

Public Document Pack

EXECUTIVE BOARD – 11TH APRIL 2012

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION – APPENDIX 5 TO AGENDA ITEM 13 – NATURAL RESOURCES & WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT – “POST SUBMISSION CHANGES”

This page is intentionally left blank

REVIEW OF THE NATURAL RESOURCES & WASTE DPD (NRWDPD) AGAINST THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

| NPPF Section & Para. No. | NRWDPD Section & Para. No. | Changes Arising | |
|--|--|--|---------------------|
| | | Minor | Affecting Soundness |
| General | | Cross reference to NPPF, rather than PPS now extant (including Table 1.2). | None |
| Achieving Sustainable Development | | | |
| Paras. 6 – 17 | The delivery of sustainable development is integral to the overall approach and scope of the DPD. This is covered in the Spatial Vision & Strategic Objectives of the plan (which incorporates the need for the efficient use of natural resources, the need for zero waste and high levels of recycling, the need to promote a low carbon economy and high levels of environmental protection). This approach has been underpinned by the preparation of a Sustainability Appraisal (to review the plan against a series of economic, social and environmental objectives), an analysis of 'resource flows' in Leeds (illustrated on figure 2.4) and the completion of an ecological footprint analysis of Leeds. | None | None |
| Section 10 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding & coastal change | | | |
| Para. 93 – Role of planning in meeting these challenges | The desire to manage the challenges of climate change and flooding, is integral to the DPD through the overall approach of resource flows | None | None |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|------|
| | and the delivery of sustainable development. Specific policies are therefore set out to promote a low carbon economy, reduce emissions and to manage flood risk. | | |
| Para. 97 – Increasing the supply of renewable & low carbon energy | Covered in Section 5 of the DPD, & addressed in Policies Energy 1 – 4. | None | None |
| Paras. 99 – 104 Managing Flood Risk | A Leeds Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) has been completed (2007). Specific Policies for managing flood risk are covered in Section 6 of the DPD & addressed in Policies Water 1 – 7. | Amend the cross reference in Policy Water 4 to PPS25 & replace with NPPF. Amend the cross reference in Policy Water 6 to 'Table B.2 of PPS25', to 'Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework', Para 11. Table 4. | None |
| Section 11 – Conserving & enhancing the natural environment. | | | |
| Para. 109 | Within the scope of the DPD, the policy framework, seeks to help conserve and enhance the natural environment, this specifically relates to the management of natural resources, in the delivery of sustainable development. | None | None |
| Section 13 – Facilitating the Sustainable Use of Minerals | | | |
| Para. 142 – Contribution of minerals to sustainable economic growth | Planning for the effective and sustainable use of minerals is an integral component of the DPD and is set out in Section 3 of the document. | None | None |
| Para. 143 – Preparing local plans | 1 st bullet: Covered in Section 3 of the document (Minerals Policies 1 – 14) 2 nd bullet: the contribution of substitute or | None | None |

| | | | |
|---|--|------|------|
| | <p>secondary materials is taken in to account as part of the apportionments developed through the Regional Aggregates Working Party (RAWP).</p> <p>3rd bullet: Covered in Section 3 of the DPD in Policies relating to sand & gravel, building stone, clay and coal.</p> <p>4th bullet: Covered in Minerals Policies 13 & 14.</p> <p>5th bullet: Covered in Minerals Policies 2 & 8.</p> <p>6th bullet: Covered in Minerals Policy 10</p> <p>7th bullet: Covered by the general provisions of Policy Minerals 10, established practice and details set out as part of Technical Guidance to the NPPF.</p> <p>8th bullet: Covered as part of Minerals Policy 11.</p> | | |
| Para 144. – Determining Planning Applications | <p>1st bullet this is recognised through the scope of the DPD and the scope of Section 3.</p> <p>2nd bullet: within the scope of the DPD land banks are provided for aggregates, stone, clay, crushed rock and sand & gravel.</p> <p>3rd bullet: Covered by Minerals Policy 10 and the Technical Guidance to the NPPF.</p> <p>4th bullet: Covered by Minerals Policy 10 and the Technical Guidance to the NPPF.</p> <p>5th bullet: not relevance to Leeds as no peat extraction.</p> <p>6th bullet: Covered by Minerals Policy 11 and the Technical Guidance to the NPPF.</p> <p>7th bullet: Covered by Minerals Policies 2 and 8.</p> <p>8th & 9th bullet: Covered by Minerals Policy 7.</p> | None | None |
| Para. 145 – Planning for aggregates | <p>1st – 3rd bullet: covered by technical work and evidence in support of Minerals Policy 1(an assessment has been undertaken via the Regional Aggregates Working Party and in</p> | None | None |

| | | | |
|--|--|------|------|
| | <p>discussion with neighbouring authorities, especially Kirklees and Wakefield) and targets set out as part of the DPD's monitoring framework.</p> <p>4th bullet: further Guidelines are still awaited and will need to be reviewed via the RAWP once available, to develop appropriate targets.</p> <p>5th & 6th bullet: Covered as part of Minerals Policy 1.</p> <p>7th bullet: not specifically an issue in Leeds & the DPD does not preclude competition. The minerals resource Map (Fig. 2.2 of the DPD), identifies the range and broad location of minerals resources across the district.</p> <p>8th bullet: Covered through Minerals Policy 1 and through policies for different minerals resources including clay, crushed rock, sand & gravel and coal.</p> | | |
| Para. 146 – Planning for industrial minerals | Other than coal and clay (which are provided for in Minerals Policies 6, 8 & 9), there are no 'industrial minerals' in Leeds. Requiring inclusion of specific policies. | None | None |
| Para. 147 & 148 – Oil & Gas development | Oil and gas exploration, other than seismic, has not taken place in Leeds, nor has production. Making specific policy provision is not therefore considered to be justified. Any issues which may arise can be addressed through the provisions of Minerals Policy 10. | None | None |
| Para. 149 - Coal | Covered by Minerals Policies 8 & 9. | None | None |
| Plan – making, Local Plans | | | |
| Para. 156 – Strategic Priorities | Section 1 (Introduction) and Section 2 (Key Characteristics & Spatial Vision for Leeds), sets out the broad purpose and scope of the DPD. Within this context, Figure 1.1 identifies the | None | None |

| | | | |
|---|--|------|------|
| | relationship of the document to other policy areas, as part of the Local Development Framework. Integral to this approach is the preparation of the Core Strategy (currently at Publication stage), which addressed longer term strategic issues, such as job and housing growth. | | |
| Para. 163 - Minerals | As part of the City Council's portfolio of LDF documents, the preparation of the NRWDPD, has been identified as a key priority. Within the scope of this document, the City Council has worked collaboratively with a range of organisations, as a basis to develop an appropriate approach to minerals planning. The City Council's Reports of Consultation, in relation to the preparation of the DPD, details the scope of 'front loading' and consultation activity. This includes developing an approach to aggregates through the Regional Aggregates Working Party (RAWP), as covered in Minerals Policy 1. | None | None |
| Planning strategically across local boundaries | | | |
| Para. 178 - 181 | As emphasised above, the City Council has worked collaboratively with neighbouring authorities, through on going consultation, the RAWP and DPD examination process, to plan strategically across local boundaries. | None | None |
| Examining Local Plans | | None | None |
| Para. 182 | Through the above activity (and technical evidence base), the City Council has evidenced that the plan has been positively prepared | None | None |

REVIEW OF THE NATURAL RESOURCES & WASTE DPD (NRWDPD) AGAINST THE PLANNING POLICY FOR TRAVELLERS SITES (ISSUED 26TH March 2012)

| Planning Policy for Travellers sites | NRWDPD Section & Para. No. | Changes Arising | |
|---|--|-----------------|---------------------|
| | | Minor | Affecting Soundness |
| <p>Policy A: Using evidence to plan positively & manage development</p> <p>Policy B: Planning for Travellers Sites</p> <p>Policy C: Sites in rural areas and the countryside</p> <p>Policy D: Rural Exceptions sites</p> <p>Policy E: Traveller Sites in the Green Belt</p> <p>Policy F: Mixed planning use traveller sites</p> <p>Policy G Major development projects.</p> <p>Policy H: Determining planning applications for traveller sites</p> <p>Policy I: Implementation</p> | <p>Section 1 (Introduction) and Section 2 (Key Characteristics & Spatial Vision for Leeds), sets out the broad purpose and scope of the DPD. This is specifically focussed upon planning for natural resources and waste across the District. Planning policies for Travellers is therefore beyond the scope of this DPD. Within this context, it is not considered that the scope of the NRWDPD, precludes planning for Travellers sites as part of related LDF documents.</p> <p>In seeking to take forward the City Council's responsibilities in planning for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People, the emerging Core Strategy (Policy H7) of the Publication draft, sets out an overall policy approach. Following on from the Core Strategy, the City Council is planning to prepare a Site Allocations DPD. Suitable sites will therefore be identified within this context, having regard to the provisions of the Planning Policy for Travellers sites.</p> | None | None |
| | | | |

Natural Resources and Waste

Leeds Local Development Framework



Development Plan Document
Sustainability Appraisal - Addendum 1: SA of Post-Submission Changes
April 2012

If you do not speak English and need help in understanding this document, please phone: 0113 247 8092 and state the name of your language. We will then we contact an interpreter. This is a free service and we can assist with 100+ languages. We can also provide this document in audio or Braille on request.

(Bengali):-

যদি আপনি ইংরেজীতে কথা বলতে না পারেন এবং এই দলিলটি বুঝতে পারার জন্য সাহায্যের দরকার হয়, তাহলে দয়া করে 0113 247 8092 এই নম্বরে ফোন করে আপনার ভাষাটির নাম বলুন। আমরা তখন আপনাকে লাইনে থাকতে বলে কোন দোভাষীর (ইন্টারপ্রিটার) সাথে যোগাযোগ করব।

(Chinese):-

凡不懂英語又須協助解釋這份資料者，請致電 0113 247 8092 並說明本身所需語言的名稱。當我們聯絡傳譯員時，請勿掛斷電話。

(Hindi):-

यदि आप इंग्लिश नहीं बोलते हैं और इस दस्तावेज़ को समझने में आपको मदद की ज़रूरत है, तो कृपया 0113 247 8092 पर फ़ोन करें और अपनी भाषा का नाम बताएँ। तब हम आपको होल्ड पर रखेंगे (आपको फ़ोन पर कुछ देर के लिए इंतज़ार करना होगा) और उस दौरान हम किसी इंटरप्रिटर (दुभाषिए) से संपर्क करेंगे।

(Punjabi):-

ਅਗਰ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਅੰਗਰੇਜ਼ੀ ਨਹੀਂ ਬੋਲਦੇ ਅਤੇ ਇਹ ਲੇਖ ਪੱਤਰ ਸਮਝਣ ਲਈ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਸਹਾਇਤਾ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ, ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰ ਕੇ 0113 247 8092 'ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ ਅਤੇ ਅਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਦਾ ਨਾਮ ਦੱਸੋ। ਅਸੀਂ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਟੈਲੀਫ਼ੋਨ 'ਤੇ ਹੀ ਰਹਿਣ ਲਈ ਕਹਾਂ ਗੇ, ਜਦ ਤਕ ਅਸੀਂ ਦੁਬਾਸ਼ੀਏ (Interpreter) ਨਾਲ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਬਣਾਵਾਂ ਗੇ।

(Urdu):-

اگر آپ انگریزی نہیں بولتے ہیں اور آپ کو یہ دستاویز سمجھنے کیلئے مدد کی ضرورت ہے تو براہ مہربانی اس نمبر 0113 247 8092 پر فون کریں اور ہمیں اپنی زبان کا نام بتائیں۔ اس کے بعد ہم آپ کو لائن پر ہی انتظار کرنے کیلئے کہیں گے اور خود ترجمان (انٹرپریٹر) سے رابطہ کریں گے۔

This publication can also be made available in Braille or audio cassette.
Please call 0113 247 8092.

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 3 |
| BACKGROUND | 3 |
| PURPOSE OF THIS ADDENDUM | 3 |
| ADDENDUM STRUCTURE | 3 |
| 2. METHODOLOGY..... | 4 |
| GUIDANCE ON DEALING WITH PROPOSED CHANGES..... | 4 |
| METHOD OF ASSESSMENT | 4 |
| LIMITATIONS AND UNCERTAINTIES SPECIFIC TO THE PROPOSED CHANGES..... | 4 |
| 3. THE PROPOSED CHANGES AND INITIAL ‘SCREENING’ | 5 |
| SEA ‘SCREENING’ OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES | 5 |
| REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES FOR HRA..... | 9 |
| CONSIDERATION OF SECONDARY AND CUMULATIVE ISSUES / EFFECTS | 9 |
| 4. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED CHANGES ‘SCREENED IN’, AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 10 |
| PROPOSED CHANGE No.5 – MARINE-WON AGGREGATE | 10 |
| PROPOSED CHANGE NOS 8 AND 26 – NEW URBAN SAND AND GRAVEL MSA | 11 |
| PROPOSED CHANGE No.10 – WHARFE VALLEY MINERALS POLICY | 15 |
| PROPOSED CHANGE No.12 – SITES ADJACENT TO MINERALS SITES..... | 15 |
| PROPOSED CHANGE No.14 – FUTURE REVIEW OF SAFEGUARDED WHARVES AND RAIL SIDINGS.... | 16 |
| PROPOSED CHANGE No.15 – CRITERIA FOR POTENTIAL CHANGE OF USE OF WHARVES AND RAIL SIDINGS | 17 |
| SA MONITORING | 17 |
| REFERENCES | 21 |
| APPENDIX A: NRW DPD SCHEDULE OF CHANGES (JAN. 2012) | 22 |

List of Tables and Figures

| | | |
|------------|---|----|
| Table 3.1: | SEA ‘Screening’ of the Schedule of Changes | 5 |
| Table 4.1: | Comparison of Alternatives to the Sand and Gravel MSA Extension (Urban Area)..... | 11 |
| Table 4.2: | SA Monitoring Framework and Further SA Recommendations..... | 17 |

Jacobs Engineering U.K. Limited

This document has been prepared by a division, subsidiary or affiliate of Jacobs Engineering U.K. Limited (“Jacobs”) in its professional capacity as consultants in accordance with the terms and conditions of Jacobs’ contract with the commissioning party (the “Client”). Regard should be had to those terms and conditions when considering and/or placing any reliance on this

**Leeds City Council Local Development Framework
Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document – Publication Document
Sustainability Appraisal Report**

document. No part of this document may be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from Jacobs. If you have received this document in error, please destroy all copies in your possession or control and notify Jacobs.

Any advice, opinions, or recommendations within this document (a) should be read and relied upon only in the context of the document as a whole; (b) do not, in any way, purport to include any manner of legal advice or opinion; (c) are based upon the information made available to Jacobs at the date of this document and on current UK standards, codes, technology and construction practices as at the date of this document. It should be noted and it is expressly stated that no independent verification of any of the documents or information supplied to Jacobs has been made. No liability is accepted by Jacobs for any use of this document, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided. Following final delivery of this document to the Client, Jacobs will have no further obligations or duty to advise the Client on any matters, including development affecting the information or advice provided in this document.

This document has been prepared for the exclusive use of the Client and unless otherwise agreed in writing by Jacobs, no other party may use, make use of or rely on the contents of this document. Should the Client wish to release this document to a third party, Jacobs may, at its discretion, agree to such release provided that (a) Jacobs' written agreement is obtained prior to such release; and (b) by release of the document to the third party, that third party does not acquire any rights, contractual or otherwise, whatsoever against Jacobs and Jacobs, accordingly, assume no duties, liabilities or obligations to that third party; and (c) Jacobs accepts no responsibility for any loss or damage incurred by the Client or for any conflict of Jacobs' interests arising out of the Client's release of this document to the third party.

1. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

In November 2010, Jacobs produced a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report, on behalf of Leeds City Council to accompany their Natural Resources and Waste (NRW) Development Plan Document (DPD) – or NRW DPD. The Examination in Public (EIP) for the NRW DPD took place during December 2012.

As a result of the EIP the Planning Inspector has requested that the Council consider a number of changes to the NRW DPD. As such, Leeds City Council is now proposing changes to some aspects of the NRW DPD document which are identified in the Schedule of Changes (Appendix A). These changes must be reviewed under the SA for potential changes to the sustainability assessment results and recommendations published in the original SA Report.

PURPOSE OF THIS ADDENDUM

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

This document forms an addendum to the November 2010 SA Report and identifies whether the outcomes of that report should be varied from those originally reported, as a result of the NRW DPD Schedule of Changes. Where they should be varied, this addendum has been created to specify where and how, including any supplementary recommendations (e.g. mitigation and monitoring). This includes further policy wording changes.

As such, this addendum is a full SA of the Schedule of Changes, but should be read in conjunction with the original SA Report.

ADDENDUM STRUCTURE

This addendum presents the following information:

- Section 1: this section (general background)
- Section 2: method used in assessing the Schedule of Changes
- Section 3: a review, or 'screening' exercise, of the Schedule of Changes for their potential to alter the SA (i.e. their 'likely significant effects')
- Section 4: the detailed assessment of the proposed changes 'screened in' to requiring further assessment, including conclusions and recommendations.

2. METHODOLOGY

GUIDANCE ON DEALING WITH PROPOSED CHANGES

Guidance on SA states:

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

(PAS, 2009)

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

METHOD OF ASSESSMENT

In conducting SA of the Schedule of Changes, the following tasks have been done.

- I. An initial SA 'screening' of each change: each proposed change has first been compared against the original NRW DPD policies and supporting information to check whether or not it changes what the original policy or other statements intended (and thus if it could change the SA results), and also whether or not it changes any of the SA's original assumptions.
- II. A review of the changes for potential to alter the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening results: the NRW DPD was 'screened out' from any requirement to conduct the Appropriate Assessment stage of HRA. This report documents that the policies and proposals which underpin this outcome still hold true, without any additional potential for significant effects on Natura 2000 sites.
- III. Where necessary, further SA assessment work of proposed changes: where the Schedule of Changes were 'screened in' to requiring further attention by the SA, the changes and reasonable alternatives have been assessed in order to identify potential effects and inform the proposed changes and their future implementation.
- IV. Check the SA monitoring framework: as a result of the previous step, the SA monitoring framework was checked in order to ensure it still addressed the potential significant implications of the NRW DPD and uncertainties of the SA.

LIMITATIONS AND UNCERTAINTIES SPECIFIC TO THE PROPOSED CHANGES

Where the proposed changes relate to minerals provision outside of the Leeds boundary, there is inherent uncertainty in the sustainability and effects of such sources on people or the environment. Regarding land-based sources, the SA Report considers that the NRW DPD's sustained local provision plus move towards increased aggregate recycling will likely reduce the potential for negative effects (which does not necessarily mean that none will occur at all, but potentially fewer than would have without the NRW DPD). The proposed changes introduce some support for marine-won aggregate in the long term, and the sustainability and effects of such sources at the time they may enter the Leeds market is entirely uncertain. Assumptions are discussed in Section 4.

3. THE PROPOSED CHANGES AND INITIAL ‘SCREENING’

SEA ‘SCREENING’ OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES

The initial review, or ‘screening’, of the Schedule of Changes is documented in Table 3.1 below. This exercises ‘screens’ the changes to filter out those which do not change the way in which the NRW DPD would be implemented on the ground, and therefore are certain not to change the SA Report’s outcomes as previously documented. Those which are ‘screened in’ are those which have the potential to change the SA outcome (answer being ‘yes’ in the third column), and which therefore require further SA assessment in Section 4.

Table 3.1: SEA ‘Screening’ of the Schedule of Changes

| No. and Summary of the Change | Potential to Change SA Outcome? | Reason |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 1 | No | This is existing baseline only. No change to policy or the way the NRW DPD is implemented. |
| 2 | No | This largely reiterates the DPD’s pre-existing support for modal shift, which the SA has already incorporated / addressed. |
| 3 | No | The extent to which the DPD supports sustainable minerals development is the topic of the entire SA, and the references make no material difference to how the SA interprets its implementation. Regardless, the references are positive and show commitment to sustainable development. |
| 4 | No | This is considered additional background context only. No change to policy or the way the NRW DPD is implemented. |
| 5 | Yes | The potential for marine-won aggregate was not addressed within the SA Report. |
| 6 | No | One change is a reference only, and the others reiterate the pre-existing process which developers must be aware of, which the SA has already incorporated / assumed. |

**Leeds City Council Local Development Framework
Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document – Publication Document
Sustainability Appraisal Report**

| No. and Summary of the Change | Potential to Change SA Outcome? | Reason |
|---|--|--|
| 7 Policy MINERALS 1: change to recognise application to both sand and gravel and crushed rock, and add the targets. | No | The SA was based on the assumption that this policy applied to both, anyway. |
| 8 Re-wording of paragraphs 3.8 and 3.9 pursuant to proposed change No.26, which is for an additional 'urban area' sand and gravel MSA. Removal of paragraphs 3.21 and 3.22, which address the coal MSA. New paragraphs 3.10 to 3.13 supporting revised policies below. Revised Policy MINERALS 2, now addressing sand and gravel only and providing a 'criteria-based' approach. New Policy MINERALS 3 which combines MINERALS 8 and 9. | Yes | The revised / additional MSA for sand and gravel is within the urban area, and paragraph 3.10 has been drafted with the intention of clarifying key issues in the urban area. The SA should input into this text, as there are some key omissions. The additional extent of the MSA to apply to the urban area could have the side effect of delaying some developments, whilst it is decided whether extraction is economic or not, having associated sustainability effects. The provisions of former policies MINERALS 8 and 9 have essentially been preserved, perhaps with greater clarification. |
| 9 Change paragraph 3.16 to remove reference to the landbank for crushed rock and substitute with the sub-regional figure. | No | The changes clarify and reiterate the pre-existing apportionment, which the SA has already incorporated / assumed. |
| 10 Revised Policy MINERALS 5, moving away from 'resisting' development, and stating development is unlikely to be supported in the Wharfe Valley. | Yes | The SA needs to consider the potential repercussions of this position in relation to planning applications, and how clearly and consistently it can be applied. |
| 11 Add to paragraph 3.18 the fact that quarries that produce building stone also help to maintain provision of aggregate (crushed rock and sand). | No | This is existing context only. No change to policy or the way the NRW DPD is implemented. |
| 12 Add to paragraph 3.23 the provision that applicants for development of sites adjacent to existing or potential minerals workings will be expected to ensure that they have considered effects of existing or future minerals-related activity on the proposed land use. | Yes | This is an additional provision which the SA had not considered. Developers would need to take this into account alongside other sustainability considerations. |
| 13 Change paragraph 3.29 by deleting reference to the need for costly dredging of the canal. | No | This is context only. No change to policy or the way the NRW DPD is implemented. |

Leeds City Council Local Development Framework
Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document – Publication Document
Sustainability Appraisal Report

| No. and Summary of the Change | Potential to Change SA Outcome? | Reason |
|--|---------------------------------|---|
| 14 Create a new paragraph 3.30 which clarifies how the policy of safeguarding sites with rail and wharf facilities will be reviewed and updated. | Yes | This change introduces the prospect that safeguarded wharves and rail sidings in the NRW DPD may be removed from safeguarding in five years, which the SA should consider. |
| 15 Create a new paragraph 3.31 and new Policy MINERALS 15 which introduces a criteria-based policy on alternative development of protected wharves and rail sidings. | Yes | Related to change No.14, the criteria for potential loss of a safeguarded wharves and rail sidings should benefit from SA input. |
| 16 Change paragraph 4.4 and Table 4.1 to include for extrapolated waste arising figures from 2021 to 2026. | No | <p>This is clarification on the baseline only. No change to policy or the way the NRW DPD is implemented. The annual waste arisings over the plan period were always projected as an annual requirement to 2026 and so this does not change any other aspects of the plan. There are separate papers explaining the technicalities of this.</p> <p><i>However, it is suggested that the proposed additional sentences could provide more clarity and should be amended simply to, “The annual waste arisings expected over the plan period to 2026 have been provided in Table 4.1.”</i></p> |
| 17 Change paragraph 4.12 to reflect current status of the Core Strategy. | No | This is context only. No change to policy or the way the NRW DPD is implemented. |
| 18 Change Policy WASTE 6 by adding that any application for a Strategic Waste Management facility should be accompanied by a Travel Plan and a Transport Assessment. | No | The SA recommendations imply that this would be expected in order to address cumulative effects, anyway, so no change to the assessment or outcomes. |
| 19 Change paragraph 4.17 to recognise existing cross-boundary movements of hazardous waste, the need and scope for additional treatment, and the potential solid hazardous waste cells in Leeds. | No | The changes clarify and reiterate the pre-existing policy on hazardous waste treatment, which the SA has already incorporated / assumed (alongside the appropriate statutory / regulatory protections). |
| 20 Change paragraph 6.26 by adding reference to specific provision for where hard surfaces are to be constructed on land between a wall forming the principal (front) | No | The changes expand upon the pre-existing policy on sustainable drainage, which the SA has already assessed. There may be some minor further benefits (e.g. |

**Leeds City Council Local Development Framework
Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document – Publication Document
Sustainability Appraisal Report**

| No. and Summary of the Change | Potential to Change SA Outcome? | Reason |
|--|--|---|
| elevation of the dwelling and the highway. | | townscape), but negligible as compared to the wider implications of the DPD. |
| 21 Update and revision of the monitoring framework in Table 7.1. | Yes | This does not affect the DPD's policies / implementation. <i>However, it changes the proposed statutory SA/SEA Monitoring – refer to 'SA Monitoring' in Section 4.</i> |
| 22 Definition for Energy Recovery added to the glossary (Ch.8). | No | This does not affect the DPD's policies / implementation. |
| 23 Create new section which lists the saved UDP policies to be replaced by the NRW DPD. | No | This does not affect the DPD's policies / implementation. |
| 24 For all map references within the DPD, remove reference to the mapbook and change this to 'Proposals Map'. | No | This does not affect the DPD's policies / implementation. |
| 25 Specific alterations to site boundaries as follows: | | |
| Map 200 Strategic Waste Site at Skelton Grange, revised boundary to reflect operational land now identified. | No | It is noted that the site is much reduced in size from when it was assessed under the SA as agreed as a pre-examination change with the landowner. This may reduce the potential for enhancements (e.g. habitat creation, river corridor enhancement / landscaping) due to less land area, however it is impossible to know for certain and the assessment would remain the same at this strategic level. |
| Map 139 Aggregate recycling site at Warren House Lane, Yeadon, revised boundary to reflect recent planning approval. | No | This was already considered as a safeguarded site, and the reduction in size is immaterial to the SA's outcomes. |
| Map 14 Canal Wharfage at Stourton, revised boundary to reduce the extent of the site area proposed for safeguarding. | No | This reduction is not thought to reduce the viability of the site for intermodal transfer, however this can only be assumed. |
| Map 18, Fleet Lane wharf, revised boundary to correct an earlier error. | No | This was already considered as a safeguarded site, and the change is immaterial to the SA's outcomes. |
| 26 Additional Sand and Gravel MSA in the urban area. | Yes | Refer to change no.8 above. |

REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES FOR HRA

The HRA Screening identified Policies ENERGY 1 and WASTE 6 as requiring consideration under HRA. On review of the above Schedule of Changes, there are no further policies which present risks to the nature conservation objectives of Natura 2000 sites. Likewise, other than referencing (i.e. the policy number), there are no material changes to ENERGY 1 or WASTE 6 proposed.

HRA Screening also identified Policies ENERGY 1 and WASTE 9 as providing the key mitigation for the issues identified. There are no material changes to these policies in terms of the mitigation they provide.

Therefore, the existing HRA Screening decision would be expected to apply, and no further HRA / Appropriate Assessment is required.

CONSIDERATION OF SECONDARY AND CUMULATIVE ISSUES / EFFECTS

The seven (eight in total, but one a replication) potentially significant changes identified in Table 3.1 above are generally isolated issues, however there are a few potentially significant interactions with other changes and policies / plans.

Firstly, there is a new marine planning regime which is being implemented, and which may have an effect on the ability / capacity of marine aggregate producers to meet any anticipated increases in demand in the long term (including the cumulative demand across the UK). In light of uncertainties surrounding climate change and other pressures on our marine resources, it is impossible to forecast, but the trend may be of limited increases in production in balance with environmental protection. This is a situation for Leeds to monitor over the long term and periodically during the lifespan of the NRW DPD.

Secondly, the additional MSA in the urban area must be considered in the context of potential cumulative growth in housing, economic development and road use in the Leeds urban area, plus the goal of achieving an increasingly pedestrian and cycle-friendly city. More residents, jobs and visitors can be interpreted in SA terms as more receptors who can potentially be affected by the temporary disruption caused by mineral workings in the urban area – including the traffic / transport involved in working and removing the minerals on urban sites. This could occur in combination with the effects of construction of future developments nearby, and therefore phasing is also an issue. These factors were not discussed particularly during the examination, with discussion more focused on the loss of minerals as a resource. Therefore, the assessment in Section 4 can be seen to incorporate this future baseline.

Finally, the effect of altering the approach to the potential for minerals development applications in the Wharfe Valley must be considered in light of the future North Yorkshire Minerals Core Strategy and subsequent documents of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework. (This can also be said of any policies or proposals which could affect the Wharfe Valley, though none are of note at present.) As of now, the North Yorkshire Minerals Core Strategy is under development, and therefore the best course of action is to review NRW DPD policy at the time that North Yorkshire adopts it, to ensure that the level of protection remains adequate.

4. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED CHANGES ‘SCREENED IN’, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PROPOSED CHANGE NO.5 – MARINE-WON AGGREGATE

Although this proposed change to NRW DPD only applies to supporting text and states that marine-won aggregate may towards the end of the plan’s timeframe contribute towards supply (to an indeterminate extent), over the years there could be actions which the Council eventually takes (even if not directly proposed by the DPD) in anticipation of such a change, and these should be addressed by the SA.

At this stage, the SA can only make the following quite broad conclusions.

- The potential sources of marine-won aggregate are far and wide, and can range from regional (e.g. the Humber, Yorkshire and/or Lincolnshire coast) to international sources.
- Where any developments of the future are built with the purpose of facilitating marine-won aggregate (which may include intermodal transfer projects), they could be indirectly and partially responsible for the degree to which those sources are sustainable (cumulatively with other projects).
- Marine-won aggregate imported from other countries may generally have a higher climate change impact, and could be subject to lesser environmental controls.
- Future marine-won aggregate may be more or less sustainable than land-won aggregate, given the many uncertainties of the future baseline. Potentially sensitive issues which are specific to marine-won aggregate include associated infrastructure (e.g. required berthing and port space), water transport impacts, rare marine habitats and fish spawning grounds, unique marine heritage / archaeology, and coastal geomorphology alongside climate adaptation.

The result is that the certainty of the long-term SA assessments reported under such topics as biodiversity, flora and fauna; climatic factors; historic environment; and air, water & contaminated land is very low. As stated in the previous section, given the new marine planning system and the various pressures on our marine resources, levels of future ‘sustainable’ production of marine aggregate are impossible to forecast, but the trend may be of limited increases in production in balance with environmental protection.

This is a situation for Leeds to monitor over the long term and periodically during the lifespan of the NRW DPD, and so the SA recommends the following:

1. see the suggested **statutory monitoring** in the ‘SA Monitoring’ section below, where an additional indicator is suggested under SA Objective 19 (for lack of a more appropriate location), which is **‘regional estimates of the sustainable supply of marine-won aggregate as may be interpreted from or developed under the emerging marine planning system’**; and
2. additional text in new paragraph 3.4 to say, “Where targets are repeatedly not being met **or environmental / sustainability problems come to light**, this may lead to a review of the DPD and consideration of the sub-regional apportionment through the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Aggregates Working Party.”

Of note, this issue relates closely to the original SA Report’s recommendation of, most likely with wider support, developing studies into the total lifecycle impacts of Leeds’ minerals supply versus alternatives. Again, such a study would focus mainly on the lifecycle pertaining to extraction, transport, disposal and afteruse of mineral workings.

PROPOSED CHANGE NOS 8 AND 26 – NEW URBAN SAND AND GRAVEL MSA

As stated in Section 3, the extension of the MSA into the urban area was not assessed nor were alternatives considered in the SA submitted at Publication Stage. Table 4.1 provides the assessment of other alternatives to the ‘urban area’ MSA for sand and gravel which is now proposed as a post examination change to the plan. There are essentially two other alternatives to this option, although the ‘do nothing’ option did not apply, as having an MSA outside the urban area of Leeds was established at the examination. At this high level, the SA is only able to identify key risks, some of which are ‘worst case’ risks.

Table 4.1: Comparison of Alternatives to the Sand and Gravel MSA Extension (Urban Area)

| SA Topic | Do Minimum i.e. MSA Outside of Urban Limits Only | Urban ‘Area of Search’ i.e. instead of MSA, identify the likely areas of viable minerals in the urban area | Urban Area MSA Extension – Blanket Approach |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Economy and Employment | Neutral – the results of the SA Report apply. | Minor Positive | Minor Negative |
| Human Health | | Minor Positive | Minor Negative |
| Leisure, Recreation and Tourism | | Minor Negative | Minor Negative |
| Housing | | Minor Negative | Moderate Negative |
| Social Inclusion and Cohesion | | Minor Negative | Minor Negative |
| Meeting Local Needs Locally | | Minor Positive | Neutral / Negligible |
| Air, Water and Contaminated Land | | Neutral / Negligible | Minor Negative |
| Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna | | Neutral / Negligible | Neutral / Negligible |
| Climatic Factors | | Neutral / Negligible | Minor Negative |
| Historic Environment | | Minor Negative | Moderate Negative |
| Landscape | | Minor Positive | Minor Positive |
| Transport (Material Assets) | | Neutral / Negligible | Minor Negative |
| Soils and Geology | | Neutral / Negligible | Minor Negative |

There are a number of issues associated with the option of a blanket MSA extension across the whole urban area. This option would have the following potential implications on the SA topics via the agreed SA Framework and Decision-Making Questions:

Economy and Employment

- 1a, 1c, 1d, 1e - employment rates / opportunities and skills: there are potential positive effects where the MSA extension leads to additional minerals extraction and associated business opportunity. However, this must be balanced against potential negative effects in situations where this policy leads to delays in both submitting and approving planning applications for other development, plus those situations where minerals extraction delays the initiation of construction.
- 1g, 2b, 2c – renewal and enhancement of urban areas, encouraging investment and productivity / competitiveness: the MSA appears to be largely in the Core Urban Area

of the City including areas of significant regeneration, plus the city centre upon which all people living in Leeds and visitors to the City value highly. Given the additional investigation and assessment required as a result of the MSA extension and associated policy (in proving whether or not minerals extraction is viable), it is felt that this change could (as stated above) lead to delays in both submitting and approving planning applications and also initiating construction. It is also unclear how extraction might lead to required changes in design, and thus additional cost and/or loss of development function. It therefore considered overall a short-, medium- and long-term **minor negative** effect (assuming few applications lead to extraction), which would thus reduce the performance of the overall DPD. The revised net performance of the DPD is unknown, as site-specific circumstances are likewise unknown in terms of potential viability of sand and gravel working.

Human Health and Air, Water & Contaminated Land

- 4b, 11b, 11c, 11e, 11f – air, water, noise, land and light pollution, risk of incidents, reduction in road transport, and reduction in emissions which can damage human health: where the MSA extension leads to additional minerals extraction in the urban area, there are many unknowns as to the cumulative effect this may have on people and the environment. Sites and vehicles are likely to be exposed to many more receptors than in rural areas, from residents to employees and users of the roads and footpaths. The inherent constraints mean that most minerals will be transport by road, and urban parts of Leeds are where the road network is most likely to remain congested already. Dust from minerals extraction cannot be eradicated completely and is likely to be more of a problem in areas of densely populated neighbourhoods and important sub-regional employment locations. There is expected to be **at least a minor negative effect**, as even with environmental controls, some effect (including cumulative effect with other projects in the district) cannot be avoided, and small effects across many receptors will accumulate with time.

Leisure, Recreation & Tourism and Social Cohesion & Inclusion

- 6a, 9a and 9b – the provision of culture, leisure and recreational activities / venues, and of high-quality open/green space and amenity: the effects described under economy and employment as apply to delays to planning applications and construction could affect the delivery of this type of development or improvement. Also, the effects identified under human health and emissions above would likely have at least some effect on recreational users near to sites, including pedestrians and cyclists. This is considered to be an **at least minor negative** effect, but it could be **moderate or major negative** depending upon the specific proposals affected.

Housing

- 7a, 7b – availability of housing to those in need, as well as quality of housing stock: the effects described under economy and employment as apply to delays to planning applications and construction would potentially be felt most in the housing market, particularly as the MSA appears to be largely in areas in need of regeneration. This is therefore considered to be a **moderate negative** effect, without precise information on where and how many sites are likely to inevitably require extraction.

Meeting Local Needs Locally, Climatic Factors and Material Assets

- 10a, 13b, 13c – minimising the distance between supply and users, reducing emissions and making efficient use of minerals: potentially **minor positive**, given the little mineral extraction which is likely to be achieved in the urban area. This is due to

potentially minimising the reliance of the region on minerals from outside of its boundaries. However, the benefit **may be reduced to negligible / neutral** if materials must be transported outside of the urban area for stockpiling or temporary storage, and then returned to the urban area, or then transported onward to other destinations within the region. The effect cannot be quantified given the unknowns. The overall impact of lots of small-scale extraction in the urban area has not been tested in the plan, and it is unclear if there are any tangible sustainability benefits to the addition to the MSA.

- 21a, 21b and 21c – reducing reliance on the road network and attractive sustainable transport modes: minerals development in an urban area would like have at least some negative effects on congestion (cumulatively) and on the pedestrian and cyclist environment. This is considered to be a **minor negative** effect.

Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna

- 12a to 12g – effects on designated or undesignated ecological receptors: most likely negligible locally as a result of transport emissions, and also **negligible** regionally, as the minerals contribution is in practice unlikely to significantly reduce pressure on extraction in ecologically sensitive areas elsewhere.

Historic Environment

- 15a and 15b – designated historic features and sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value: as the urban area is also the part of Leeds district which has had the greatest influence by human-kind over history, it also has the greatest number of designated built features, as well as the potential for archaeology. Effects can occur from both the extraction activity itself, and the associated transport (including air pollution and vibration effects). The potential effect of urban minerals extraction both on the integrity and setting of the historic environment is therefore considered **moderate negative**, but it could be either minor or major negative depending upon the sites affected.

Landscape

- 16a, 16b, 16e and 17d – landscape character and designated landscapes: the potential reduction in pressure on minerals extraction in the countryside could have **minor positive** effects (avoiding landscape effects in the first place by supplying from a ‘to be developed’ site), however the benefit may in fact be negligible depending upon how much urban area extraction can be achieved, as it may not be significant enough to alter wider pressures.
- 16d, 17a and 17c – the built environment / townscape and local distinctiveness: the influence of minerals extraction on design is unknown, however the presence of minerals extraction in an urban area and any associated transport and storage necessary, albeit temporary, would have **minor negative** effects on townscape.

Soils and Geology

- 22a – efficient use of land: the effect of minerals extraction in the urban area on design is unknown, however it could lead to reductions in the usable space of a site due to the required slope and reduction in level. It is therefore considered a **minor negative** effect. This should be viewed in conjunction with 22c below.
- 22c – efficient use of natural resources: as for 10a (etc.) above, this is considered to be a **minor positive** effect.

The main conclusion of the SA as per Table 4.1 is that the alternative option of taking the time (and delaying adoption of the DPD) in order to do the further detailed research required to identify and define a more specific Urban ‘Area of Search’ for sand and gravel (or a similar

designation) would:

- allow sustainability principles and factors to be incorporated into the definition of the MSA / Area of Search;
- reduce the MSA such that developers / planning applications in locations where minerals extraction is unlikely to be viable and where it could potentially conflict with policy MINERALS 2 which seeks to limit minerals extraction to locations where it is environmentally acceptable to do so;
- as an 'Area of Search', give developers greater certainty in planning for the influence of minerals extraction in their planning application and design; and
- as a result of the above, increase the certainty that cumulative effects and effects on key receptors would be avoided or minimised at the DPD level.

The Council has considered the potential to adopt the 'do minimum' or sand and gravel urban 'area of search' alternatives. However, during the Examination, submissions by the Minerals Products Association provided evidence to include a blanket approach to the Urban Area MSA within the DPD as this allows the detailed consideration of the potential for extraction on its merits on a site-by-site basis. Therefore, this option is proposed to be included with the NRWDPD through an additional policy.

The Council therefore proposes a policy which will address the issues and risks identified by the SA in a proactive way. The SA, however, recommends the following amendments in order to reduce the number of uncertain risks of minerals extraction in the urban area:

MINERAL SAFEGUARDING AREAS

*3.10 The sand and gravel resource is extensively overlain by existing development within the urban area and in site-specific circumstances, there may be occasions where it can be economically removed prior to, or as part of, the redevelopment of that land. The removal of sand and gravel from existing developed sites under 1 hectare in size and / or where reconstruction to original levels is necessary, is however considered by the council to be most unlikely to be viable. Extracting sand and gravel from sites less than 1.0 ha in area will incur high unit costs in relation to the deployment of suitable extractive equipment, the temporary storage of unsuitable material to be backfilled (which may have to be off-site), the procurement of compressible material for infilling the workings, the testing of such materials for contamination, the placement and dynamic compaction of such material, supervision, load bearing tests and warranty costs, in addition to environmental **mitigation** costs such as wheel and road cleaning. Additionally, the need to support adjoining land will mean that approximately 20% of the land is unworkable. In most circumstances, buildings cannot be erected which bridge worked and unworked boundaries. On small sites, this would prevent much of the land being built upon. These factors - combined with the low value of the dug material, mean that the extraction of sand and gravel from small sites in urban Leeds under 1.0 ha where rebuilding is to take place will be uneconomic. This DPD makes adequate provision for the Leeds share of the West Yorkshire sub-regional apportionment for sand and gravel through an Area of Search and an Allocation, any mineral resulting from prior removal at development sites is over and above the provision to meet the sub regional apportionment.*

3.12 The presence of a mineral safeguarding area does not mean that other development within the MSA is unacceptable. However, the potential presence of an economic mineral is a material consideration. In rural areas, development is controlled by green belt policy. In the urban area the MSA does not preclude

development from taking place but encourages developers to consider prior extraction of important minerals at the earliest possible stage in the development process. Consequently, prior extraction will be required as part of any redevelopment proposals, unless evidence provided as part of a planning application demonstrates either that the minerals extraction is not an economically viable option or that one or more of the alternative criteria set out in the policy has been met. In addition, it may be the case that a combination of some or all of the four criteria identified in the policy when considered together, means that prior extraction could not be justified in the context of a particular development proposal. Proposals for prior extraction will also subject to the criteria set out in MINERALS 10.

MINERALS 2: MINERAL SAFEGUARDING AREAS (MSA) - SAND AND GRAVEL

Within the Sand and Gravel Minerals Safeguarding Areas shown on the Proposals Map, applications for development over 1 hectare in size must demonstrate that removal of the sand and gravel will take place prior to or during development unless:

- 1. it can be shown it is not economically viable to do so, or*
- 2. it is not environmentally acceptable to do so (including effects on communities or the wider economy), or*
- 3. the need for the development outweighs the need to extract the sand and gravel, or*
- 4. the sand and gravel will not be sterilized by the development.*

In addition, as seen in the ‘SA Monitoring’ section below, it is felt that an indicator is needed which monitors the **average delay to the determination of planning applications as a result of the urban area MSA**, as well as one which supports the implementation of a **central system of collecting and monitoring comments or complaints received as a result of urban minerals extraction and its associated transport**.

PROPOSED CHANGE NO.10 – WHARFE VALLEY MINERALS POLICY

The revision to Policy MINERALS 5 which moves away from ‘resisting’ minerals development in the Wharfe Valley, and states that such development is unlikely to be supported, could be seen as a reduction in the level of protection afforded to this locally significant landscape and area of ecological value and potential. It would be beneficial for policy to **be more definitive**, and state clearly whether it is or is not permissible. The SA would recommend that **development should only be permissible if a significant net sustainability benefit can be proven and committed to which includes ecological enhancement, without major disbenefits and whilst by and large preserving the landscape and significant ecological aspects during operation**.

PROPOSED CHANGE NO.12 – SITES ADJACENT TO MINERALS SITES

The proposed change which would require consideration of current or future minerals impacts on proposed land use provides some sustainability benefits, particularly as relates to SA criteria relating to emissions of noise or to air, quality of housing and quality of open/green space and amenity. To elaborate, the policy would serve to assist in preventing foreseeable impacts on future potential receptors, such as new residents, employees or visitors. Other aspects of the NRW DPD will ensure that the converse effects are taken into account – i.e.

potential sterilisation of minerals or impact on minerals operations.

On detailed consideration of this change, no further changes are required to the SA, but the additional sustainability benefits are recognised herein.

PROPOSED CHANGE NO.14 – FUTURE REVIEW OF SAFEGUARDED WHARVES AND RAIL SIDINGS

The SA has identified a number of potential sustainability benefits of safeguarding wharves and rail sidings. The prospect of review or changes to safeguarding was not ignored by the SA, however it was not considered in the same amount of detail as presented in new paragraph 3.30.

Once these sites are developed, it must be considered that the opportunity is likely to be lost forever without very costly intervention. The UK has experienced similar issues on its rail network as a result of the Beeching Report of the 1960s, which did not take a long-term view.

In order to ensure that *long-term* sustainability is not compromised by short-term economics, and that it is appropriately integrated into decision-making, the SA recommends the following wording change to proposed paragraph 3.30.

*There are limited opportunities for rail and wharf facilities in Leeds and it is important that the sites identified in this plan have every opportunity to develop and flourish for these uses. Nevertheless, the Council recognises that land should not be sterilised indefinitely if there is no reasonable prospect of the sites being used for such purposes. It is therefore necessary to strike a balance between the policy objectives and **achieving** effective, efficient **and sustainable** use of land. To this end, the Council will therefore undertake a review of the policy as part of its Annual Monitoring Report in the first such Report prepared after a period of 5yrs from the date of adoption. Given that there are only limited opportunities available, it should not be assumed that lack of interest in the preceding 5 years will automatically result in the removal of the safeguarding policy from any or all of the sites in question. The Report will need to consider a range of issues, **including** how circumstances have changed since adoption and **forecasts of how the economy might change in light of sustainability issues**. This will include the issue of viability, and in this respect, the redevelopment of safeguarded or proposed wharves/ rail sidings for other land uses will only be considered where it can be demonstrated that the wharf / rail siding is **not likely to become** viable or capable of being made viable for freight handling, or in the case of safeguarded wharves/ rail sidings, where an adequate replacement wharf/ rail siding has been provided.*

The following factors will be taken into account when considering viability:

- site size, shape, navigational access, road access, rail access (where possible), planning history, environmental impact and surrounding land use context, including existing uses, extant planning permissions and development plan allocations;*
- geographical location, in terms of proximity and connections to existing and potential market areas and other freight-handling sites;*
- the existing and potential contribution the site can make towards reducing road-based freight movements; and*
- **long-term** demand for the use of the site for waterborne/ rail-based freight having regard to marketing and other evidence.*

PROPOSED CHANGE NO.15 – CRITERIA FOR POTENTIAL CHANGE OF USE OF WHARVES AND RAIL SIDINGS

Given the considerations discussed in the previous sub-section, it is recommended that the proposed change to Policy MINERALS 15 is reworded slightly as follows.

MINERALS 15: CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT ON PROTECTED WHARVES AND RAIL SIDINGS

Canal wharves and rail sidings are protected from other development unless the applicant can demonstrate compliance with the following criteria:

- 1. The development would not sterilise the longer-term potential of the site for wharf or rail siding use, or*
- 2. The applicant is able to demonstrate that there are no suitable alternative sites for the proposed development, and*
- 3. A sufficient supply of sites will remain in the district, readily available and of at least the same functional capability (**including proximity to relevant economic centres**), so as not to prejudice the objective of encouraging a shift from road freight, and*
- 4. The applicant is able to conclusively demonstrate, including **current and forecasted** marketing evidence, that the site **is unlikely to ever be** appropriate for use as a freight interchange.*

SA MONITORING

The SA / SEA monitoring framework proposed in Appendix A-5 of the SA Report (November 2010) has now be superseded. The indicators presented at the time were very generic to the Leeds LDF as a whole, and not very specific to delivery of the DPD and SA outcomes. We have therefore updated and amended the proposed indicators to ensure specificity to the NRW DPD, as well as feasibility and likelihood of achievement.

The SA has fed into this process, making the following additional recommendations.

Table 4.2: SA Monitoring Framework and Further SA Recommendations

| SA Objective | Proposed Monitoring Framework – Relevant Indicators | Additional Indicators Suggested |
|--|---|--|
| 1. Maintain or improve good quality employment opportunities and reduce the disparities in the Leeds' labour market. | Those relating to amount of minerals produced. Waste: the gap between capacity of existing facilities and forecasted arisings | No. VAT-registered businesses in the minerals and waste industries in Leeds and also in the region (e.g. West Yorkshire and surrounding counties). |
| 2. Maintain or improve the conditions which have enabled business success, economic growth and investment. | Continued uptake of waste management other than landfilling. Low-carbon / renewable energy: on-going annual progress towards meeting the overall requirement | Average delay to the determination of planning applications as a result of the urban area MSA. [NOTE: for the LDF as a whole – recommend employment rates in most vs. least deprived LLSOAs.] |

**Leeds City Council Local Development Framework
Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document – Publication Document
Sustainability Appraisal Report**

| SA Objective | Proposed Monitoring Framework – Relevant Indicators | Additional Indicators Suggested |
|--|---|---|
| 4. Improve conditions and services that engender good health and reduce disparities in health across Leeds. | <p>Transport: modal change (change in movements by mode)</p> <p>Waste: continued uptake of waste management other than landfilling.</p> <p>Waste: monitoring delivery of specific sites (ensure local self-sufficiency)</p> <p>Low-carbon / renewable energy: on-going annual progress towards meeting the overall requirement</p> <p>See also SA 11 below.</p> | <p>Green Infrastructure: measures of delivered GI, including investment, no. schemes delivered and/or length of the linear network</p> <p>Implementation of a central system of collecting and monitoring comments or complaints received as a result of urban minerals extraction and its associated transport.</p> <p>See also SA 6.</p> <p>[NOTE: for the LDF as a whole – recommend % of people of working age population with limiting long-term illness and also % of SOAs in the 20% most deprived nationally in the IMD Health deprivation & disability domain]</p> |
| 6. Maintain and improve culture, leisure and recreational activities that are available to all. | Compliance with restoration and aftercare conditions. | <p>No. of restoration conditions which include a recreational or cultural function.</p> <p>Minerals or waste permissions which create new access for cyclists, pedestrians, etc.</p> |
| 7. Improve the overall quality of housing and reduce the disparity in housing markets across Leeds | <p>Those relating to amount of minerals produced relative to targets.</p> <p>Low-carbon / renewable energy: on-going annual progress towards meeting the overall requirement</p> | None. |
| 8. Increase social inclusion and active community participation. (Cross-cutting with Objective 9 and 18, Greenspace) | None | <p>No. of restoration conditions which include a recreational or cultural function.</p> <p>[NOTE: for the LDF as a whole – recommend accessibility to high-quality open / green space which is within capacity]</p> |
| 9. Increase community cohesion. (Cross-cutting with Objective 8 and 18, Greenspace) | | |
| 10. Increase the proportion of local needs that are met locally | <p>Those relating to amount of minerals produced.</p> <p>Waste: the gap between capacity of existing facilities and forecasted arisings</p> <p>Continued uptake of waste management other than landfilling.</p> <p>Low-carbon / renewable energy: on-going annual progress towards meeting the overall requirement</p> <p>Water: per capita water consumption</p> | None |

**Leeds City Council Local Development Framework
Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document – Publication Document
Sustainability Appraisal Report**

| SA Objective | Proposed Monitoring Framework – Relevant Indicators | Additional Indicators Suggested |
|---|---|---|
| 11.Reduce pollution levels. | <p>Those relating to amount of minerals produced.</p> <p>Waste: continued uptake of waste management other than landfilling.</p> <p>Low-carbon / renewable energy: on-going annual progress towards meeting the overall requirement</p> <p>Transport: modal change (change in movements by mode)</p> <p>Air: improvement of air quality / AQMA being designated</p> <p>Water: reviews of planning applications which affect water quality / EA objections</p> <p>Land: contaminated land remediation / enforcement action</p> | <p>None for DPD individually – issues are cumulative.</p> <p>[NOTE: for the LDF as a whole – recommend: - No. complaints to Council about noise or light pollution on construction sites - Significant road congestion where cumulative construction traffic has been a contributor]</p> |
| 12.Maintain and enhance, restore or add to biodiversity or geological conservation interests. | <p>Minerals: compliance with restoration and aftercare conditions.</p> <p>Waste: continued uptake of waste management other than landfilling.</p> <p>Low-carbon / renewable energy: on-going annual progress towards meeting the overall requirement</p> | <p>Review of planning applications for consideration of cumulative effects, for net habitat loss and pre-construction habitat creation measures implemented in order to avoid/reduce temporary impacts.</p> <p>No. of restoration conditions which include habitat creation and management.</p> <p>[NOTE: for the LDF as a whole – recommend wider measures of the state of biodiversity in the district]</p> |
| 13.Reduce greenhouse gas emissions | <p>Those relating to amount of minerals produced.</p> <p>Waste: continued uptake of waste management other than landfilling.</p> <p>Low-carbon / renewable energy: on-going annual progress towards meeting the overall requirement</p> <p>Transport: modal change (change in movements by mode)</p> | <p>Per capita CO₂ (equivalent) emissions from industrial vs. domestic energy sources (electricity, gas, oil and solid fuel).</p> <p>Further investigation of potential for local heat distribution network.</p> <p>[NOTE: for the LDF as a whole – recommend per capita CO₂ (equivalent) emissions for road transport]</p> |
| 14.Improve Leeds’ ability to manage extreme weather conditions including flood risk and climate change. | Functional flood plain – checking for applications where flood risk issues not addressed. | |
| 15.Preserve and enhance the historic environment. | None | Review of planning applications for consideration of townscape, landscape and historic environment effects. |
| 16.Maintain and enhance landscape quality. | | |

**Leeds City Council Local Development Framework
Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document – Publication Document
Sustainability Appraisal Report**

| SA Objective | Proposed Monitoring Framework – Relevant Indicators | Additional Indicators Suggested |
|--|---|---|
| 17. Maintain and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the built environment. | | Where negative effects on a receptor or resource unavoidable (but mitigated as appropriate), the response should be to seek to avoid further effects on that same receptor or resource from future planning applications. |
| 18. Increase and enhance the quantity, quality and accessibility of greenspace. | Those relating to amount of minerals produced. | Regional estimates of the sustainable supply of marine-won aggregate as may be interpreted from or developed under the emerging marine planning system. (See also SA 4) |
| 19. Make efficient use of energy and natural resources and promote sustainable design. | Waste: the gap between capacity of existing facilities and forecasted arisings Continued uptake of waste management other than landfilling. | |
| 20. Reduce the growth in waste generated and landfilled. | Low-carbon / renewable energy: on-going annual progress towards meeting the overall requirement Water: per capita water consumption | |
| 21. Provide a transport network which maximises access, whilst minimising detrimental impacts. | Those relating to amount of minerals produced. Waste: continued uptake of waste management other than landfilling. Low-carbon / renewable energy: on-going annual progress towards meeting the overall requirement Transport: modal change (change in movements by mode) | None for DPD individually – issues are cumulative. [NOTE: for the LDF as a whole – recommend: - Significant road congestion where cumulative construction traffic has been a contributor] |
| 22. Minimise the pressure on greenfield land by efficient land use patterns that make good use of derelict and previously used sites & promote balanced development. | Those relating to amount of minerals produced. Minerals: compliance with restoration and aftercare conditions. Waste: continued uptake of waste management other than landfilling. Low-carbon / renewable energy: on-going annual progress towards meeting the overall requirement | % planning applications on greenfield sites and area proposed to be restored to an effectively greenfield status |

REFERENCES

PAS – Planning Advisory Services (2009). *Publication and submission of a development plan document: sustainability appraisal*. Retrieved on 27th November 2012 from: <http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/core/page.do?pagelId=152696#contents-3>

APPENDIX A: NRW DPD SCHEDULE OF CHANGES (JAN. 2012)

Post Submission Schedule of Changes 31.1.12

| | |
|---|--|
| 1 | <p>Para 2.11 Add the bring sites so the sentence reads ‘Only municipal waste is collected by Leeds City Council, which includes that collected through 11 household waste sorting sites and 430 bring communal recycling points distributed around Leeds.’</p> |
| 2 | <p>Para 2.27 After this paragraph create a new paragraph 2.28 to expand on the strategic objectives regarding movement of freight on the canal and rail systems. The new paragraph to state: ‘ This DPD encourages the use of the canal and rail systems for moving freight so as to reduce the amount of heavy goods vehicles on the roads and thereby reduce congestion and greenhouse gas emissions. The protection for wharves and rail sidings maximises the potential to bring marine-won sand and gravel into the sub-region and thereby reduce the reliance on land-won extraction.’</p> <p>The remainder of chapter 2 will need to be re-numbered accordingly.</p> |
| 3 | <p>Para 3.1. Delete reference to MPS1 and add definition of sustainable minerals development as follows: ‘The objectives of sustainable development for minerals planning are: i. to conserve minerals as far as possible, whilst ensuring an adequate supply to meet the needs of society for minerals; ii. to minimise production of waste and to encourage efficient use of materials, including appropriate use of high quality materials, and recycling of wastes; iii. to encourage sensitive working practices during minerals extraction and to preserve or enhance the overall quality of the environment once extraction has ceased; iv. to protect areas of designated landscape or nature conservation from development, other than in exceptional circumstances where it has been demonstrated that development is in the public interest.’</p> |
| 4 | <p>Para 3.2 Add the following text to create a new para 3.2: ‘3.2 Minerals can be worked only where they are found. Their extraction is a temporary activity. Mineral extraction need not be inappropriate development: it need not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belts, provided that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored. ‘</p> <p>The remainder of Chapter 3 will need to be re-numbered accordingly.</p> |
| 5 | <p>Add a new para 3.4 to state: ‘ Policies in this DPD will be monitored in accordance with the monitoring framework in Section 7. Where targets are repeatedly not being met, this may lead to a review of the DPD and consideration of the sub-regional apportionment through the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Aggregates Working Party. Policy Minerals 14 will be subject to a five yearly review to allow sufficient time for businesses to respond to the opportunities created by this DPD. Towards the end of the Plan Period it is anticipated that marine-won aggregate will contribute towards supply’.</p> <p>The remainder of Chapter 3 will need to be re-numbered accordingly.</p> |
| 6 | <p>Para 3.8. Change reference to Map A3 to ‘Proposals Map’. Add wording to encourage and raise awareness of the potential for prior extraction of minerals before sites are developed. Add the following wording to the end of the paragraph: ‘Valuable resources may exist outside of an MSA (refer to the Minerals Resource Map in figure 2.2) and developers are encouraged to explore the potential for extraction prior to (and well in advance of) site development.’</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| 7 | <p>Policy MINERALS 1, change to the wording of proposed change PC7. Change the words 'sand and gravel' to 'aggregate'.</p> <p>This is because the Policy applies to both sand and gravel and crushed rock. Additionally, the targets should be added into the Policy and therefore the final Policy wording should read as follows:</p> <p><u>MINERALS 1: PROVISION OF AGGREGATES</u></p> <p>In conjunction with other West Yorkshire Metropolitan District Councils, the Council will encourage the recycling of materials and endeavour to maintain a landbank of permitted reserves of aggregate in accordance with the Sub-Regional Apportionment.</p> <p>Leeds will aim to meet the following targets for aggregate provision:</p> <p>Sand and gravel = 146,000 tonnes per annum</p> <p>Crushed rock = 440,000 tonnes per annum'</p> |
| 8 | <p>Paras 3.8 and 3.9 and Policy MINERALS 2. This change should be considered in relation to the additional Sand and Gravel MSA map included as Change 26. Replace para 3.8 and 3.9 and MINERALS 2 with the following wording and delete paras. 3.21 and 3.22 and combine MINERALS 8 and 9 and re-name as MINERALS 3.</p> <p><u>MINERAL SAFEGUARDING AREAS</u></p> <p>3.8 The mineral resources of economic importance in the Leeds District are coal, sand and gravel, clay and building stone. Where it is viable to do so, the council will seek to ensure that these resources are protected from developments that may prejudice their future extraction. There is insufficient information to know where the very extensive deposits of sandstone and limestone are of a quality which would enable them to be viably worked. Reserves of clay are sufficient to support need well beyond the plan period. Therefore this DPD defines protected areas for coal and for sand and gravel only. These Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) are shown on the Proposals Map that accompanies this DPD. The purposes of MSAs are to alert potential developers to the possible presence of economic minerals and to prevent the avoidable sterilisation of minerals which may be needed within the plan period and beyond.</p> <p>3.9 The Sand and Gravel Mineral Safeguarding Area identifies the surviving alluvial deposits within the district in which the sand and gravel resource may be found in amounts that could be viable to remove. Based on information in the British Geological Survey Technical Report WA/92/1, Leeds : A Geological Background for Planning and Development, the MSA excludes areas already worked, tributary areas which are very unlikely to contain significant amounts of sand and gravel, areas already worked primarily for surface coal and areas where the resource is overlain by a substantial depth of made ground, for example by deposited waste materials.</p> <p>3.10 The sand and gravel resource is extensively overlain by existing development within the urban area and in site specific circumstances there may be occasions where it can be economically removed prior to, or as part of, the redevelopment of that land. The removal of sand and gravel from existing developed sites under 1 hectare in size and / or where reconstruction to original levels is necessary, is however considered by the council to be most unlikely to be viable. Extracting sand and gravel from sites less than 1.0 ha in area will incur high unit costs in relation to the deployment of suitable extractive equipment, the temporary storage of unsuitable material to be backfilled (which may have to be off site), the procurement of compressible material for infilling the workings, the testing</p> |

of such materials for contamination, the placement and dynamic compaction of such material, supervision, load bearing tests and warranty costs in addition to environmental costs such as wheel and road cleaning.

Additionally, the need to support adjoining land will mean that approx 20% of the land is unworkable. In most circumstances buildings cannot be erected which bridge worked and unworked boundaries. On small sites this would prevent much of the land being built upon. These factors - combined with the low value of the dug material, mean that the extraction of sand and gravel from small sites in urban Leeds under 1.0 ha where rebuilding is to take place will be uneconomic. This DPD makes adequate provision for the Leeds share of the West Yorkshire sub-regional apportionment for sand and gravel through an Area of Search and an Allocation, any mineral resulting from prior removal at development sites is over and above the provision to meet the sub regional apportionment.

3.11 Coal is a valuable resource and has been extracted from a very diverse range of sites in Leeds. Therefore the full extent of the surface coal field in Leeds has been identified as the Coal Mineral Safeguarding Area. The MSA designation does not imply that planning permission for extraction will be granted within a particular area. The surface coal resource is extensively overlain by existing development and in site specific circumstances there may be occasions where it can be economically removed prior to, or as part of, the redevelopment of that land. Removal of coal from development sites can help prepare the site for development by removing problems of combustion and instability. In the case of surface coal present beneath undeveloped land national planning guidance makes a presumption against opencast coal mining, therefore this DPD does not allocate land for surface coal extraction.

3.12 The presence of a mineral safeguarding area does not mean that other development within the MSA is unacceptable. However, the potential presence of an economic mineral is a material consideration. In rural areas, development is controlled by green belt policy. In the urban area the MSA does not preclude development from taking place but encourages developers to consider prior extraction of important minerals at the earliest possible stage in the development process. Consequently, prior extraction will be required as part of any redevelopment proposals, unless evidence provided as part of a planning application demonstrates either that the minerals extraction is not an economically viable option or that one or more of the alternative criteria set out in the policy has been met. In addition, it may be the case that a combination of some or all of the four criteria identified in the policy when considered together, means that prior extraction could not be justified in the context of a particular development proposal. Proposals for prior extraction will also subject to the criteria set out in MINERALS 10.

3.13 The policy requirement to consider prior extraction applies to all development sites over 1 hectare within the Sand and Gravel MSA and to all non-householder development within the Coal MSA. Examples of exceptions include applications for change of use, extensions, Conservation Area, Listed Building and Advertisement applications and any other proposals which do not include excavation of the ground. Temporary development is not generally considered to sterilize the resource.

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p><u>MINERALS 2: MINERAL SAFEGUARDING AREAS (MSA) - SAND AND GRAVEL</u></p> <p>Within the Sand and Gravel Minerals Safeguarding Areas shown on the Proposals Map, applications for development over 1 hectare in size must demonstrate that removal of the sand and gravel will take place prior to or during development unless:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. it can be shown it is not economically viable to do so, or 2. it is not environmentally acceptable to do so, or 3. the need for the development outweighs the need to extract the sand and gravel, or 4. the sand and gravel will not be sterilized by the development. <p><u>MINERALS 3 : MINERAL SAFEGUARDING AREAS – SURFACE COAL DEVELOPMENT SITES</u></p> <p>Within the Surface Coal Mineral Safeguarding Area shown on the Proposals Map applications for non-householder development must demonstrate that the opportunity to recover any coal present at the site has been considered. Coal present should be removed prior to or during development unless:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. it can be shown it is not economically viable to do so, or 2. it is not environmentally acceptable to do so, or 3. the need for the development outweighs the need to extract the coal, or 4. the coal will not be sterilized by the development. <p><u>NON-DEVELOPMENT SITES</u></p> <p>There will be a presumption against working of surface coal deposits beneath undeveloped land which is not going to be developed for other uses, unless applicants are able to demonstrate the environmental acceptability of their proposal, that the highest operational standards will be met and that restoration will enhance landscape quality and biodiversity. Weight will be attached to schemes which provide local and/or community benefits, avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources or facilitate other development which is in accordance with the development plan.’</p> |
| 9 | <p>Para. 3.16 Delete the first sentence referring to the landbank for crushed rock in the region and substitute with the sub-regional figure so the sentence reads: The landbank for crushed rock in the West Yorkshire sub-region has sufficient capacity to satisfy estimates of demand for a period of 28.3 years.</p> |
| 10 | <p>Policy MINERALS 5. Add the words ‘It is unlikely that’ to the beginning of the policy and exchange ‘resisted’ for ‘supported’ so that the Policy reads: ‘It is unlikely that proposals for the extraction of sand and gravel within the area to the east of Pool in the Wharfe Valley will be supported.’</p> |
| 11 | <p>Para 3.18 Add to the end of the last paragraph ‘Quarries that produce building stone also help to maintain provision of aggregate (crushed rock and sand).’</p> |
| 12 | <p>Para 3.23 Add sentence to the end of the text as follows: ‘Applicants for development of sites adjacent to safeguarded sites, allocations, preferred areas or the area of search will be expected to ensure that they have adequately considered the effect of mineral processes or wharf / rail related freight on the proposed land use.’</p> |
| 13 | <p>Para 3.29 Delete the sentence ‘Use of the canal is hampered by the need for costly dredging’.</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| 14 | <p>Add new para. 3.30 as follows:</p> <p>‘There are limited opportunities for rail and wharf facilities in Leeds and it is important that the sites identified in this plan have every opportunity to develop and flourish for these uses. Nevertheless the Council recognises that land should not be sterilised indefinitely if there is no reasonable prospect of the sites being used for such purposes. It is therefore necessary to strike a balance between the policy objectives and making effective and efficient use of land. To this end the Council will therefore undertake a review of the policy as part of its Annual Monitoring Report in the first such Report prepared after a period of 5yrs from the date of adoption. Given that there are only limited opportunities available it should not be assumed that lack of interest in the preceding 5 years will automatically result in the removal of the safeguarding policy from any or all of the sites in question. The Report will need to consider a range of issues and how circumstances have changed since adoption. This will include the issue of viability and in this respect the redevelopment of safeguarded or proposed wharves/ rail sidings for other land uses will only be considered where it can be demonstrated that the wharf / rail siding is no longer viable or capable of being made viable for freight handling, or in the case of safeguarded wharves/ rail sidings where an adequate replacement wharf/ rail siding has been provided.</p> <p>The following factors will be taken into account when considering viability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site size, shape, navigational access, road access, rail access (where possible), planning history, environmental impact and surrounding land use context, including existing uses, extant planning permissions and development plan allocations; • geographical location, in terms of proximity and connections to existing and potential market areas and other freight-handling sites; • the existing and potential contribution the site can make towards reducing road based freight movements; • demand for the use of the site for waterborne/ rail-based freight having regard to marketing and other evidence. |
| 15 | <p>Create a new Para 3.31 as follows:</p> <p>“ 3.31 Applications for alternative uses on a safeguarded or allocated wharf or rail siding will be considered in terms of their benefits weighed against the loss of the non-road freight opportunity using the following criteria based policy.</p> <p><u>MINERALS 15 : CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT ON PROTECTED WHARVES AND RAIL SIDINGS</u></p> <p>Canal wharves and rail sidings are protected from other development unless the applicant can demonstrate compliance with the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development would not sterilise the longer term potential of the site for wharf or rail siding use, or 2. The applicant is able to demonstrate that there are no suitable alternative sites for the proposed development, and 3. A sufficient supply of sites will remain in the district, readily available and of at least the same functional capability, so as not to prejudice the objective of encouraging a shift from road freight, and 4. The applicant is able to conclusively demonstrate, including marketing evidence, that the site is no longer appropriate for use as a freight interchange.” |

| | |
|----|--|
| 16 | <p>Alterations to para 4.4. Delete the first two sentences of the paragraph and replace with the following sentence: 'Future waste arisings have been provided till 2026 in Table 4.1. These are based on projections till 2021 that have been extrapolated to 2026.'</p> <p>Alterations to Table 4.1 of the DPD. Change the title of the table to state: 'Table 4.1 Future Waste Management Needs In Leeds till 2026 (tonnes per annum)'.</p> <p>Change the heading of the arisings column to read 'Arisings at 2026'.</p> |
| 17 | <p>Para 4.12 Where there is reference to the Core Strategy, need to add an explanation of the current status, suggest changing to: 'The emerging Core Strategy (approaching Publication at the time of writing) requires all development....'</p> |
| 18 | <p>Para 4.32 Policy WASTE 6 Add the following wording to the end of the Policy: 'Any application for a Strategic Waste Management facility should be accompanied by a Travel Plan and a Transport Assessment which considers the impact on the Strategic Road Network'.</p> |
| 19 | <p>Add the following wording to the end of paragraph 4.17 "Whilst some solid hazardous waste is exported out of the district, overall Leeds is a net importer of hazardous waste. Liquid hazardous waste arising in the district and beyond is treated at the White Rose Environmental Clinical Waste Incinerator and WRG Effluent Treatment Plant. These are important facilities for the treatment of hazardous waste and are safeguarded in this DPD. The Waste Strategy for England 2007 says that as well as seeking to reduce the amount of hazardous waste there is a need for additional treatment facilities and infrastructure for hazardous waste to assist in meeting changes brought about by the Landfill Directive. There is scope for further hazardous waste treatment in Leeds, such as soil-washing or bio-remediation and this could be accommodated on any of the strategic waste sites or industrial estates that are identified as suitable for waste treatment facilities. The Council will encourage the provision of hazardous waste treatment facilities in preference to disposal at landfill sites. As a last resort solid new hazardous waste cells could potentially be provided at Swillington and Howley Park landfill sites, which are also safeguarded".</p> |
| 20 | <p>Para. 6.26 add the following to the end of the paragraph: 'Where hard surfaces are to be constructed on land between a wall forming the principal (front) elevation of the dwelling and the highway, alternatives to impermeable surfacing must be considered first and it will be necessary to demonstrate why these are not feasible before planning approval will be considered for impermeable surfacing'.</p> |
| 21 | <p>Chapter 7 Table 7.1 The monitoring framework has been revised and updated. The revised framework is included as Appendix 1.</p> |
| 22 | <p>Chapter 8 In the glossary add the definition for Energy Recovery as follows 'Energy recovery: The production of energy in the form of electricity, heat and/or gas through the biological or thermal treatment of waste in a controlled environment'.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 23 | <p>Create new section entitled ‘List of Saved UDP Policies to be Replaced by this DPD.’</p> <p>Add new text to state:</p> <p>‘The following saved policies from the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Revised) 2006 are replaced by policies in this Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document:</p> <p>N45, N46, N46A, N46B, GM4, GM4A, EM9, N47, WM1, WM2, WM3, WM4, WM5, WM6, WM7, WM8, WM9, WM10, WM11, WM13, WM14, WM15, WM16, WM17, WM18, N54, N38A, N38B, N39A.</p> |
| <p><u>Map Changes</u></p> | |
| 24 | <p>For all map references within the DPD, remove reference to the mapbook and change this to ‘Proposals Map’.</p> |
| 25 | <p>25. Specific alterations to site boundaries as follows:</p> <p>Map 200 Strategic Waste Site at Skelton Grange, revised boundary to reflect operational land now identified.</p> <p>Map 139 Aggregate recycling site at Warren House Lane, Yeadon, revised boundary to reflect recent planning approval.</p> <p>Map 14 Canal Wharfage at Stourton, revised boundary to reduce the extent of the site area proposed for safeguarding.</p> <p>Map 18, Fleet Lane wharf, revised boundary to correct an earlier error.</p> |
| 26 | <p>Additional Sand and Gravel MSA in the urban area.</p> <p><u>Minerals and Waste Topic Papers</u></p> <p>The Council proposes to incorporate the additional papers that have been prepared on Crushed Rock Targets and Sand and Gravel Targets into the Minerals Topic Paper and also to incorporate the additional report on Waste Targets into the Waste Topic Paper.</p> |

Contact Details

Write to: Natural Resources and Waste DPD
Jacobs UK
1 City Walk
Leeds
LS11 9DX

Telephone: 0113 24 78092

Email: nrwdpd@jacobs.com

Web: www.leeds.gov.uk/ldf



Natural Resources and Waste

Leeds Local Development Framework

Development Plan Document

Sustainability Appraisal - Addendum 1: SA of Post-Submission Changes

April 2012

Leeds Natural Resources and Waste DPD –
Public Examination

Address for correspondence

C/O Programme Office
Leeds City Council
Leonardo Building
2 Rossington Street
Leeds
LS2 8HD

Date: 02 April 2012

David Feeney
Head of Forward Planning & Implementation
Leeds City Council
(by email)

Dear David

Leeds Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document
National Planning Policy Framework

As you are aware, the Government has recently published the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Planning Policy Statement 10: *Planning for Sustainable Waste Management* and its Companion Guide underpin a large part of the Waste Strategy and have not been superseded by this new policy document. Nevertheless, other aspects of the plan that rely on other national policy statements, which have been revoked as a consequence of the publication of the framework, may need to be revisited.

The Inspector has therefore asked me to ask you to review the plan in the light of the changes to National Policy brought about by the Framework and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and to let me know what changes to the plan you propose to make to rectify any perceived defects in the plan, as currently written, that you identify. An indication as to whether any proposed changes are minor or affect soundness should also be provided.

The Inspector has also asked me to write to all Statutory Consultees and other interested parties to see if they wish to make representations on the matters raised by the new documents. He suggests a closing date of 31 May 2012 be established for this process.

Any representations suggesting changes will be dealt with by written representations in the first instance with the re-opening of the Hearing sessions being a last resort.

Yours sincerely

C K Edwards
Programme Officer

Tel: 07969 631930
Email: programme.officer@leeds.gov.uk

Inspector: Melvyn Middleton BA ECON DIPTP DIPMGT MRTPI
Programme Officer: Carmel Edwards B Lib (Hons) MCLIP

This page is intentionally left blank

Natural Resources & Waste Development Plan Document – “Post Submission Changes”

Report to Executive Board 11th April 2012

Further Changes

1. Context

- 1.1 Following the preparation of the above report for Executive Board and consideration by the Development Plan Panel, further work has been completed which has the consequence of requiring further changes (to the post submission changes 21 1.12, appended to the Executive Board report).

2. Further Changes

- 2.1 These changes have arisen as a consequence of the need to complete a **Sustainability Appraisal** (see attached Addendum) of the post submission changes (a requirement of the LDF Regulations and in order to be compliant with the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive). In addition, on 2nd of April (see attached letter), the City Council has been invited by the Inspector **to review the DPD in the light of the changes to National policy brought about by the Framework and Planning Policy for Travellers Sites** (see attached schedule).

- 2.2 Based on this further work, with the exception of the SA recommendations made in relation to the monitoring of Minerals 2 (Minerals Safeguarding Areas (MSA) – Sand & Gravel and text wording changes in relation to proposed Change No. 10, the SA conclusions are recommended to Executive Board. With regard to these suggested changes, the proposed indicator to monitor the MSA within the urban area, is not felt to be practicable or realistic. In respect of the revised wording relating to the Wharfe Valley, it is not considered that this is necessary, as the intent of this is covered in the existing supporting text and through the detailed scope of Minerals Policy 10, which sets out detailed criteria for the consideration of Applications for Mineral Development.

- 2.3 Following the review of the DPD against the NPPF and Planning Policy for Travellers, other than minor wording changes to refer to the NPPF (rather than extant PPSs), it is not considered that any other changes are necessary which might affect soundness.

3. Conclusion & Recommendation

- 3.1 Based upon the further technical work outlined above, Executive Board Members are Recommended to:
- i) Agree the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum and with the exception of the points detailed in para. 2.2 above, accept the SA's recommendations and for these subsequent changes, to be consolidated as part of the post submission changes (detailed in the 21.1.12. schedule),

- ii) Agree the conclusions of the review of the DPD against the NPPF and Planning Policy for Travellers, as the City Council's response to the Inspector's request of 2nd April.