The third was for two small changes in the Airport Operational Land Boundary (AOLB) under existing Policy T30 (Alt 14/017).
- 2.10 The City Council considered it important to get the technical wording of the two new policies correct and so negotiated with the objectors. The outcome was that objections were withdrawn on the basis of the Revised Deposit wording of both Alt 14/018 and Alt 14/019.

- 2.11 Although a brief submission was made to the Public Inquiry for Alt 14/019 (Aerodrome Safeguarding Area) explaining the background to the withdrawn objections, the Inspector did not report on this. No submission was required for Alt 14/018 (Airport Public Safety Zones) as it was a not duly made objection and, hence, not included in Inspector's Report.
- 2.12 The objection to the AOLB (Alt 14/017) was due to a misunderstanding which, when explained, was withdrawn. A submission to the Public Inquiry was not therefore required and, hence, not included in the Inspector's Report.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 Members are asked to agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendations in respect of Chapter 14 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.

CHAPTER 14 – AIREBOROUGH, HORSFORTH & BRAMHOPE

<p>Prop. Alt. 14/004</p>	<p>PA 14/004 GREENLEA RD., YEADON – H3B(4)</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para 14.4 I recommend that the UDP be modified to include site H3-3.5, Greenlea Road Yeadon in recommended Phase 2</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 14.2-14.3 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the UDP</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing the site from Policy H3-3 and including the site in Phase 2 of the revised Policy H3, under reference H3-2A.1
<p>Prop. Alt. 14/010</p>	<p>PA 14/010 WESTBROOK LANE/BROWNBERRIE LA., HORSFORTH – H4.2</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para. 14.10 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration 14/010</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 14.6-14.9 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the UDP in accordance with Proposed Alteration 14/010.</p> <p>Proposed Modification None</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 14/012</p>	<p>PA 14/012 A660/A65</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation: Para. 14.13 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration 14/012</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 14.12 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the UDP in accordance with Proposed Alteration 14/012</p> <p>Proposed Modification None</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 14/014</p>	<p>PA 14/014 BREARY LANE EAST, BRAMHOPE – N34.1</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para. 14.24 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 14.15-14.23 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan. Although the Inspector's wording in his recommendation is that "no modification be made to the UDP", his clear intent is for the site to be retained as PAS and therefore a modification to the UDP Review is required.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deleting Proposed Alteration 14/014 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.1 Reinstate paragraph 14.2.12 of Volume 1:

		<p>BREARY LANE EAST, BRAMHOPE</p> <p>15.4 ha of land at Breary Lane East, Bramhope, has been allocated as Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstatement of the site as Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map • Reinstatement of the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A14.4 of Volume 2: <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>SITES IDENTIFIED UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p>Breary Lane East, 15.4 ha Deletion, to allow for possible long-term Bramhope development</p>
<p>Prop. Alt 14/015</p>	<p>PA 14/015 CANADA ROAD, RAWDON – N34. 15</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation The Inspector did not consider this site at the Inquiry. However he does comment on the 6 PAS sites, including Canada Road, which were not before him in paragraph 5.2 of his report</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons This was not an issue at the Public Inquiry as the Proposed Alteration did not attract any objections. However, in paragraph 5.2 of the Inspector's Report, he concludes that the overarching policy considerations are such that PAS sites which were not considered by him at the Inquiry should be treated consistently with his recommendations on PAS. It is therefore proposed to accept the Inspector's recommendations to modify the Deposit Plan by retaining this site as a PAS</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting Proposed Alteration 14/015 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.2 • Reinstatement of paragraph 14.2.13 of Volume 1: <p>LAND AT CANADA ROAD, YEADON</p> <p>1.13 ha of land at Canada Road, Yeadon, has been allocated as Protected Area of Search under Policy N34</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstatement of the site as Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map • Reinstatement of the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A14.4 of Volume 2: <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>Land at Canada Road, Yeadon 1.13 ha Deletion, to allow for possible long-term development needs beyond the plan period</p>

<p>Prop. Alt. 14/016</p>	<p>PA 14/016 HAW LANE, YEADON – N34.3</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para. 14.38 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 14.26-14.37 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation that no modification be made to the Plan. Although the Inspector's wording in his recommendation is that "no modification be made to the UDP", his clear intent is for the site to be retained as PAS and therefore a modification to the UDP Review is required.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting Proposed Alteration 14/016 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.21 • Reinstate paragraph 14.2.14 of Volume 1: <p style="text-align: center;">HAW LANE, YEADON</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2.27 ha of land at Haw Lane, Yeadon, has been allocated as Protected Area of Search under Policy N34</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate the site as Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map • Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A14.4 of Volume 2: <p style="text-align: center;">PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Haw Lane, Yeadon 2.27 ha Deletion, to allow for possible long-term development needs beyond the plan period</p>
---------------------------------	--	---

REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLANS PANEL
DATE: 3rd January 2006

SUBJECT: LEEDS UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW – INSPECTORS REPORT CHAPTER 16 – GARFORTH			
Electoral Wards Affected: BARWICK & KIPPAX		Specific Implications for: Ethnic Minorities <input type="checkbox"/> Women <input type="checkbox"/> Disabled People <input type="checkbox"/>	
Key Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	Major Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible for call in <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Eligible for call in <input type="checkbox"/>
Significant Operational Decision <input type="checkbox"/>		Administrative Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	(details contained in the report)

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this covering report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 16: Garforth, and to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 A number of site specific allocations identified in Chapter 16 were subject to objections. A summary is provided below and the attached table highlights the proposed modifications in light of the Inspectors recommendations:

Protected Areas of Search (PAS)

2.2 One of the key issues in Garforth concerned the Council’s proposals to return PAS sites into the Green Belt, with the exception of Scholes Farm Park (which forms part of the East Leeds Extension, and is dealt with in Chapter 15: East Leeds). The following six sites are recommended by the Inspector to be retained as PAS:

- East of Scholes (N34.8)
- Land South of Garforth (N34.9)
- Pit Lane, Micklefield (N34.10)
- Moorgate, Kippax (N34.12)
- Wood Lane, Scholes (N34.39)
- Park Lane, Allerton Bywater (N34.40)

2.3 All the sites are specific examples of the key strategic issues which have been set out in the separate report on PAS policy which has been presented to Panel. In that report, the Inspector’s clear recommendation to retain all PAS sites in the Plan, with the exception of those sites comprising the East Leeds Extension, has been

explained. He essentially argues that no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated that would justify amending the Green Belt boundaries so soon after adoption (2001). Whilst the Inspector's commentary about the Green Belt merits of individual sites is not in accord with the Council's judgement, his recommendations at both a strategic and site-specific level has been accepted.

- 2.4 It is therefore recommended that the above six sites in the Garforth chapter are duly retained as PAS and that Modifications are made to the UDP Review to reflect the Council's acceptance of the Inspector's strategic recommendations on PAS in Chapter 5.
- 2.5 The PAS site at Scholes Farm Park forms part of the East Leeds Extension which the Inspector has recommended as a Phase 3 housing site. This site will be dealt with in the report for Chapter 15: East Leeds, which is to be presented to panel in due course.

Regeneration Area Areas

- 2.6 The Council, under Policy R1 (Chapter 11), proposed the allocation of the following villages in the Garforth Chapter as Village Regeneration Areas (VRA):
- Allerton Bywater
 - Micklefield
- 2.7 The Inspector, in his recommendations on Chapter 11: Regeneration has amended Policy R1 with the effect that the above VRA's now fall within a new Policy R2. Details are covered in a separate report to Panel.
- 2.8 The Inspector has recommended that Allerton Bywater Village Regeneration Area, as proposed by the Council, is not modified. Although Park Lane has been retained as PAS (see above) the Inspector has recommended that the site is to be excluded from the Regeneration Area, as it's inclusion would promote the site's status from PAS to a more regenerative purpose.
- 2.9 In regard to Micklefield, the Inspector supports the Village Regeneration Area designation, but in light of his conclusions with regard to the Strategic Housing Site under Alteration 16/009 (see para 2.14 below) he concludes that the Plan should be modified to confine the Village Regeneration Area to the existing built-up area of the village and Peckfield Business Park (see attached plan). Objections seeking the inclusion of text on the role of developers and reference to a timetable has not been included. Although the Inspector has recommended the retention of Pit Lane as PAS land (see above), he has recommended that the site is excluded from the Regeneration Area. Likewise objections seeking the inclusion of land North of the railway station and land at Old Micklefield have not been included in the VRA.
- 2.10 It is therefore recommended that no modification is made to Allerton Bywater Village Regeneration Area, but that Micklefield Village Regeneration Area is modified to reflect the Council's acceptance of the Inspector's recommendations in regard to Chapter 11 and Micklefield Strategic Housing Site.

Strategic Housing Sites

- 2.11 Within the Garforth Chapter the Council, under Policy H3-1B, proposed that the following housing allocations, are identified as Strategic Housing Sites (SHS) in recognition of the investment and regeneration benefits that they will bring to the former mining communities:

- Allerton Bywater (H4:10)
- Micklefield (H4:13 and H4:72)

- 2.12 The Inspector supports the Councils proposals for Allerton Bywater Strategic Housing Site and therefore recommends that its status remains the same. The Inspector agrees with the Council that the site's planning permission has no bearing upon its status.
- 2.13 The Inspector, in his recommendations on Chapter 7: Housing has amended Proposed Alteration 7/001 to include Allerton Bywater SHS in Phase 1A under Policy H3. Details on Chapter 7 are covered in a separate report to Panel.
- 2.14 In regard to the two greenfield allocations that constitute Micklefield Strategic Housing Site, the Inspector concludes that there is no clear explanation as to why the development of green field sites for housing is a necessary component to comprehensive regeneration and how release in Phase 1 would materially enhance the regeneration of derelict land and degraded infrastructure – nor is it clear how the proposed development would address local deprivation levels or improve access to employment. The Inspector also concludes that, based on the sequential approach and regeneration of the village and the overall housing supply, there is no need to extend or alter the boundary of the housing allocations. Such a change would require a consequential change to the Green Belt, to which there are no exceptional circumstances. The Inspector therefore amends the Council's proposals for Micklefield, concluding that the two housing allocations should not be allocated as a Strategic Housing Site and should not proceed in Phase 1 of the UDP. Instead the two housing allocations (H4.13 and H4.72) without areal amendment should be placed in Phase 3 of the housing strategy. Subsequently the two housing allocations have been excluded from the Village Regeneration Area (see above).

Queen Street Housing Site (H3-3:25)

- 2.15 The Council proposed the inclusion of Queen Street housing allocation (H4.11) to be included in Phase 3 of the housing phasing strategy.
- 2.16 The Inspector supports the Council's proposals and therefore recommends that no modification is made to the UDP Review.

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 Members are asked to agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter 16 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.

CHAPTER 16 - GARFORTH

<p>Prop. Alt. 16/002</p>	<p>PA 16/002 AREA STATEMENT – New Para.</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para.16.3 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with Alteration 16/002 amended to read:</p> <p>“The former coalfield villages of Allerton Bywater and Micklefield are identified as areas for Local Community Regeneration under Policy R2. Land at Allerton Bywater has been identified as a Strategic Housing Site under Policy H3-1A.”</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 16.2 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector’s recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Proposed Alteration 16/002 to read: The former coalfield villages of Allerton Bywater and Micklefield are identified as areas for Local Community Regeneration under Policy R2. Land at Allerton Bywater has been identified as a Strategic Housing Site under Policy H3-1A. <p><u>Related Alterations</u> 7/001, 16/004, 16/005, 16,008 and 16/009</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 16/004</p>	<p>PA 16/004 ALLERTON BYWATER VILLAGE REGENERATION</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para 16.6 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with Alteration 16/004.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 16.11 – 16.15 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector’s recommendation to identify Allerton Bywater Regeneration Area in accordance with his amendments to Policy R1 (Chapter 11).</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete references to Policy R1 and replace with Policy R2 <p><u>Related Alteration:</u> 11/002, 16/009</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 16/005</p> <p>16/005/ RD</p>	<p>PA 16/005 ALLERTON BYWATER – STRATEGIC HOUSING SITE</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para 16.19 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with Alteration 16/005 amended to take account of my recommendation that the SHS should be included in Housing Phase 1A.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusion in Para 16.18 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector’s recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Proposed Alteration 16/005 by deleting references to H3.1B:5 and replacing with H3-1A.42 <p><u>Related Alteration:</u> 7/001</p>

<p>Prop. Alt. 16/006</p>	<p>PA 16/006 POLICY H4.11 – QUEEN STREET, WOODEND, ALLERTON BYWATER</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 16.22 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with Alteration 16/006.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para 16.21 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with his recommendations to Proposed Alteration 7/001.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> None</p> <p><u>Related Alterations</u> 7/001, 7/002, 7/003, 7/004</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 16/008</p>	<p>PA16/008 MICKLEFIELD VILLAGE REGENERATION AREA</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 16.28 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with Alteration 16/008 amended to exclude reference to the SHS and the developers of the constituent housing sites and that the VRA be confined to the built-up area of the village and the Peckfield Business Park.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 16.24– 16.27 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with his amendments to Policy R1, Chapter 11.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete references to Micklefield Village Regeneration Area under Policy R1 and include it within Policy R2 • Amend the last paragraph of Proposed Alteration 16/008 to read: An Action Plan will be prepared to support the existing overall regeneration strategy and provide a context for regeneration proposals and applications for planning permission which will come forward in the future, particularly in the context of the Housing Allocations (H3-3A.31 (formerly H3-1B.4) and H3-3A.32 (formerly H3-1B.4) • Amend the boundary of the Micklefield Village Regeneration Area on the Proposals Map (Plan No M/xxx) <p><u>Related Alterations</u> 11/002, 16/002, 16/009</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 16/009 16/009/ RD</p>	<p>PA 16/009 MICKLEFIELD STRATEGIC HOUSING SITE</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 16.60 I recommend that the UDP should not be modified in accordance with Alteration 16/009 but that the housing allocations H4.13 and H4.72, without areal amendment, be included in the proposed Phase 3 of the UDP.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 16.30– 16.59 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete Proposed Alterations 16/009 and 16/012 and Plan M/033 • Reinstate paragraphs 16.2.4 and 16.2.7 of Volume 1, as amended by 16/009/R: amending the housing reference H4.13 and H4.72 to H3-3A.31 and H3-3A.32 <p>16.2.4 SOUTH OF OLD MICKLEFIELD</p> <p>Under Policy H3-3A.31, 5.2 ha of land is allocated for housing and local facilities South of Old Micklefield, subject to:</p>

i. PROVISION OF EXTENSIVE OFF-SITE FOUL DRAINAGE WORKS AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SHERBURN-IN-ELMET SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS, FOLLOWING THE RE-ALIGNMENT OF THE A1 EAST OF MICKLEFIELD;

ii. PROVISION OF SATISFACTORY ACCESS FROM CHURCH LANE, TOGETHER WITH OFF-SITE HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS TO CHURCH LANE;

iii. AN AGREED PLANNING FRAMEWORK WHICH WILL DETERMINE THE LOCATION OF HOUSING, GREENSPACE, LANDSCAPING, LOCAL FACILITIES AND ACCESS POINTS.

iv. SUBMISSION OF A SATISFACTORY FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT INCORPORATING AN APPROPRIATE DRAINAGE STRATEGY.

Furthermore, the developer will be expected to contribute to:

iv. PROVISION OF AN EXTENSION TO THE ADJACENT PRIMARY SCHOOL, IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICY A2(5) AND A CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL SECONDARY SCHOOL FACILITIES

v. PROVISION OF LOCAL FACILITIES WITHIN OR CLOSE TO THE SITE.

Development of this site provides housing to help meet local and District requirements, utilising the village's strategic location, close to the existing and proposed transport links (e.g. the existing station on the Leeds – Hull railway line, the A1, the M1-A1 Link Road and the A63). Furthermore, additional development is likely to support further facilities for use by both the existing and future residents of Micklefield.

The site abuts the Green Belt and the requirements of Policy N24 apply.

Access should be taken from Church Lane via a priority junction. Church Lane will require improvements to cater for the increased traffic generation from this site.

New sewage treatment facilities, required as a result of the A1 improvements, need to be in place prior to development.

The development of this and the Manor Farm site will result in the need for additional facilities at Micklefield Primary School (Policy A2(5)) and for extensions at the existing secondary school. Developers of these sites will be expected to contribute towards these at a level proportionally related to the development opportunities available at each site.

16.2.7 MANOR FARM, MICKLEFIELD

Under Policy H3-3A.32, 15.5 ha of land is allocated for housing and local facilities between Old Micklefield/New Micklefield and the realigned A1, subject to:

i. PROVISION OF EXTENSIVE OFF-SITE FOUL DRAINAGE WORKS AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SHERBURN-IN-ELMET SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS, FOLLOWING THE RE-ALIGNMENT OF THE A1 EAST OF MICKLEFIELD;

ii. PROVISION OF SATISFACTORY ACCESS;

iii. AN AGREED PLANNING FRAMEWORK WHICH WILL DETERMINE THE LOCATION OF

HOUSING, GREENSPACE, LANDSCAPING, LOCAL FACILITIES AND ACCESS POINTS;

- iv. **PROVISION OF AN EXTENSION TO THE ADJACENT PRIMARY SCHOOL, IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICY A2(5) AND A CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL SECONDARY SCHOOL FACILITIES;**
- v. **PROVISION OF A GREEN WEDGE BETWEEN OLD MICKLEFIELD AND NEW MICKLEFIELD;**
- vi. **THE COMPLETION OF THE A1 REALIGNMENT;**
- vii. **NOISE ATTENUATION MEASURES NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE SATISFACTORY STANDARDS OF RESIDENTIAL AMENITY.**
- iv. **SUBMISSION OF A SATISFACTORY FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT INCORPORATING AN APPROPRIATE DRAINAGE STRATEGY.**

Development of this site provides housing to help meet local and District requirements, utilising the village's strategic location, close to the existing and proposed transport links (e.g., the existing station on the Leeds – Hull railway line, the A1, the M1-A1 Link Road and the A63). Furthermore the scale of development is likely to support additional facilities for use by both the existing and future residents of Micklefield.

The A1 is to be realigned to the east and is to form the eastern edge of the site. Occupation of the area East of Old Micklefield will not be permitted in advance of the A1 realignment being completed.

In view of the sites proximity to the A1, satisfactory noise attenuation measures will be required.

The site abuts the Green Belt and the requirements of Policy N24 apply.

New sewage treatment facilities, required as a result of the A1 improvements, need to be in place prior to development.

The development of this and the site South of Old Micklefield will result in the need for additional facilities at Micklefield Primary School [Policy A2(5)] and for extensions at the existing secondary school. Developers of these sites will be expected to contribute towards these at a level proportionally related to the development opportunities available at each site.

Old and New Micklefield are separated by open countryside which provides a valuable visual feature and permits long distance views over the countryside. This open aspect should be retained in the form of a green wedge between Old and New Micklefield.

- Delete Micklefield Strategic Housing Site from Policy H3-1B and add the constituent housing allocations H3-3A.31 and H3-3A.32 to Phase 3 under the re-worded Policy H3-3.
- Reinstate the housing allocations H3-3A.31 and H3-3A.32 on the Proposals Map.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate Paragraph A16.4 of Volume 2: <p>OTHER CHANGES</p> <p>MICKLEFIELD</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>South of Old Micklefield</td> <td>5.9ha</td> <td>UDP proposal H4(13) and school playing field to the east</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Manor Farm</td> <td>15.5ha</td> <td>UDP proposal H4(72)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Related Alterations 7/001, 16/002, 16/008</p>	South of Old Micklefield	5.9ha	UDP proposal H4(13) and school playing field to the east	Manor Farm	15.5ha	UDP proposal H4(72)
South of Old Micklefield	5.9ha	UDP proposal H4(13) and school playing field to the east						
Manor Farm	15.5ha	UDP proposal H4(72)						
<p>Prop. Alt. 16/014</p>	<p>PA 16/014 POLICY N34.8 – LAND EAST OF SCHOLES</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para 16.72 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspectors conclusions in Para's 16.62 – 16.71 of the Report consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete proposed alteration 16/014 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.8 Reinstate paragraph 16.2.13 of Volume 1: <p>Land East of Scholes</p> <p>31.4ha of land East of Scholes has been allocated as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A 16.4 of Volume 2: <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>East of Scholes</td> <td>31.4ha</td> <td>To allow for possible long-term development needs beyond the plan period</td> </tr> </table> <p>Related Alterations 5/001, 5/002 and 7/005</p>	East of Scholes	31.4ha	To allow for possible long-term development needs beyond the plan period			
East of Scholes	31.4ha	To allow for possible long-term development needs beyond the plan period						
<p>Prop. Alt. 16/015</p>	<p>PA 16/015 POLICY N34.10 – PIT LANE, NEW MICKLEFIELD</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspectors conclusions in Para's 16.74 – 16.81 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan.</p>						

	<p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para16.82 I recommend that the objection site be retained as PAS within the RDUDP but not included within the Micklefield Regeneration Area.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete proposed alteration 16/015 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.10 • Reinstate paragraph 16.2.15 of Volume 1: <p>Pit Lane, New Micklefield</p> <p>4.8ha of land at Pit Lane, New Micklefield, is allocated as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map • Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A 16.4 of Volume 2. <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Pit Lane Micklefield</td> <td>5.1ha</td> <td>To allow for possible long-term development needs beyond the plan period</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Related Alterations</u> 5/001, 5/002, 7/005 and 16/008</p>	Pit Lane Micklefield	5.1ha	To allow for possible long-term development needs beyond the plan period
Pit Lane Micklefield	5.1ha	To allow for possible long-term development needs beyond the plan period			
<p>Prop. Alt. 16/016</p>	<p><u>PA 16/016</u> POLICY N34.11 – SCHOLLES FARM PARK</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> This site has been dealt with under Alteration 15/015</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> This Site has been dealt with under Proposed Alteration 15/015 in Chapter 15 – East Leeds</p>			
<p>Prop. Alt. 16/017</p>	<p><u>PA 16/017</u> POLICY N34.12 – MOORGATE, KIPPAX</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 16.93 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspectors conclusions in Para's 16.85 – 16.92 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete proposed alteration 16/017 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.12 • Reinstate paragraph 16.2.14 of Volume 1: <p>Moorgate, Kippax</p> <p>10.9ha of land at Moorgate, Kippax, has been allocated as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.</p>			

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A 16.4 of Volume 2. <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p>Moorgate, Kippax 10.94ha To allow for possible long-term development needs beyond the plan period</p> <p><u>Related Alterations</u> 5/001, 5/002, 7/005</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 16/018</p>	<p>PA 16/018 POLICY N34.39 – WOOD LANE, SCHOLES</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 16.98 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspectors conclusions in Para's 16.95 – 16.97 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the plan.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete proposed alteration 16/018 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.39 Reinstate paragraph 16.2.18 of Volume 1: <p>Wood Lane, Scholes</p> <p>1.9ha of land at Wood Lane, Scholes, has been allocated as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A 16.4 of Volume 2. <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p>Wood Lane, Scholes 1.9ha To allow for possible long-term development needs beyond the plan period</p> <p><u>Related Alterations</u> 5/001, 5/002, 7/005</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 16/019</p>	<p>PA 16/019 POLICY N34.40 – PARK LANE, ALLERTON BYWATER</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 16.100 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p> <p>The Inspector has dealt with this site under Proposed Alteration 16/004.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspectors conclusions in Para 16.99 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the plan as described under 16/004.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete proposed alteration 16/019 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.40

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate paragraph 16.2.19 of Volume 1: <p>Park Lane, Allerton Bywater</p> <p>41.2ha of land at Pit Lane, New Micklefield, has been allocated as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A16.4 of Volume 2. <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p>Park Lane, Allerton Bywater 41.2ha To allow for possible long-term development needs beyond the plan period</p> <p><u>Related Alterations</u> 5/001, 5/002, 7/005</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 16/025</p>	<p><u>PA 16/025</u> POLICY N34.9 – LAND AT SOUTH GARFORTH</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 16.107 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspectors conclusions in Para's 16.101-107 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the plan.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete proposed alteration 16/025 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.9 Reinstate paragraph 16.2.14 of Volume 1: <p>Land at South Garforth</p> <p>17.9ha of land at South Garforth, A63, has been allocated as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A16.4 of Volume 2. <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p>South Garforth, A63 17.9ha To allow for possible long-term development needs beyond the plan period</p> <p><u>Related Alterations</u> 5/001, 5/002, 7/005</p>



AGENDA
ITEM NO.:

Originator: Ian MacKay

Tel: 2478090

REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: PLANS PANEL
DATE: 3 JANUARY 2006

SUBJECT: REVIEW LEEDS UDP – INSPECTORS REPORT – CHAPTER 17 MORLEY	
Electoral Wards Affected: Morley	Specific Implications for: Ethnic Minorities <input type="checkbox"/> Women <input type="checkbox"/> Disabled People <input type="checkbox"/>
Key Decision <input type="checkbox"/> Major Decision <input type="checkbox"/> Eligible for call in <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Eligible for call in <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Operational Decision <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Decision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (details contained in the report)	

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of the report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 17 – Morley, and to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations.

2.0. BACKGROUND

2.1. There were 44 Proposed Alterations in the Morley Chapter, 11 of these were the subject of an objection to the Plan and were considered at the Inquiry by the Inspector. Of these, 11 sites, eight of them concerned land allocated in the Adopted UDP as Protected Areas of Search (PAS) which, were proposed to be returned to the Green Belt. The remaining three objection sites were related to the phased release of housing sites. All these sites are site-specific examples of the key strategic issues which have been set out in the separate reports on PAS and housing phasing policies which have been presented to the Panel.

2.2. The only PAS site in the adopted UDP which in the past has been suggested for possible employment development is located at the former Tingley Station, Morley, just north of the M62. Due to raised objections, the Inspector had to consider if this PAS site should come forward for employment development during the plan period, come forward for residential development in phase 2 or 3 of the plan period and whether the site could be partly developed as a conference centre. The Inspector rejected objector arguments to bring the site forward for any development during the plan period.

2.3. However, in terms of PAS, the Inspector’s clear recommendation is to retain all PAS sites in the Plan. Whilst the Inspector’s conclusions concerning the green belt merits of individual sites is not in accord with the Council’s judgement, his recommendations at both a strategic and site specific level, have been accepted. The strategic paper on PAS covers this issue in greater detail.

- 2.4. It is, therefore, recommended that these eight sites are retained as PAS in the UDP Review and that Modifications are made to the Deposit Plan to reflect the Council's acceptance of the Inspector's strategic recommendation on PAS in Chapter 5.
- 2.5. In considering the phasing of residential development sites in Morley, the inspector has recommended that two greenfield sites which the council had proposed for phase 3 (2012-2016) be brought forward for development in the new phase 2 (2008-2012). The sites now recommended for phase 2 now include Bruntcliffe Road and Daisy Hill, Morley. In considering the phasing of the third objection site at Whitehall Road, the Inspector recommended it remain in phase 3 as proposed by the council on the grounds the site is greenfield, it is not within or adjacent to the main urban area and is not well placed in sustainability terms. The objector was seeking to bring this site forward into an earlier version of the plan.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 Members are asked to agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendations in respect of Chapter 17 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.

CHAPTER 17 – MORLEY

<p>Prop. Alt. 17/004</p>	<p>PA 17/004 POLICY H4 (73) – BRUNTCLIFFE ROAD, MORLEY</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para 17.11 I recommend that site H3-3.35, Bruntcliffe Road, be included in Phase 2 of the RUDP, as I recommend it should be modified.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 17.2 to 17.10 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to include site H3-3.35, Bruntcliffe Road, in Phase 2 of the RUDP.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deleting H3.3.35 Bruntcliffe Road from H3-3 and inserting Bruntcliffe Road into Policy H3-2 under ref. H3.2A.5.
<p>Prop. Alt. 17/005</p>	<p>PA 17/005 POLICY H4(83) – DAISY HILL, MORLEY</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para 17.16 I recommend that the site H3-3.37, Daisy Hill, be included in Phase 2 of the RDUDP as I recommend it should be modified.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 17.12 to 17.15 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to include the site H3-3.37, Daisy Hill, in Phase 2 of the RUDP.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deleting H3-3.37, Daisy Hill, from policy H3-3 and inserting Daisy Hill, into policy H3-2 under ref. H3.2A.6.
<p>Prop. Alt. 17/007</p>	<p>PA 17/007 POLICY H3B(13) – WHITEHALL ROAD</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para 17.20 I recommend that the site be included in Phase 3 of the UDP.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 17.18 to 17.19 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to retain the site in phase 3 of the RUDP.</p> <p>Proposed Modification None</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 17/037</p>	<p>PA 17/037 POLICY N34.13 – LAND AT LOW MOOR FARM, MORLEY</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para 17.25 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 17.22 to 17.24 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to not modify the AUDP.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deleting proposed alteration 17/037 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.13 Reinstate paragraph 17.2.18 of volume 1

		<p>LAND AT LOW MOOR FARM, MORLEY</p> <p>7.4 ha of land at Low Moor Farm has been allocated as a Protected Area of Search under policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstatement of the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. • Reinstatement of the reference to a Green Belt change at para. A17.4 of Volume 2 <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Low Moor Farm, Morley</td> <td>6.5 ha.</td> <td>Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the plan period</td> </tr> </table>	Low Moor Farm, Morley	6.5 ha.	Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the plan period
Low Moor Farm, Morley	6.5 ha.	Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the plan period			
<p>Prop. Alt. 17/038</p>	<p><u>PA 17/038</u> POLICY N34.20 – WEST OF CHURWELL</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 17.35 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 17.27 to 17.34 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to not modify the AUDP.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting proposed alteration 17/038 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.20 • Reinstatement of paragraph 17.2.19 of volume 1 <p>LAND WEST OF CHURWELL</p> <p>3 ha of land to the east of the M621 are safeguarded as a Protected Area of Search. As part of the development of this site, adjacent to the west will be identified as proposed greenspace.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstatement of the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. • Reinstatement of the reference to a Green Belt change at para. A17.4 of Volume 2 <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>West of Churwell</td> <td>3 ha.</td> <td>Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the plan period</td> </tr> </table>	West of Churwell	3 ha.	Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the plan period
West of Churwell	3 ha.	Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the plan period			

<p>Prop. Alt. 17/039</p>	<p>PA 17/039 POLICY N34.14 – TINGLEY STATION</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation:</u> Para 17.90 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 17.37 to 17.89 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to not modify the AUDP.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting proposed alteration 17/39 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.14 • Reinstate paragraph 17.2.20 of volume 1 <p>LAND AT TINGLEY STATION, MORLEY</p> <p>43.6 ha of land at Tingley Station, Morley is allocated as a Protected Area of Search under policy N34. The site will only be considered in future at a review of the Plan and in the event that the Supertram link to Tingley is implemented or firmly committed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. • Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at para. A17.4 of Volume 2 <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Tingley Station, Morley</td> <td>43.6 ha.</td> <td>Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the plan period</td> </tr> </table>	Tingley Station, Morley	43.6 ha.	Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the plan period
Tingley Station, Morley	43.6 ha.	Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the plan period			
<p>Prop. Alt. 17/040</p>	<p>PA 17/040 POLICY N34.15 – LAND AT SPRING GARDENS, DRIGHLINGTON</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation:</u> Para 17.99 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 17.92 to 17.98 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to not modify the AUDP.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting proposed alteration 17/040 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.15 • Reinstate paragraph 17.2.21 of volume 1 <p>LAND AT SPRING GARDENS, DRIGHLINGTON</p>			

		<p>9.1 ha of land at Spring Gardens, Drighlington has been allocated as a Protected Area of Search under policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstatement of the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. • Reinstatement of the reference to a Green Belt change at para. A17.4 of Volume 2 <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p>Spring Gardens, Drighlington 9 ha. Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the plan period</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 17/041</p>	<p>PA 17/041 POLICY N34.16 – NEW LANE, EAST ARDSLEY</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 17.106 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 17.101 to 17.105 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to not modify the AUDP.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting proposed alteration 17/041 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.16 • Reinstatement of paragraph 17.2.22 of volume 1 <p>LAND AT NEW LANE, EAST ARDSLEY</p> <p>4.3 ha of land at New Lane, East Ardsley is allocated as a Protected Area of Search under policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstatement of the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. • Reinstatement of the reference to a Green Belt change at para. A17.4 of Volume 2 <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p>New Lane, East Ardsley 4.3 ha. Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the plan period</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 17/042</p>	<p>PA 17/042 POLICY N34.40 – BRADFORD ROAD, EAST ARDSLEY</p> <p><u>Inspector's Recommendation:</u></p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 17.108 to 17.116 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to not modify the AUDP.</p>

	<p>Para 17.117 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting proposed alteration 17/042 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.40 • Reinstate paragraph 17.2.23 of volume 1 <p>LAND AT BRADFORD ROAD, EAST ARDSLEY</p> <p>13.64 ha of land at Bradford Road, East Ardsley is allocated as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. • Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at para. A17.4 of Volume 2 <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p>Bradford Road, East Ardsley 13.64 ha. Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the Plan period</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 17/043</p>	<p><u>PA 17/043</u> POLICY N34.18 – LANE SIDE FARM, CHURWELL</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 17.125 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 17.119 to 17.124 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to not modify the AUDP.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting proposed alteration 17/043 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.18 • Reinstate paragraph 17.2.24 of volume 1 <p>LAND AT LANE SIDE FARM, CHURWELL</p> <p>17.5 ha of land at Lane Side Farm, Churwell is allocated as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34. If this is considered in future it is anticipated that only 12 ha will be available for housing, with the remaining 5.5ha to be provided as greenspace.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. • Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at para. A17.4 of Volume 2

		<p style="text-align: center;">PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Lane Side Farm, Churwell 17.5 ha. Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the plan period</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 17/044</p>	<p>PA 17/044 POLICY N34.19 – OWLERS FARM, MORLEY</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 17.130 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 17.127 to 17.129 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to not modify the AUDP.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting proposed alteration 17/044 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.19 • Reinstate paragraph 17.2.25 of volume 1 <p style="text-align: center;">LAND AT OWLERS FARM, MORLEY</p> <p>4.1 ha of land at Owlery Farm, Morley is allocated as a Protected Area of Search under policy N34. If this site is considered in future it is anticipated that it will be associated with proposals for woodland planting on 8.4 ha of land to the east of the Dewsbury Road/Wide Lane roundabout in furtherance of UDP policies N41, N41A and N41B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. • Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at para. A17.4 of Volume 2 <p style="text-align: center;">PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Owlery Farm, Morley 4.1 ha. Deletion to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the plan period</p>

REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLANS PANEL
DATE: 3RD JANUARY 2006

SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON CHAPTER 18 (NORTH LEEDS)			
Electoral Wards Affected: Adel & Wharfedale, Weetwood, Moortown, Chapel Allerton and Roundhay		Specific Implications for: Ethnic Minorities <input type="checkbox"/> Women <input type="checkbox"/> Disabled People <input type="checkbox"/>	
Key Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	Major Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible for call in <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Eligible for call in <input type="checkbox"/>
Significant Operational Decision <input type="checkbox"/>		Administrative Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	(details contained in the report)

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 18 – North Leeds, and to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 There were 33 Proposed Alterations in the North Leeds Chapter, of which four were the subject of objections to the plan and were considered at the Inquiry by the Inspector. An additional objection affecting North Leeds, in relation to Chapter 7 - Housing (land at Bodington) was also considered at the Inquiry by the Inspector.

Protected Areas of Search

2.2 Of the five sites considered at the inquiry, two of them (land at Moseley Bottom, Cookridge and Church Lane, Adel) concerned land allocated in the Adopted UDP as Protected Areas of Search (PAS) which were proposed to be returned to the Green Belt. These two sites are site-specific examples of the key strategic issues which have been set out in the separate report on PAS policy which has been presented to the Panel. In that report, the Inspector’s clear recommendation to retain all PAS sites in the Plan, with the exception of those sites comprising the East Leeds Extension, has been explained. Whilst the Inspector’s conclusions concerning the green belt merits of individual sites is not in accord with the Council’s judgement, his recommendations at both a strategic and site specific level, have been accepted.

2.3 It is therefore recommended that these two sites are duly retained as PAS in the UDP Review and that a Modification is made to the Deposit Plan to reflect the Council’s acceptance of the Inspector’s strategic recommendation on PAS in Chapter 5.

Greenfield Housing Allocation

- 2.4 The site at Church Lane, Adel concerns a housing allocation which was placed in Phase 3 of the UDP Review. As a consequence of the Inspector's recommendations relating to the distribution and phasing of housing land release in Chapter 7, the site is now recommended to be placed in Phase 2.

Holt Park District Centre

- 2.5 The proposals for the redevelopment of Holt Park District Centre were subject to an objection to Proposed Alteration 18/031. The objection was not about the principle of development, but raised specific comments in relation to the planning application for the replacement Ralph Thoresby High School, playing pitch provision, public consultation and the need for an environmental and transport assessment of the proposals.
- 2.6 Although the Inspector recommended a number of modifications to the text for the Proposed Alteration in order to tighten up some of the wording. He supported the general approach taken in the UDP Review. Many of the issues raised by the objector related to details which will be dealt with through the consultation on the emerging development proposals and subsequent planning application.

Land at Bodington, Lawnswood

- 2.7 The site occupies an area of 6.5 hectares within the grounds of the University of Leeds Bodington Hall student accommodation complex to the east of Otley Road, Lawnswood and to the north of the existing Bodington Hall playing pitches. The land is allocated for employment use (Policy E4(17)), specifically as a Key Business Park reserved for B1 offices (Policy E18(6)). The land is also washed over by the Urban Green Corridor (Policy N8)
- 2.8 An objection was lodged under Chapter 7 (Proposed Alteration 7/003) on behalf of the University of Leeds primarily on the grounds that there was an adequate supply of employment land and that the site should be reallocated for residential use.
- 2.9 The Council's principal argument at the Inquiry was that a review of existing employment allocations was not part of the UDP Review and as such the site should be retained as an employment allocation. Furthermore, the site is greenfield and its release would not accord with planning policy in terms of the phased release of housing land.
- 2.10 The Inspector has supported the Council's position and commented that no evidence had been put forward at the Inquiry to change the allocation of the site in advance of the Regional Employment Land Study and a full review of employment land within the Leeds district. Furthermore, the Inspector commented that "Bodington's location, on a main radial road and close to the Outer Ring Road and to extensive housing areas, its attractive setting, and its good public transport links, existing and proposed, suggest that the site has considerable potential for prestige office development".
- 2.11 The Inspector therefore recommends that no modification is made to the Adopted UDP. The land will therefore remain allocated for employment use.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 Members are asked to agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendations in respect of Chapter 18 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.

CHAPTER 18 – NORTH LEEDS

<p>Prop. Alt. 18/006</p>	<p>PA 18/006 POLICY H4(21) – CHURCH LANE, ADEL</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para 18.6 I recommend that the UDP be modified to include H3-3.26, Church Lane, Adel in Phase 2</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 18.2-18.5 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the UDP.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing the site from Policy H3-3 and including the site in Phase 2 of the revised Policy H3, under reference H3-2A.7
<p>Prop. Alt. 18/031</p>	<p>PA 18/031 REGENERATION – HOLT PARK DISTRICT CENTRE</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para 18.20 I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration 18/031, as amended by IC/001 and LCC/043 but subject to the following further amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> deleting the FOLLOWING ISSUES WILL BE ADDRESSED: and substituting THE OBJECTIVES ARE: deleting "unless it can be demonstrated that other significant benefits to sport can be provided" and substituting as a new sentence: "Loss of playing pitches will only be acceptable where pitches are replaced by others of equivalent or better quantity and quality, or where outdoor or indoor sports facilities are provided of sufficient benefit to the development of sport to outweigh the loss." updating the text to reflect the up to date situation on the proposals at the formal modification stage 	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 18.8-18.19 of the Report. However the comment at paragraph 18.10 that there is unmet demand for playing fields in Leeds referred to the Adopted UDP (paragraph 5.2.22) is not the up to date position. Playing pitch provision is being addressed through the Playing Pitch Strategy in consultation with the Department of Learning & Leisure.</p> <p>The Council accepts all of the Inspector's recommendation in relation to Holt Park. As a consequence of the Inspector's recommendation under the Chapter 11 - Regeneration, Holt Park District Centre is now listed under Policy R2, not Policy R1.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The highlighted text should be modified to read as:- <p>UNDER POLICY R2, HOLT PARK DISTRICT CENTRE, DEFINED IN THE PROPOSALS MAP, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN 'ACTION AREA' IN ORDER TO GUIDE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS AND INVESTMENT IN AND AROUND THE DISTRICT CENTRE. THE OBJECTIVES ARE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of modern shopping facilities, including a new supermarket The provision of new and enhanced community facilities such as a replacement secondary school (Ralph Thoresby School), new library, health centre and improvements to the existing leisure centre provided within the site, both for the school and the community To promote underused car parking sites for appropriate development To ensure that the centre is a focus for public transport To secure a net gain in the overall quality of playing pitch provision. Loss of playing pitches will only be acceptable where pitches are replaced by others of equivalent or better quantity and quality, or where outdoor or indoor sports

		<p>facilities are provided of sufficient benefit to the development of sport to outweigh the loss</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the end of the paragraph entitled “Partnerships” replace “2003” with “2006” • At the end of the paragraph entitled “Timescale” replace “2004” with “2006 with the development of a replacement Ralph Thoresby School. The remaining elements of the District Centre will come forward when the school has been completed” 			
<p>Prop. Alt. 18/033</p>	<p>PA 18/033 POLICY N34.21 – MOSELEY BOTTOM, COOKRIDGE</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para 18.29 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 18.22-18.28 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector’s recommendation to modify the plan</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting Proposed Alteration 18/033 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.21 • Reinstate paragraph 18.2.15 of Volume 1: <p>MOSELEY BOTTOM, COOKRIDGE</p> <p>9.9ha of land at Moseley Bottom, Cookridge has been allocated as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map • Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A18.4 of Volume 2 <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Moseley Bottom, Cookridge</td> <td>9.9 ha</td> <td>Deletions to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the Plan Period</td> </tr> </table>	Moseley Bottom, Cookridge	9.9 ha	Deletions to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the Plan Period
Moseley Bottom, Cookridge	9.9 ha	Deletions to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the Plan Period			
<p>Prop. Alt 18/034</p>	<p>PA 18/034 POLICY N34.22 – CHURCH LANE, ADEL</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para. 18.38 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 18.31-18.37 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector’s recommendation that no modification be made to the Adopted UDP</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting Proposed Alteration 18/034 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under 			

		<p>reference N34.22.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate the paragraph 18.2.16 of Volume 1: <p>CHURCH LANE, ADEL</p> <p>11.7 ha of land at Church Lane, Adel has been allocated as a Protected Area of Search under Policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A18.4 of Volume 2 <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p>Church Lane, Adel 11.7 ha Deletions to allow for possible long term development needs beyond the Plan period</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 7/003</p>	<p>PA 7/003 LAND AT BODINGTON, LAWNSWOOD</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 18.54 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 18.40-18.53 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation not to modify the UDP.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> None</p>

**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL
DATE: 3 JANUARY 2006**

**SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON
CHAPTER 20 (Pudsey)**

Electoral Wards Affected:

ALL

Specific Implications for:

Ethnic Minorities

Women

Disabled People

Key Decision Major Decision Eligible for call in Not Eligible for call in
Significant Operational Decision Administrative Decision (details contained in the report)

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of the report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 20 – Pudsey, and to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 There were 22 Proposed Alterations in the Pudsey Chapter, but only 6 of these were the subject of an objection to the Plan and were considered at the Inquiry by the Inspector. Of these six sites, three of them concerned land allocated in the Adopted UDP as Protected Areas of Search (PAS) which, in the case of land at Calverley Lane and Kirklees Knowl, were proposed to be returned to the Green Belt and, in the case of Hill Foot Farm, was proposed to be re-allocated as Protected Open Land under Policy N11.

2.2 All these sites are site-specific examples of the key strategic issues which have been set out in the separate report on PAS policy which has been presented to the Panel. In that report, the Inspector’s clear recommendation to retain all PAS sites in the Plan, with the exception of those sites comprising the East Leeds Extension, has been explained. Whilst the Inspector’s conclusions concerning the green belt merits of individual sites is not in accord with the Council’s judgement, his recommendations at both a strategic and site specific level, have been accepted.

2.3 It is therefore recommended that these three sites are duly retained as PAS in the UDP Review and that a Modification is made to the Deposit Plan to reflect the Council’s acceptance of the Inspector’s strategic recommendation on PAS in Chapter 5.

2.4 The other 3 cases concern housing allocations which were placed in Phase 3 of the UDP Review. As a consequence of the Inspector’s recommendations relating to the distribution and phasing of housing land release in Chapter 7, Delph End, Pudsey and

Pudsey Road, Swinnow are recommended to be placed in Phase 2. The third site, a very small one located at Hare Lane, is recommended to be placed in Phase 1 in recognition of it being under construction following the grant of planning permission.

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 Members are asked to agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendations in respect of Chapter 20 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.

CHAPTER 20 – PUDSEY

<p>Prop. Alt. 20/002</p>	<p>PA 20/002 POLICY H4(30) – DELPH END, PUDSEY</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para. 20.39 I recommend that the UDP be modified to include H3-3.30., Delph End, Pudsey in the proposed Phase 2.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 20.35 to 20.38 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing this site from policy H3-3 and including the site in phase 2 under the reworded policy H3 – 2C.
<p>Prop. Alt. 20/007</p> <p>20/007/ RD</p>	<p>PA 20/007 POLICY H3B(63) – HARE LANE, PUDSEY</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para 20.33 I recommend that the UDP be modified by adding Hare Lane, Pudsey to the H3-1A sites and deleting it from the H3-3 sites, and to take account of consequent changes in accordance with IC/013.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para 20.32 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with IC/013.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deleting Hare Lane, Pudsey from policy H3-3 and adding it to the reworded policy H3-1A as Phase 1 housing site
<p>Prop. Alt. 20/009</p> <p>20/009/ RD</p>	<p>PA 20/009 POLICY H3C(14) – PUDSEY ROAD, SWINNOW</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para 20.7 I recommend that the UDP be modified to include H3-3.19 Pudsey Road Swinnow in the proposed Phase 2</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 20.2 to 20.6 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing this site from policy H3-3 and adding it to Phase 2 under the reworded policy H3 – 2C.
<p>Prop. Alt. 20/020</p>	<p>PA 20/020 POLICY N34.24 – HILL FOOT FARM, PUDSEY</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para 20.15 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accept the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 20.9 to 20.14 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan. Although the Inspector's wording in his recommendation is that "no modification be made to the UDP", his clear intent is for the site to be retained as PAS and therefore a modification to the UDP Review is required.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deleting proposed alteration 20/020 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.24. Reinstate paragraph 20.2.13 of Volume 1 <p>HILL FOOT FARM, PUDSEY</p> <p>2.7 ha of land is protected at Hill Foot Farm, Pudsey as an area of search for long term development under Policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. 			
<p>Prop. Alt. 20/021</p>	<p>PA 20/021 POLICY N34.25 – CALVERLEY LANE, FARSLEY</p> <p><u>Inspector’s Recommendation</u> Para 20.24 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 20.17 to 20.23 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector’s recommendation to modify the Plan. Although the Inspector’s wording in his recommendation is that “no modification be made to the UDP”, his clear intent is for the site to be retained as PAS and therefore a modification to the UDP Review is required.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deleting proposed alteration 20/021 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.25. Reinstate paragraph 20.2.14 of Volume 1: <p>CALVERLEY LANE, FARSLEY</p> <p>6.5 ha of land is protected at Calverley Lane, Farsley as an area of search for long term development under Policy N34.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A 20.4 of Volume 2. <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Calverley Lane, Farsley</td> <td>6.5 ha.</td> <td>Deletion to allow for protected area of search for potential long term development</td> </tr> </table>	Calverley Lane, Farsley	6.5 ha.	Deletion to allow for protected area of search for potential long term development
Calverley Lane, Farsley	6.5 ha.	Deletion to allow for protected area of search for potential long term development			
<p>Prop. Alt. 20/022</p>	<p>PA 20/022 POLICY N34.26 – KIRKLEES KNOWL</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para 20.30 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 20.26 to 20.29 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector’s recommendation to modify the Plan. Although the Inspector’s wording in his recommendation is that “no modification be made to the UDP”, his clear intent is for the site to be retained as PAS and therefore a modification to the UDP Review is required.</p>			

		<p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting proposed alteration 20/022 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.26. • Reinstate paragraph 20.2.15 of Volume 1 <p>KIRKLEES KNOWL, FARSLEY</p> <p>19.7 ha of land is protected at Kirklees Knowl, Farsley as an area of search for long term development under Policy N34</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. • Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A 20.4 of Volume 2. <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1153 699 1400 719">Kirklees Knowl, Farsley</td> <td data-bbox="1442 699 1523 719">19.7 ha.</td> <td data-bbox="1585 699 2078 746">Deletion to allow for protected area of search for potential long term development</td> </tr> </table>	Kirklees Knowl, Farsley	19.7 ha.	Deletion to allow for protected area of search for potential long term development
Kirklees Knowl, Farsley	19.7 ha.	Deletion to allow for protected area of search for potential long term development			

**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL
DATE: 3 JANUARY 2006**

SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON CHAPTER 21 (ROTHWELL)			
Electoral Wards Affected:	Specific Implications for:		
ALL	Ethnic Minorities	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Women	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Disabled People	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Key Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	Major Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible for call in <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Eligible for call in <input type="checkbox"/>
Significant Operational Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	Administrative Decision <input type="checkbox"/>	(details contained in the report)	

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of the report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter 21 – Rothwell, and to determine the appropriate response to these recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 There were 25 Proposed Alterations in the Rothwell Chapter, but only four sites were the subject of an objection to the Plan and these were considered at the Inquiry by the Inspector. Three of them concerned land allocated in the adopted UDP as Protected Areas of Search (PAS) which were proposed to be returned to the Green Belt.
- 2.2 The strategic PAS report refers to 6 other PAS sites proposed to be returned to the Green Belt in the Review including Mickletown Road, Methley which were not before the Inspector. In line with the recommendation in the strategic report on PAS, it is proposed to retain these sites as PAS and not to proceed to include them in the Green Belt as originally proposed. The other objection in the Rothwell Chapter involved a housing allocation site within Phase 3 of the UDP Review.
- 2.3 In addition to these objections, the Council also sought, via an Inquiry Change, to change the Matty Lane, Robin Hood housing allocation (H3-1A.13) from Phase 1 to Phase 3 in recognition that it is a greenfield site and to correct an error in the sequential approach to housing land release, which places brownfield before greenfield.

3.0 PROTECTED AREAS OF SEARCH

3.1 One of the key issues in Rothwell concerned the Council’s proposals to return PAS sites into the Green Belt. The following three sites are recommended by the Inspector to be returned as PAS:-

- Greenland Farm, Oulton (Alteration 21/010)
- Royds Lane, Rothwell (Alteration 21/011)
- Pitfield Road, Carlton (Alteration 21/012)

3.2 All these sites are site-specific examples of the key strategic issues which have been set out in the separate report on PAS policy which has been presented to the Panel. In that report, the Inspector's clear recommendation to retain all PAS sites in the Plan, with the exception of those sites comprising the East Leeds Extension, has been explained. He essentially argues that no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated that would justify amending the Green Belt boundary so soon after its adoption (2001). Whilst the Inspector's conclusions concerning the Green Belt merits of individual sites is not in accord with the Council's judgement, his recommendations at both a strategic and site specific level, have been accepted.

3.3 It is therefore recommended that these three sites are duly retained as PAS in the UDP Review and that a Modification is made to the Deposit Plan to reflect the Council's acceptance of the Inspector's strategic recommendation on PAS in Chapter 5.

4.0 PHASING ALLOCATION - POTTERY LANE, WOODLESFORD

4.1 This site was included as a Phase 3 greenfield allocation in the Review on the basis that it accorded with the sequential approach to housing land release set out in paragraph 30 of PPG3.

4.2 The Inspector agreed that this site was in a sustainable location but disagreed with the objector's argument that the Phase 1 brownfield sites (Bowcliffe Road, Bramham, East Moor, Tile Lane and Dunstarn Lane, Adel) perform so poorly as to preclude their development or inclusion in Phase 1 as brownfield sites. He recommended that the site should not be included in Phase 1 because it would tend to divert the focus away from the development of brownfield sites, but should be included in a new Phase 2.

5.0 INQUIRY CHANGE - MATTY LANE, ROBIN HOOD

5.1 The Council originally included the Matty Lane, Robin Hood site within Phase 1 of the UDP Review housing strategy. The Council recognised that this was an error given the greenfield credentials of the site. In view of this the Council is proposing to modify the Plan to reclassify the site under Phase 3 (greenfield housing sites) via an Inquiry Change.

5.2 The Inspector's response to the Inquiry Change raises no objections to the original designation as the issue was not one before him. In effect the Inspector's statement indicates that it is for the Council to determine this site's ultimate phasing given that it falls outside the remit of the Inquiry. In view of this the Council would wish to reclassify the Matty Lane site as a Phase 3 greenfield allocation.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION

6.1 Members are asked to agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendations in respect of Chapter 21 and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.

CHAPTER 21 – ROTHWELL

<p>Prop. Alt. 21/010</p>	<p>PA 21/010 POLICY N34.27 – GREENLAND FARM, OULTON</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation</u> Para 21.7 I recommend that the developed frontage of Farrer Lane be excluded from the PAS site, and included within the built-up area of Oulton as shown on the Proposals Map, but otherwise no modifications be made to the UDP.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 21.2 – 21.6 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First and Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deleting proposed alteration 21/010 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.27. Reinstate paragraph 21.2.17 of Volume 1: <p>GREENLAND FARM, OULTON</p> <p>3.56ha of land is protected as an area of search for long term development under Policy N34</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map but excluding the developed frontage of Farrer Lane and including it within the built-up area of Oulton. Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A21.4 of Volume 2. <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p>Greenland Farm, Oulton 3.56ha Deletion to allow for protected area of search for potential long term development</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 21/011</p>	<p>PA 21/011 POLICY N34.28 – ROYDS LANE, ROTHWELL</p> <p><u>Inspector's recommendation:</u> Para 21.12 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 21.9 - 21.11 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First and Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deleting proposed alteration 21/011 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.28. Reinstate paragraph 21.2.18 of Volume 1: <p>ROYDS LANE, ROTHWELL</p> <p>3.84ha of land is protected as an area of search for long term development under Policy N34</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A21.4 of Volume 2. <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p>Royds Lane, Rothwell 3.84ha Deletion to allow for protected area of search for potential long term development</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 21/012</p>	<p>PA21/012 POLICY N34.29 – PITFIELD ROAD, CARLTON</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation: Para 21.22 I recommend that no modification be made to the UDP.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 21.12 – 21.21 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First and Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deleting proposed alteration 21/012 and retain as a Protected Area of Search under reference N34.29. Reinstate paragraph 21.2.19 of Volume 1: <p>PITFIELD ROAD, CARLTON</p> <p>3.9ha of land is protected as an area of search for long term development under Policy N34</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate the site as a Protected Area of Search on the Proposals Map. Reinstate the reference to a Green Belt change at paragraph A21.4 of Volume 2. <p>PROPOSED GREEN BELT CHANGES</p> <p>CHANGES ARISING UNDER POLICY N34</p> <p>Pitfield Road, Carlton 3.9ha Deletion to allow for protected area of search for potential long term development</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. 21/015</p>	<p>PA 21/015 POLICY H3B(72) – MATTY LANE, ROBIN HOOD</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para 7.107 I recommend that since there was no objection to the</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector's conclusions in Para's 7.107 of the Report and consequently his recommendation and proposes to reclassify the site as a Phase 3 greenfield housing allocation in line with the Inquiry Change (IC/004).</p>

	<p>original inclusion of the site as a Phase 1 brownfield allocation to re-classify it under Phase 3 is not an issue for this Inquiry.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First and Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> reclassifying the site as a Phase 3 greenfield allocation under ref H3-1A.13.
<p>Prop. Alt. 21/025</p>	<p><u>PA 21/025</u> POLICY H3B(82) – POTTERY LANE, WOODLESFORD</p> <p><u>Inspector’s recommendation</u> Para 21.33 I recommend that the UDP be modified to include site H3-3.16, Pottery Lane, Woodlesford in the proposed Phase 2.</p>	<p><u>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons</u> The Council <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s conclusions in Para’s 21.24 – 21.32 of the Report and consequently <i>accepts</i> the Inspector’s recommendation to re-allocate the site within Phase 2.</p> <p><u>Proposed Modification</u> Modify the Leeds UDP Review (First & Revised Deposit) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> including Pottery Lane, Woodlesford (formerly under ref H3-3.16) within Phase 2 under ref H3-2A.10.

**REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
REPORT TO: DEVELOPMENT PLANS PANEL
DATE: 3 JANUARY 2006**

**SUBJECT: LEEDS UDP REVIEW – RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR’S REPORT ON
CHAPTER A9A (CAR PARKING GUIDELINES)**

Electoral Wards Affected:

ALL

Specific Implications for:

Ethnic Minorities

Women

Disabled People

Key Decision Major Decision Eligible for call in Not Eligible for call in
Significant Operational Decision Administrative Decision (details contained in the report)

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The purpose of the report is to consider the Inspector’s recommendations for Chapter A9A (Car Parking Guidelines) to determine the appropriate response to his recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 The subject of this chapter relates to car parking guidelines. The main purpose in the review of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (AUDP) has been to review parking guidelines to bring them into line with more recent national (PPG13: Transport & PPG3: Housing) and regional guidance (RPG12 – Yorkshire & Humber now known as RSS for Yorkshire & Humber).

2.2 Outlined below is a very brief summary of the main points raised by representors.

- Whether references to (policy) S2 centres be removed or amended.
- Proposed amendments to the car parking guidelines in the review are more stringent than those advised in PPG13.
- Whether residential parking guidelines outside centres be expressed as an average over the local authority area.
- In view of the guidance in paragraph 86 of PPG13 the retained reference to 'commuted parking' is confusing.

2.3 The Council’s principal arguments at the Inquiry was that;

- The Council will apply car parking guidelines with sensitivity to local circumstances.
- It is considered that the guidelines are in line with those outlined in PPG13 & RPG12.

- There are a number of uncertainties about how an average parking guideline across the district is meant to be achieved and that residential parking guidelines will be applied with flexibility in response to differing local circumstances.
- References to commuted provision have been brought over from the Adopted UDP and are therefore not subject to review. Nevertheless, the case for commuted payments is not based "purely on lack of parking on site" but rather providing communal parking provision for city centre users.

3.0 THE INSPECTOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 The Inspector has supported the Council's position in his report with the caveat that references to, the requirement for, commuted spaces in the City Centre core car parking area be deleted.
- 3.2 The Inspector therefore recommends that the UDP be modified in accordance with Revised Deposit Alteration A9A/008.

4.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 4.1 Members are asked to agree this report as the City Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Chapter A9A and to recommend its approval to the Executive Board in due course.

CHAPTER A9A – CAR PARKING GUIDELINES

<p>Prop. Alt. A9A/002</p>	<p>PA A9A/002 ADD NEW PARA. 6</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para. A9A.6 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration A9A/002 as amended by IC/012.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's A9A.2 to A9A.5 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with the alteration proposed by the Council at the First Deposit stage as amended by IC/012. Outlined below is the change proposed during the Public Inquiry that has been considered and recommended for insertion by the Inspector.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Amend para 6 of the First Deposit by adding and deleting text as follows: (Inquiry Changes are shown in italics with double underlining whereas First Deposit text to be deleted is struck though singly);</p> <p><i><u>The Council's approach to parking provision is to ensure the need for restraint, but to apply these guidelines with sensitivity to local circumstances. For example bearing in mind the level of public transport accessibility to the site, the level of on street parking control and other relevant planning and highway considerations. For residential development it is important to recognise, and to take into consideration, that car ownership varies with income, age, household type, and the type of housing and its location. The guidelines will be implemented with a degree of flexibility with the intention that a more restrictive provision will be the starting point will be to provide car parking spaces within the maximum guidelines up to the maximum in order to influence people's travelling habits and to develop a reliable non-car mode infrastructure. In the case of residential development it may be more appropriate to have higher levels of car parking for family housing and dwellings in rural locations where there is a heavier reliance on the private car or where in view of PPG3 car ownership is likely to be higher.</u></i></p>
<p>Prop. Alt. A9A/003</p>	<p>PA A9A/003 AMEND CLASS A1 & A2</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para. A9A.11 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration A9A/003.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's A9A.8 to A9A.10 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with the alteration proposed by the Council at the First Deposit stage.</p> <p>Proposed Modification None</p>
<p>Prop. Alt. A9A/006</p>	<p>PA A9A/006 REPLACE CLASS C3</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para. A9A.16 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's A9A.13 to A9A.15 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with the alteration proposed by the Council at the Revised Deposit stage.</p> <p>Proposed Modification None</p>

	with RD Alteration A9A/006.	
Prop. Alt. A9A/008	<p>PA A9A/008 REPLACE CLASS D2</p> <p>Inspector's recommendation Para. A9A.23 - I recommend that the UDP be modified in accordance with FD Alteration A9A/008, subject to deleting references to commuted spaces.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council Decision and Reasons The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions in Para's A9A.18 to A9A.22 of the Report and consequently accepts the Inspector's recommendation to modify the Plan in accordance with the alteration proposed by the Council at the First Deposit stage subject to deleting the references to commuted spaces.</p> <p>Proposed Modification Modify the Adopted UDP and the Leeds UDP Review (First Deposit) by deleting all references to: <i>'commuted spaces within the core car parking area' in Chapter A9A .</i></p>