

## **SCRUTINY BOARD (HOUSING AND REGENERATION)**

---

**Meeting to be held in Civic Hall, Leeds, LS1 1UR on  
Tuesday, 30th April, 2013 at 10.00 am**

**A pre-meeting will take place for ALL Members of the Board at 9.30 am**

---

### **MEMBERSHIP**

#### **Councillors**

B Atha	Kirkstall;
D Collins	Horsforth;
J Cummins	Temple Newsam;
P Grahame	Cross Gates and Whinmoor;
M Iqbal	City and Hunslet;
S Lay	Otley and Yeadon;
V Morgan	Killingbeck and Seacroft;
D Nagle	Rothwell;
J Procter (Chair)	Wetherby;
C Towler	Hyde Park and Woodhouse;
G Wilkinson	Wetherby;

---

*Please note: Certain or all items on this agenda may be recorded*

---

**Agenda compiled by:  
Guy Close  
Governance Services  
Civic Hall  
LEEDS LS1 1UR  
Tel: 39 50878**

**Principal Scrutiny Adviser:  
Richard Mills  
Tel: 24 74557**

# A G E N D A

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
1			<p><b>APPEALS AGAINST REFUSAL OF INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS</b></p> <p>To consider any appeals in accordance with Procedure Rule 25* of the Access to Information Procedure Rules (in the event of an Appeal the press and public will be excluded).</p> <p>(* In accordance with Procedure Rule 25, notice of an appeal must be received in writing by the Head of Governance Services Officer at least 24 hours before the meeting).</p>	
2			<p><b>EXEMPT INFORMATION - POSSIBLE EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</b></p> <p>1 To highlight reports or appendices which officers have identified as containing exempt information, and where officers consider that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, for the reasons outlined in the report.</p> <p>2 To consider whether or not to accept the officers recommendation in respect of the above information.</p> <p>3 If so, to formally pass the following resolution:-</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b> – That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated as containing exempt information on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information, as follows:</p> <p><b>No exempt items have been identified on the agenda.</b></p>	

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
3			<p><b>LATE ITEMS</b></p> <p>To identify items which have been admitted to the agenda by the Chair for consideration.</p> <p>(The special circumstances shall be specified in the minutes.)</p>	
4			<p><b>DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS</b></p> <p>To disclose or draw attention to any disclosable pecuniary interests for the purposes of Section 31 of the Localism Act 2011 and paragraphs 13-16 of the Members' Code of Conduct.</p>	
5			<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES</b></p> <p>To receive any apologies for absence and notification of substitutes.</p>	
6			<p><b>RESIGNATION OF CO-OPTED MEMBER</b></p> <p>To receive and consider a report from the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development on the resignation of the Scrutiny Board's Co-opted Member.</p>	1 - 2
7			<p><b>MINUTES - 26TH MARCH 2013</b></p> <p>To confirm as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2013</p>	3 - 10
8			<p><b>STUDENT HOUSING</b></p> <p>To receive and consider reports from the Director of City Development and Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods on student accommodation in the city.</p>	11 - 30

Item No	Ward/Equal Opportunities	Item Not Open		Page No
9			<b>ENGAGEMENT WITH BUILDING OWNERS</b>  To receive and consider a report from the Director of City Development on what engagement there has been with building owners in the city centre following the opening of Trinity Leeds where businesses have vacated premises to relocate to this prestigious development and similarly when Victoria West opens.  <b>(Report to follow)</b>	
10			<b>LEEDS CITY REGION LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP DEVOLUTION OPPORTUNITIES - POST HESELTINE REVIEW</b>  To receive and consider a briefing paper on the latest position in relation to the Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership Devolution Opportunities – Post Heseltine Review.	31 - 32
11			<b>CITY PRIORITY PLAN REVIEW OF TIMELINE</b>  To receive and consider a report from the Assistant Chief Executive (Planning, Policy and Improvement) presenting a review of the City Priority Plan Timeline.  <b>(Report to follow)</b>	
12			<b>WORK SCHEDULE</b>  To receive and consider a report from the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development outlining the Scrutiny Board's work schedule for the 2012/13 municipal year.  <b>(Minutes of Executive Board to follow)</b>	33 - 38
13			<b>DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING</b>  This is the last meeting of the 2012/13 municipal year.	

## Report of Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

### Report to Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Board

**Date: 30<sup>th</sup> April 2013**

### **Subject: Resignation of Co-opted Member**

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **1 Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Board of the receipt of the resignation of Mr George Hall as Co-opted Member to the Scrutiny Board.

## **2 Recommendation**

- 1.2 Members are asked to
- (i) note the resignation of Mr George Hall as a Co-opted Member to the Board.
  - (ii) thank him for his contribution to the work of this Scrutiny Board and that of the former Scrutiny Board (Regeneration) in 2011/12.

## **3 Background papers<sup>1</sup>**

- 3.1 None used

<sup>1</sup>The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

This page is intentionally left blank

## SCRUTINY BOARD (HOUSING AND REGENERATION)

**TUESDAY, 26TH MARCH, 2013**

**PRESENT:** Councillor J Procter in the Chair

Councillors D Collins, P Grahame, M Iqbal,  
S Lay, M Lyons, V Morgan, D Nagle and  
C Towler

Mr G Hall – Co-opted Member

**102 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the March meeting of the Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration).

**103 Late Items**

There were no formal late items of business to consider, however the Chair agreed to accept the following as supplementary information:-

- Executive Board – Minutes of a Meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2013 (Agenda Item 9)(Minute 109 refers)

The document was not available at the time of the agenda despatch, but made available to the public on the Council's website.

**104 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no disclosable pecuniary and other interests declared at the meeting.

**105 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors J Cummins and G Wilkinson.

Notification had been received for Councillor M Lyons to substitute for Councillor J Cummins.

**106 Minutes - 26th February 2013**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2013 be confirmed as a correct record.

**107 Scrutiny Inquiry - Strategic Partnership Boards**

The report of the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development referred to the remit of the Scrutiny Board to act as the 'critical friend' to the Housing and Regeneration Strategic Partnership Board. In doing so, the Board was asked to consider the strengths of this particular Partnership Board and also identify potential areas for development. To assist the Scrutiny Board, a background report was also provided by the Housing and Regeneration Board entitled 'Scrutiny Inquiry – Strategic Partnership Boards - Report of the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods'.

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Tuesday, 30th April, 2013

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments:-

- Councillor P Gruen, Executive Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services
- Councillor R Lewis, Executive Member, Development and the Economy
- Mr Martin Farrington, Director of City Development
- Ms Christine Addison, Chief Regeneration Officer/Acting Chief Asset Management Officer, City Development
- Ms Maggie Gjessing, Housing Investment Manager, City Development

Prior to presenting the report, the Director of City Development conveyed an apology received from Neil Evans, Director of Neighbourhoods and Housing.

The Director of City Development introduced the report and highlighted and commented on the challenge of achieving growth in the current housing market. He stated that 3,828 housing units had been delivered in 2008/09 but this had fallen to 1,700 in 2010/11 and had risen to 1,931 in 2011/12. However, the latest figure of 1,200 houses delivered in 2012/13 was only 52% of what the target was in the Council's core strategy and therefore there were significant areas of improvement to be made. Whilst the Council had significant influence it was not within its power to deliver the homes required. As the Council is the lead agency, the largest land owner and the planning and highways authority it has considered how it could facilitate housing growth. To this end it had developed a series of initiatives and mechanisms including the

- development of the brownfield land programme
- older peoples housing and care programme
- facilitation of self-build schemes
- reviewed its policies on affordable housing

Finally, the Director of City Development referred to the membership of the Housing and Regeneration Strategic Partnership Board and in particular to the importance of having Building Society representation on the Board as mortgage access was one of the key factors to housing growth.

The Chief Regeneration Officer gave the Board a brief update on the background and membership of the Housing and Regeneration Strategic Partnership Board. She stated that the strength of the Board was the range of its members but advised the meeting that it remained difficult to engage the private sector in its work. Specific reference was made to the

- work of the board's Sub Groups, namely the East Leeds Regeneration Board and the Housing Forum
- Council's City Priority Plan target for affordable housing in 2012/13 of 525 and the likely outcome of just under 500 affordable homes being delivered



- target set for reducing the number of empty properties by 2,200 and the likely outcome being 2,300
- various energy efficiency targets which would be met this year

The Executive Board Member for Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services stated that he was satisfied with how the Housing Forum was working and the fact that there was now one voice for housing in the city. It had good representation from the private sector and the Housing Associations. The meetings were not officer led and any Member of the Board could place items on the agenda and present reports. He then referred to the East Leeds Regeneration Board and acknowledged that it had taken sometime to reach an accord and clarity as to the direction it wanted to move towards. It was clear that any development in East Leeds was dependent upon having the necessary infrastructure in place. Finally, he referred to the difficulties of selecting representation from the private sector on the Board. It was clear that developers were often not without prejudice and pursue their development interests. He stated that membership remained an issue and that the group was still emerging and that further work needed to be undertaken to develop relationships further.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Acknowledgement of the benefits that this Partnership Board had brought in terms of bringing together Councillors with other partners, including those from the voluntary sector
- Clarification as to why there was no mention of the work of the North East Quadrant Forum in the report which included representation from East Leeds Parish Councils, local schools and ward members and was chaired by Councillor P Grahame  
*(The Director of City Development responded and acknowledged the valued work that was being undertaken by the Forum)*
- How brownfield sites could be redeveloped to reduce the pressure on greenfield sites?  
*(The Director of City Development referred to the development of the 10 year Brownfield land programme which would require more bespoke measures to make brownfield sites more attractive to developers. This could include attracting new house builders to the city and encouraging niche house builders more suited to developing smaller and more difficult sites)*
- Reference to the fact that whilst planning approvals had been given for a number of housing developments in East Leeds, they were subject to the development of the East Leeds Orbital Route (ELOR) and Manston Lane and other improvements in order to secure the 12,500 jobs on offer in East Leeds  
*(The Executive Board Member Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services acknowledged the importance of getting the necessary infrastructure in place in East Leeds in order to unlock the land that already had planning approval for housing development. He stated that*

*the Director of City Development was currently leading on a feasibility study on the financing of the ELOR)*

- Reference to the Carla11 judgement and the fact that despite phases 2 and 3 greenfield sites being released three years ago to provide 12,000 homes there were no sites 'shovel ready' for development
- The need to challenge developers to increase their build out rates on sites currently averaging say 30 to 40 homes per year per site to 60 to 80 homes per year
- Whether the Home Builders Federation would be more representative of the house builders on the Housing and Regeneration Strategic Partnership Board and Sub Groups  
*(The Director of City Development agreed that this would be considered)*
- Whether decontamination of brownfield sites funded by the Council would be sufficient to make sites more viable for development  
*(The Director of City Development stated that decontamination alone would not be sufficient. What was needed was a range of initiatives. He referred to the government decision to offer home buyers a 20% interest free 5 year loan that would provide buyers with a substantial initial deposit and make brownfield sites more viable)*
- Reference to affordable housing and the view that some officers were taking a firm line on the percentage of affordable homes required for developments within the 'golden triangle' and were none negotiable. This was of particular concern if developers had not had previous dealings with the Council and were put off at the first hurdle by such an inflexible approach  
*(The Director of City Development recognised this concern and agreed that every request required a proactive, considered and in depth response in order to achieve the best and most effective outcomes)*
- Concern that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) has no democratic accountability and no formal decision making powers. Although there were planning approvals for 21,000 housing units the SHLAA had accepted the view of developers that 8,000 units were not achievable for development  
*(The Executive Board Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services reported that a paper would shortly be presented to the Executive Board that reviews the membership, operation and terms of reference of this group. The Chair referred to the Scrutiny Board meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2012 which expressed concerns as to whether the SHLAA was fit for purpose and welcomed the Executive Board Members intervention on this matter)*
- The approval of the Executive Board to accept a request from the Homes and Community Agency (HCA) that the Council transfer four Listed Buildings into its ownership at Tower Works, Globe Road, Holbeck. The transfer of the buildings would be accompanied by a financial dowry funded by the Department of Communities and Local Government and will result in the City Council and HCA working in partnership to bring forward the redevelopment of Tower Works and the wider Holbeck Urban Village

- Members noted that many of the views and recommendations of the Scrutiny Board on housing growth, re-development of brownfield sites, development of greenfield sites and concerns over the SHLAA process had been acknowledged by the relevant Executive Members. A number of initiatives had been progressed and approved by the Executive Board which were supported by this Scrutiny Board.
- Taking a firm line on the percentage of affordable homes required for developments within the 'golden triangle' and were none negotiable.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the reports be noted.
- b) That the Scrutiny Board continues to monitor progress in delivering the development of the brownfield land programme which it strongly supports.
- c) That the Director of City Development consider the Board's suggestion that the Home Builders Federation might be a more appropriate body to represent house builders on the Housing and Regeneration Strategic Partnership Board and Sub Groups.
- d) That the Scrutiny Board welcomes confirmation by the Executive Board Member (Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services) that the Executive Board would shortly consider a report reviewing the membership, operation and terms of reference of the Strategic Housing and Land Availability Assessment.
- e) To note that the Director of City Development acknowledged the Board's concerns that some officers were taking a firm line on the percentage of affordable homes required for developments within the 'golden triangle' and were none negotiable and instead every request by developers ought to be proactive, considered and given an in depth response that would achieve the best and most effective outcomes for the city.
- f) To support the initiative to bring forward the redevelopment of Tower Works and the wider Holbeck Urban Village.
- g) That the Scrutiny Board's observations and recommendations would be provided to the Partnership Board and would also inform the wider Scrutiny report to Council in relation to the Strategic Partnership Boards.

(Councillor M Iqbal joined the meeting at 10.20am during discussions of the above item)

(Councillor M Lyons left the meeting at 11.00am at the conclusion of this item)

#### **108 2012/13 Quarter 3 Performance Report**

The Assistant Chief Executive (Customer Access and Performance) submitted a report providing a summary of performance against the strategic priorities for the council and city relating to the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Board.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Tuesday, 30th April, 2013

- City Priority Plan Performance Report – 2012/13 Quarter 3
- 2012/13 Directorate Scorecard – Quarter 3 20112-13

The following representatives were in attendance and responded to Members' queries and comments:-

- Councillor P Gruen, Executive Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services
- Ms Christine Addison, Chief Regeneration Officer/Acting Chief Asset Management Officer, City Development
- Ms Maggie Gjessing, Housing Investment Manager, City Development

Prior to discussing the report, the Executive Board Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services informed the meeting that it was his intention to develop and refresh the key performance indicators in an attempt to make them more meaningful.

The Chair, on behalf of the Board, welcomed this proposal which was also supported by the Chief Regeneration Officer who agreed to liaise with the Executive Board Member, Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services on the timescales involved with a view to providing a report on this issue at the next Board meeting in April 2013.

The Chief Regeneration Officer presented the report and provided the meeting with the latest figures and targets in relation to such key issues as the number of new homes and affordable homes that had been built, the reduction in the number of empty properties and energy conservation measures completed.

Specific reference was made to the Green Deal and that a report would be submitted to a future Executive Board meeting on this matter.

Detailed discussion ensued on the contents of the report and appendices.

In summary, specific reference was made to a number of issues including:-

- Clarification of proposals in relation to the New Homes Bonus in 2014
- Clarification if the empty homes referred to in the report were privately owned  
*(The Chief Regeneration Officer responded and confirmed that the empty homes were privately owned)*
- The need for the Board to revisit the ownership of properties and shops with a view to bringing council properties back into the housing stock
- Clarification of pepper potting in relation to the type of affordable housing where it was delivered on site through s106 agreements
- Clarification if the authority met the EU Energy Efficiency objectives in relation to Council non-housing property

*(The Chief Regeneration Officer responded and agreed to ask colleagues in Neighbourhoods and Housing to investigate this issue and provide a written response to Members of the Board)*

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That an initial report on how a review of the current performance indicators might be achieved to make the data more meaningful be submitted to the next Scrutiny Board meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2013.

**109 Work Schedule**

A report was submitted by the Head of Scrutiny and Member Development which detailed the Scrutiny Board's work programme for the current municipal year.

Appended to the report was a copy of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:

- Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration) Work Schedule for 2012/2013 Municipal Year (Appendix 1 refers)
- Executive Board – Minutes of a Meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2013 (Appendix 2 refers)

The Principal Scrutiny Adviser, Scrutiny Support presented the report and responded to Members' queries and comments.

The Chair made specific reference to the newly opened Trinity Shopping development within the city centre and raised his concerns as to what would happen to those shops/businesses which had been vacated as a result of relocating to major shopping developments. He requested a report at the next meeting of the Board in April 2013 on the engagement process that had taken place between the Council and affected businesses and land owners. He also made reference to Hammersons and development of the Eastgate Quarter and requested that the same information be incorporated in to the report to assist Board Members with their deliberations on this issue.

In concluding discussions, Mr G Hall referred to the Local Enterprise Partnership and requested that this issue be tied in with the report referred to above. The Principal Scrutiny Adviser responded and informed the meeting that on going discussions were being held with representatives from the Local Enterprise Partnership in relation to agreeing a convenient date for the organisation to attend a future Board meeting.

**RESOLVED -**

- a) That the contents of the report and appendices be noted.
- b) That the work schedule be approved as now outlined.
- c) That the Director of City Development submit a report to the next Scrutiny Board meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2013 on what engagement there had been with building owners in the city centre following the opening of Trinity Leeds where businesses had vacated premises to relocate to

this prestigious development. Similarly what engagement would there be with building owners where tenants vacate their premises to move to the Eastgate Quarter once completed. What were the projections for both these developments attracting new businesses and how many businesses were likely to close and relocate to the new developments? What was being done to prevent the decline of shopping areas that were vacated by branded names?

**110 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> April 2013 at 10.00am in the Civic Hall, Leeds  
(Pre-meeting for Board Members at 9.30am)

(The meeting concluded at 11.45am)



Report authors: Robin Coghlan 2478131  
Daljit Singh 2478010

---

## Report of the Director of City Development

### Report to: Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration)

**Date:** 30 April 2013

**Subject:** Student Housing

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

---

### Summary of main issues

1. This report explores planning policy for student housing development and the interim report by Renew on supply and demand and lists current planning enquiries for purpose built student accommodation.

### Recommendations

Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration) is recommended to:

- i). note and comment on the contents of the report.

## **1. Purpose of this Report**

- 1.1. The request for a scrutiny report concerns council strategy toward student housing and dialogue with private landlords. This report deals with the former.

## **2. Background Information**

- 2.1. A number of concerns have been raised by Members and residents about student housing in Leeds, and the Council continues to receive applications for new development despite falls in number of University places in the City and experience of empty units in some of the less popular localities and rental discounts on some developments. This means questions about the long term viability of the market and the need to better manage future provision and the location for new development. However, the Council continues to receive applications for student development, often in locations which are considered unsuitable by adjoining occupiers and local residents. Currently there are few criteria against which future planning applications can be determined.

## **3. Main Issues**

### **Planning Policy**

- 3.1. In determining planning applications for student housing, the prime consideration is policy set out in the statutory development plan. For Leeds, the statutory plan that contains relevant policy is the Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP). However, this is expected to be superseded by policy in the Draft Core Strategy when this plan is adopted late 2013 or early 2014.

### *Unitary Development Plan*

- 3.2. Policy H15 sets policy for the “Area of Housing Mix”. This was originally proposed by LCC as the “Area of Student Housing Restraint”, but the UDP Inspector considered that policy approach discriminatory against students. The adopted policy is positively worded to permit development intended for occupation by students providing that it would not reduce the stock of housing available for family occupation, that there would be no unacceptable harm to residential amenity, that the scale would be compatible with surroundings, that satisfactory car parking provision will be made and that the proposal will improve the quality or variety of student housing.
- 3.3. Policy H15 has a sister policy, Policy H15A which expects LCC to be pro-active in identifying suitable sites for new student housing. Criteria for suitable locations include i) proximity to the Universities or good public transport, ii) potentially attractive to students, iii) supported by services and facilities, iv) contribute to regeneration and v) not prejudice the quality, quantity or variety of the local housing stock.



- 3.4. Also, the UDP contains policy H18 which has criteria for dealing with proposals for houses in multiple occupation.
- 3.5. The UDP also has city centre policies which promote a number of “quarters” for particular uses , such as the Prime Office Quarter. This policy (CC27) sees the quarters as having a dominant purpose, but not exclusively single use. Supporting uses are encouraged which will provide supporting services or add variety, providing they do not prejudice the main purpose of the quarter.

### *Core Strategy*

- 3.6. Draft Core Strategy policy H6 set out the Council’s current approach to student accommodation within the city. This takes two forms, Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and purpose built student accommodation. Part A seeks to control the concentration of HMOs within the Article 4 Direction area by avoiding high concentration of HMOs, ensuring the amenity of nearby residents is protected and by preventing further loss of housing suitable for family occupation. Part B outlines the approach for purpose built accommodation which should be controlled to help extend the supply accommodation taking pressure off the need for private housing to be used. Also, Part B seeks to avoid excessive concentrations of purpose built accommodation and development in areas which are not easily accessible to the universities.

### **Demand and supply**

- 3.7. Re’new has been commissioned to examine demand and supply for student housing in Leeds and report on options for future decision making. This will look at future demand for student housing in conjunction with the Higher Education Institutions, key providers such as UNIPOL and others active in the student market. It will take account of the local supply chain and current trends in the student market, as well as vacancies. It will propose policies and management arrangements to better assess the future provision of student housing and the suitability of locations.

### **Planning applications and enquiries**

- 3.8 Planning permission is in place for a total of 2471 new student bedrooms in purpose built accommodation. Some of these schemes are currently under construction:

Pennine House, Russell Street	119 bedrooms
26-30 Clarendon Road	15 bedrooms
4-28 Westfield Road	119 bedrooms
22 Lovell Park Road	66 bedrooms
Algernon Firth, Thoresby Place	110 bedrooms
City Campus, Calverley Street	404 bedrooms
Servia Road	300 bedrooms
20-28 Hyde Terrace	97 bedrooms
St Marks Road	526 bedrooms
Moorland Road	53 bedrooms
Glass Works, Cardigan Road	154 bedrooms

The Gateway, East Street                      508 bedrooms

In addition, other sites (eg Boddington Hall) have become surplus to requirements.

**4. Corporate Considerations**

- 4.1. Adoption of the Core Strategy is recognised as a corporate priority.

**5. Consultation and Engagement**

- 5.1. Preparation of the UDP and Core Strategy involved considerable public consultation and engagement. The Core Strategy will be subject to a public examination in the summer 2013 whereby the “soundness” of the plan policies will be considered by an independent inspector who will hear representations from objectors and from LCC. The review will involve key stakeholders including Higher Education providers, UNIPOL, key developers and local groups.

**6. Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration**

- 6.1. National planning policy is to create inclusive and mixed communities (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 50). Similarly, UDP and Core Strategy policy seeks to avoid excessive concentrations of student housing that could undermine the balance and health of communities.

**7. Council Policies and City Priorities**

- 7.1. Policy is summarised in paragraphs 3.1 – 3.6 above.

**8. Resources and value for money**

- 8.1. The preparation of planning policy and dealing with planning applications is covered under existing budgets.

**9. Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In**

- 9.1. The Core Strategy is being prepared within the context of the LDF Regulations, national planning guidance and statutory requirements. Planning applications are determined in accordance with the Planning Acts.

**10. Risk Management**

- 10.1. The Core Strategy needs to be prepared according to national planning practice guidance in order to be considered “sound”. Planning applications that are refused planning permission have the right of appeal to the Secretary of State.

**11. Conclusions**

- 11.1. Local policy on student housing provides a good context for considering planning applications. This will be strengthened if the policies in the Core Strategy are adopted following the examination in public this summer. The final report from Renew on student housing will provide evidence to help inform decisions on future planning policies and applications for purpose built student accommodation.

## 12. **Recommendations**

12.1. Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration) is requested to:

- i). note and comment on the contents of the report.

## Appendix 1: Student Housing Demand and Supply: Issues Paper

This is an initial report on the issues relating to new student housing in the context of changing demographic patterns, demand for housing and supply.

### 1. DEMOGRAPHICS AND STUDENT NUMBERS

#### a) *Take up of University places in Leeds 2012*

A survey by the Yorkshire Evening Post revealed that universities across Yorkshire had more than 1,800 places left after the clearing process last summer. Leeds University had 540 places unfilled and Leeds Metropolitan had 141 places unfilled, (although this has since fallen to 123 after students started at the university). Leeds Trinity filled all its courses in 2012.

It is felt that this came as a result of an overhaul of the way in which universities were financed and recruited students. Fees increased to £9,000-a-year which may have deterred some young people from applying or to defer their applications. The Government changed the rules for student recruitment whereby every university in the country had a reduced quota of the number of students they were allowed to recruit but were also given the freedom to take on an unlimited number of students who achieved two As and a B or better at A-level. However, there was a reduction in the number of top grades at A-level last summer and with fewer AAB students in the system then the number of students recruited fell. The University of Leeds could have filled places if it had been prepared to lower its entry requirements but it was not willing to do so.

#### b) *Student applications 2013:*

Analysis from UCAS suggests there has been a 3.5% increase in student applications at January 2013 in comparison to the same time point last year.

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
	464,167	570,556	583,546	540,073	558,898
Diff +/-		106,389	12,990	- 43,473	18,825
Diff (%)		22.9%	2.3%	- 7.4%	3.5%

There has been a 10.5% increase in applications from 19 year olds suggesting that some people had stalled their applications. There were reductions however, in applications from over 30 year olds who may be more fearful over the level of fees.

There has been a 2.8% increase in applications from UK students; a 4.9% increase in applications from EU countries and a 9.6% increase in applications from non-EU students. There was also a 2% increase in applications from people living in Yorkshire and Humberside.

The figures suggest that the impact from increased fees may not be as great as thought and that the number of young people applying to university may increase, but gradually over the coming years.

### c) Census 2011

Published data from the 2011 Census suggests a mixed picture regarding future demand for university places.

Leeds - Census 2011: Age	2001		2011		England & Wales 2011	Numerical change (Leeds) 2001 - 2011	% change (Leeds) 2001 - 2011
aged Under 5	40,871	5.7%	47,844	6.4%	6.2	6,973	17.1%
aged 5 - 15	102,220	14.3%	89,649	11.9%	12.6	-12,571	-12.3%
<i>aged under 16</i>	<i>143,091</i>	<i>20.0%</i>	<i>137,493</i>	<i>18.3%</i>	<i>18.8</i>	<i>-5,598</i>	<i>-3.9%</i>
aged 16 - 19	39,439	5.5%	43,934	5.8%	5.1	4,495	11.4%
aged 20 - 29	108,981	15.2%	131,734	17.5%	13.6	22,753	20.9%

This indicates a fall in the number of school age children (5-15) which may indicate reducing demand in the future (2015 – 2013) , but it also shows substantial increases in the proportion of under 5s (which could impact on demand from 2023) and also in those aged 16 – 19 which suggests that demand in the short term may increase.

## Implications

It would appear that applications to universities have recovered from the fall of last year. Census data meanwhile suggests that future numbers of young people seeking university places may well increase, but gradually and not at the extremely high rates of past years.

## **2. DEMAND SIDE**

### **a) Demand from new students:**

With the number of applications increasing for 2013, this would appear to suggest an increase in demand from new students for accommodation in 2013/14 and a potential continuing increase over future years. Census data also suggests that future demand may fluctuate but in the short term may well increase given an increasing number of 16 – 19 year olds.

The economics of university application are becoming increasingly linked to the economic circumstances of parents who are, more than ever, picking up the cost of higher education. The increase in fees to approximately £9000 a year does not appear to be having the impact on applications that had been predicted, young people seem to be becoming aware that the burden of repayment is on them but may not impact for some considerable time. In the meantime, the BOMAD (Bank Of Mum And Dad) is having to meet accommodation costs as the 'living expense' loan is insufficient to cover both living expenses and accommodation. In this context parents are looking both for good deals and value for money in terms of security and amenity.

## Implications

If demand from new students does increase then there may well be a case for some moderate increases in new supply of purpose built accommodation aimed at new students. It is clear that such accommodation is popular with students and their parents despite the relatively high cost.

Increasing new student demand may also feed into a moderate increase in demand for shared housing of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year students.

### **b) Returning students**

For a long time, demand from 'returning students' i.e. 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> year students has been for shared housing. There is little data to throw light on the actual number of returning students choosing to either remain in purpose built housing or switch to it in their final years. However, indications from purpose built accommodation providers suggest a constant minority of bedspaces are taken up by returning students.

Research by re'new for Unipol found a clear preference from students for housing options closer to the universities and the city centre, and accordingly this may translate into increasing demand from returning students for purpose built accommodation.

#### Implications

Demand for purpose built housing from returning students may well increase resulting in continuing justification for provision. How much can be met from existing supply, given likely increases in new students, is not yet clear.

There may be an impact, albeit slight on the demand for shared private rented housing but this may well be offset however by returning students switching to purpose built housing given evidence of some changing attitudes to housing options amongst final year students, and especially given the nature of accommodation offers and the views of parents about value for money.

#### **c) 'Brand switching'**

There is an indication that returning students are switching their demand patterns as outlined above. Also, there appears to be an influx of new purpose built providers who see opportunities from encouraging new students to take up their accommodation offer instead of some of the existing university accommodation or older private sector accommodation aimed at new students.

A number of University-run or leased accommodation schemes are old and do not offer the facilities and amenities offered by the newer purpose built accommodation (en-suite rooms, internet access, location close to the university/city centre etc.). Some older purpose built housing may not appear as 'attractive' as newly built accommodation.

There is some evidence that demand for older schemes (such as Sugarwell Court in Meanwood) has been reducing and this may accelerate with additional new provision with better amenities.

#### Implications

Provision by new private sector providers could have significant implications for existing accommodation, especially older University accommodation.

Should new providers offer a 'product' that is more attractive to students and their parents, then this may result in reducing demand for older accommodation, increasing voids and rent loss and accordingly to questions about the sustainability of that accommodation.

### 3. SUPPLY SIDE

#### a) Current and planned provision

The research by re'new in 2012 showed almost 13,000 students living in purpose built accommodation.

##### § Empty bedspaces (2013) from UNIPOL

There are also 3,363 new bedspaces with planning permission. It is not certain whether these will be built out, but a substantial proportion may be.

#### b) Meeting new and switching demand

If the projected increase in student applications manifests itself, then it would appear that there may be scope and justification for some small scale increases in new purpose built accommodation to meet demand changes, although this needs to be considered in the context of any surplus provision.

Providers may need to consider alternative sources of demand should the situation with student numbers change, or should surplus places arise.

New providers entering the market seem to be aiming at encouraging students to switch demand from existing university or private sector accommodation to what they may regard as their 'superior' product. It is likely that they will portray this as responding to student and parental choice.

#### c) Reasons for refusal

It would appear that currently refusing planning permission for new student accommodation would be difficult to evidence given that demand no longer appears to be reducing.

Provisions of new accommodation aimed at providing competition for new student demand would be portrayed as offering choice to students and their parents and would be hard to argue against.

Questions must arise over whether the very high, high-rise accommodation schemes built so far would be sustainable in the longer term but lower-rise, lower density schemes may be in terms of demand, but it is uncertain whether this would be financially viable for the developers

The provision of new accommodation may well have impacts on existing university accommodation rendering some unsustainable. Whether this is a reasonable reason for refusal of planning permission is not clear.



#### d) Planning Policy

The Leeds Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Review 2006: Volume 1: Written Statement (7.5.29, p171) states that in terms of the needs of students planning policy seeks to control the growth of the student population in the wider Headingley area with measures to disperse students to other appropriate parts of the city. In addition to this is a commitment to address the problems associated with the concentration of students which can include lack of community integration and a transient population reducing the ability to self-police and avert crime, as examples, yet this relates more to areas of housing mix in suburban communities.

Aforementioned purpose built student accommodation blocks have since been introduced to the city centre area of Leeds with developments such as Sky Plaza (LS2); Concept Place (LS3); and Opal 1, 2 and 3 (LS3).

Leeds City Council's approach to the use of areas of the city which have been designated as Quarters (e.g. Education, Hospital, Entertainment, Prime Office Quarters) states that "...there is a need to establish a strategic approach which is flexible enough to cope with the innate uncertainties facing the development future of a city like Leeds". Leeds UDP (2006), p289.

Furthermore that "The main objectives are to achieve a greater mix of uses throughout the City Centre, to avoid the creation of large single use areas which may be 'dead' at certain times of the day, to contribute to a livelier and more vibrant City Centre at all times, to ensure adequate provision of supporting uses and to provide variety in use and built form". Leeds UDP (2006), p265.

In 2007 Leeds City Council commissioned re'new to produce 'A Strategy for Housing Students in Leeds 2005-2010'. Within the strategy was the aim to 'achieve balance in the distribution of the locations of housing for students throughout the city' with some objectives including:

- § Establishing a strategic approach to new purpose built student accommodation to avoid over-supply;
- § Encouraging the location of new purpose built housing on the fringes of Leeds City Centre but close to the university campuses within such a strategic framework;
- § Promoting private rented housing in areas adjacent to new purpose built student housing complexes;
- § Establishing other locations that could be potentially attractive to students and the potential for encouraging students to move to different locations;
- § Promoting private rented shared housing markets from purpose built student accommodation in city centre locations.

The Leeds Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Update 2011, undertaken by GVA revisits Students, younger households and the private rented market. This update refers to a report published by CBRE (2010) stating that the student market during the recession has proved to be a resilient one, yet there is uncertainty around the ability of the student residential sector being able to continue such success.

The report also refers to an interview conducted with Unipol Student Homes in Leeds suggesting that a picture of oversupply exists in Leeds with 4,500 surplus bedspaces in shared HMOs and large developments with halls of residence developments struggling to secure tenants due to price and location. Here, it is reported that a trend of international students and first year UK students have a tendency to occupy the purpose built developments and second year students to occupy shared housing. Furthermore, the patterns suggest that Leeds student area's geographical focus is increasingly shifting towards the city centre due to closer proximity to amenities and distance to campus.

The Leeds Core Strategy Publication Draft (2012) states that between 2001 and 2010 Leeds experienced considerable development of new purpose built student accommodation and with regard to the growing residential community *"the city centre remains a good location for purpose built student housing, but excessive concentrations in one area should be avoided in line with Policy H6"*. Leeds Core Strategy PD (2012), p53.

Policy H6: 'Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs), Student Accommodation and Flat Conversions' refers to the need for development proposals for purpose built student accommodation to be controlled in order to:

- § Remove pressure from the need for private housing to be used;
- § Avoid loss of existing housing suitable for families
- § Avoid excessive concentrations of student accommodation which would undermine the balance and wellbeing of communities;
- § Avoid locations not accessible to the Universities by foot or public transport.

On balance, and equally as necessary to take into account, is the Article IV Direction for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and how development proposals for new HMOs will be determined.

Here, changes to occupation of houses from dwelling-house (class C3 of the use class order) to shared houses (class C4), now requires planning permission in those areas affected by the HMO Article Four Direction including all of inner Leeds and adjoining suburbs. Core Strategy policy seeks to balance the need for HMO growth with the need to avoid over-concentrations and, as such, the following considerations will need to be made:

- § Ensuring that a sufficient supply of HMOs is maintained in Leeds;

- § Ensuring that HMOs are distributed in areas well connected to employment and educational destinations associated with HMO occupants;
- § Avoiding detrimental impacts through high concentrations of HMOs, which would undermine the balance and health of communities.

Outside of Leeds and Yorkshire, as a point of reference, Newcastle City Council has produced 'Interim Planning Guidance on Purpose Built Student Housing 2007' under the Local Development Framework for Newcastle.

The planning guidance seeks to address student housing needs in Newcastle and refers specifically to new purpose built student housing. The guidance supports objectives of the Newcastle LDF as well as the Newcastle Housing Strategy by promoting and enabling development of appropriate purpose built student housing schemes in sustainable locations.

The aim of Newcastle's planning guidance is to promote and enable development of a range of purpose built student housing schemes after identifying that provision of such accommodation has fallen behind rising demand. There is also a need to provide such accommodation in Newcastle as not to deter potential students being attracted to the university and to avoid large concentrations of those students that are attracted to Newcastle to opt for private rented accommodation and potentially imbalance already high concentrated communities. The full report on student housing demand and supply in Leeds will consider how purpose built student housing in Newcastle has developed in Newcastle since the introduction of this interim guidance.

#### **e) Political viewpoints in Leeds**

Local intelligence suggests that some ward councillors covering the city centre and its environs are opposed to further large scale student accommodation blocks. However with regard to student accommodation in former office accommodation:

- The recent city centre Plans Panel (17 January 2013) Heard planning application (12/04154/FU) for 'Change of use of offices to form student accommodation, involving alterations to elevations and addition of rooftop extension, Pennine House, Russell Street, Leeds 1' saw members resolving to approve the application, in principle.
- Initial member concerns revolved around introducing student accommodation into the Prime Office Quarter part of the city, yet independent advice sought suggests that any impact would be negligible. It was suggested that in this case, and similar to applications in the Green Belt, special circumstances should be required to be demonstrated for such a change of use.

- Also, in view of the recent loss of major retailers nationwide, the need to consider how business might take place in the future was considered with concerns being raised as to whether planning policies would need to be reviewed in readiness for possible changes to town and city centres.

## Report of Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods

### Report to Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Board

**Date: 30<sup>th</sup> April 2013**

**Subject: Update on the analysis of current housing market trends within the Leeds 6 postcode areas**

Are specific electoral Wards affected?	Yes
If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): Headingley, Hyde Park and Woodhouse, Weetwood	
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	Yes
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	No
If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number:	
Appendix number:	

### Summary of main issues

1. Safer, Stronger Communities Scrutiny Board's April 2012 report into the private rented sector recommended that consideration of current market trends in the Leeds 6 area be considered and used to help predict future empty property trends.
2. On the 29<sup>th</sup> January 2013 the Housing and Regeneration Board received a report on the issues facing Leeds 6. That report showed that there has been a migration of students from the Far Headingley towards the city centre. This has been compounded by the increased number of purpose built student accommodation units built since 2005. However the existing evidence suggests that as of yet there has not been an increase in empty property numbers in the area.
3. As part of the on going research by Unipol and re'new further discussions have been held with housing providers in the area. These discussions have confirmed the conclusions of the previous Scrutiny Board Report of January 2013.
4. The discussions with the housing providers confirmed that there has and continues to be a readjustment in the markets with newer markets being developed away from the traditional student lets. Providers are also considering options around future demand and the potential conversion of properties into flats aimed at couples.

5. Providers are currently of the opinion that market forces will determine the nature of the market and that it will be for the Council to help to facilitate this change by taking action over those issues over which it has direct control.

## **Recommendations**

6. Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Board is requested to note the progress made against recommendation 4 from the Safer, Stronger Communities Scrutiny report into the Private Rented Sector (2012) and the subsequent Board report of January 2013.

### **1 Purpose of this report**

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to update the Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Board on progress since the Scrutiny Board Report in January 1023 regarding recommendation 4 of the Safer Stronger Communities scrutiny enquiry into Private Rented Sector Housing.
- 1.2 Recommendation 4 was
  - 1.2.1 That the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods leads on undertaking an analysis of current housing market trends within the Leeds 6 postcode areas and for this to then be used to predict empty property trends within these areas over the next 2-3 years

### **2 Background information**

- 2.1 The Safer Stronger Communities Scrutiny Board carried out an investigation into the Private Rented Sector in 2011 and published its report in April 2012. As part of the recommendation an initial report was brought to the Housing and Regeneration Board in January 2013.
- 2.2 The Board made the following requests for further information following on from the January 2013 meeting, namely;
  - 2.2.1 An update on the discussions that have occurred with Housing Providers in the area and what the Council can do to help them;
- 2.3 The purpose of the report is to provide the Board with the updates as per this issue.

### **3 Main issues**

- 3.1 Leeds 6 has traditionally been the home for students in Leeds whilst studying at its further education institutions. The Scrutiny Board report of January 2013 illustrated that there had been a change in the Leeds 6 market with an increased number of purpose built student flats and a migration of students away from the far reaches of Leeds 6 towards the city centre.
- 3.2 As part of the continued research undertaken by re'new into the area further discussions have been undertaken with interested housing providers in the area. Those discussions have indicated the following;

- 3.3 The providers do not believe there is or can be a grand plan for the area. The market is undergoing a change but the implications are yet to be fully understood. Far Headingley and Meanwood appear to moving away from the student sector towards a more professional and young persons market, Hyde Park remains predominately students, with more uncertainty in the Burley, Woodhouse areas as to future demand.
- 3.4 Providers are bidding their time as to the future nature of the market. Currently some large portfolio holders are letting below capacity, reducing numbers in properties, where necessary but smaller holders are still letting at the capacity of their holdings wherever possible. It is their opinion that properties are unlikely to attract the traditional family market but possibly the younger element of single people, couples, friends etc. There was some interest in converting larger properties into flats to accommodation this type of future market. However this would depend upon the cost of such conversions.
- 3.5 In terms of the Council, providers believe that market forces will drive the changes to the area. The Council's role is to monitor what is happening, help to facilitate change through local partnerships and to take action on those issues under its direct control. These issues in their opinion include waste disposal, street and environmental improvements and community safety.

## **4 Corporate Considerations**

### **4.1 Consultation and Engagement**

- 4.1.1 Though the Council's consultation processes stakeholders and partners will be engaged and consulted with, with a view to determining any necessary changes to service provision which may be required by the Council and partners.

### **4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration (EDCI)**

- 4.2.1 Any new strategy, action plan or new service provision which may result from the work undertaken by any Council Service will be subject to EDCI assessment(s).

### **4.3 Council policies and City Priorities**

- 4.3.1 The work will continue to contribute to Council priorities across a number of themes:
- Reducing the number of long term empty properties
  - Reducing crime levels and their impact across Leeds
  - Effectively tackling and reducing anti-social behaviour in our communities
  - Increase a sense of belonging that builds cohesive and harmonious communities
  - Increase affordable homes within sustainable neighbourhoods
  - Improve quality of the environment.
  - Improving housing conditions and energy efficiency

#### **4.4 Resources and value for money**

- 4.4.1 Currently the Council and partners are providing services within Leeds 6 to address the issues faced by this community. It is essential that any potential changes in this area are determined to enable appropriate resources and services to be provided to the Leeds 6 area. This will ensure that the service provision meets the new needs of any new emerging community.

#### **4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In**

- 4.5.1 Officers will continue to operate within their existing powers and to work with partners to address current and emerging issues affecting Leeds 6.
- 4.5.2. The Executive Board decision was eligible to call in.

#### **4.6 Risk Management**

- 4.6.1 The Council's normal risk management procedures have been and continue to be applied.

### **5 Conclusions**

- 5.1 There have been changes to the housing market in Leeds 6. The outer areas have seen a contraction of the traditional student market. With the raise in purpose built student accommodation and city centre living students have migrated towards the city centre away from Far Headingley, Meanwood and Kirkstall.
- 5.2 Currently Housing Providers are of the opinion that market forces will drive the changes. The role of the Council is to affect those services that it directly controls, including collection of waste, environmental and community safety. The Council should continue to monitor the change and determine what it means for the city as a whole and engage with the relevant partners as and when any issues arise.
- 5.3 Any changes to the existing housing market and the demographics of the area will affect the current service provision in the area. The Council and its partners will need to consider the potential changes and the affect that these will have on the delivery of existing current services.

### **6 Recommendations**

- 6.1 Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Board is requested to note progress made against recommendation 4 from the Safer, Stronger Communities Scrutiny report into the Private Rented Sector (2012) and the Scrutiny Board Report in January 2013.



## **7 Background documents<sup>1</sup>**

- 7.1 Safer, Stronger Communities Inquiry report into the Private Rented Sector (2012)
- 7.2 Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Board Report January 2013

---

<sup>1</sup> The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

This page is intentionally left blank



Originator: Colin Blackburn

---

**Report to:** LCC Scrutiny Committee

**Date:** 30<sup>th</sup> April 2013

**Subject:** LCR LEP DEVOLUTION OPPORTUNITIES - POST HESELTINE  
REVIEW

---

## **1.0 PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To outline the latest situation in relation to the potential devolution of funding to the Leeds City Region Local Enterprise Partnership by Government, in response to the Lord Heseltine Growth Review.

## **2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 Members are requested to note the report.

## **3.0 BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 In the Budget in March 2013, reference was made to the Government looking favourably on recommendations from Lord Heseltine's report 'No Stone Unturned,' and that bids for funding are to be invited from Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) to encourage competition, efficiency and regional growth.
- 3.2 Very little is known of what the potential offer to LEPs could be, beyond what has been announced. The time period the Government is referring to is post-2015, so it is concerned with the next Parliament. It is understood that the full details of the potential devolution proposals and LEP bidding process will be announced in the Spending Review on the 26<sup>th</sup> June. It will be a national competitive process.
- 3.3 The Government refers to skills, housing and transport budgets as being three key areas for exploration, but no further details are provided. However, it is understood that if LEPs could make a strong case for other options to be considered, then the Government would be willing to listen.

## **4.0 LCR LEP RESPONSE**

- 4.1 The current LCR City Deal which was agreed with Government in 2012 and which is being implemented, covers several of these agendas already such as the devolution of some skills and major transport scheme funding; but LCR

Leaders would need to give a steer once the announcement is made in June about what other options they may wish to pursue.

- 4.2 As there are no longer Regional Development Agencies, LEPs have been allocated 250K this financial year to support them in developing these bids, although this funding is particularly to support new capacity and expertise for developing EU Structural Investment Fund Strategies for post 2014 EU funding.
- 4.3 Initial consideration is being given to the potential scope of these workstreams, which will need to build on and reflect the LCR LEP Economic Plan (2011) and the City Region Deal Agreement. LCR Leaders / LEP will consider the Government's announcement, the options for developing the plan, and any resource implications at their next meetings following the June announcement. The LCR Leaders Board is scheduled for early August 2013. Options for engaging and consulting with local authorities, the private sector and other partners and stakeholders would also be considered at that time.

## Report of Head of Scrutiny and Member Development

### Report to Housing and Regeneration Scrutiny Board

**Date:** 30<sup>th</sup> April 2013

**Subject:** Work Schedule

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## 1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to receive the Scrutiny Board's work schedule for the current municipal year.

## 2 Main issues

- 2.1 As this is the last scheduled meeting in the current municipal year the work schedule attached as appendix 1 shows the issues the Board has considered in 2012/13.
- 2.2 A copy of the latest minutes of the Executive Board meeting will be circulated as appendix 2 as soon as they are available.

## 3 Recommendations

- 3.1 Members are asked to:
- a) Note and comment on the issues the Board has considered in 2012/13.
  - b) Note the latest minutes of the Executive Board meeting.

## 4. Background papers<sup>1</sup>

- 4.1 None used

<sup>1</sup>The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration) 2012/13 Municipal Year   Revised 10.04.13   Appendix 1**

Area of review	Schedule of meetings/visits during 201213		
	June	July	August
<b><i>Consultation Major Changes to Housing Policy</i></b>		Initial Paper on decision of Executive Board and Proposed Changes including draft tenancy strategy consultation	Working Group comprising all Members of the Board to submit its comments on the proposals
<b><i>Development of Brown field Sites</i></b>		Initial Paper from Director of City Development	
<b><i>Development of Guidance/protocol for Developers</i></b>		Initial Paper from Director of City Development	
<b><i>To be determined</i></b>			
<b>Briefings</b>	Equality Improvement Priorities SB 18/06/12 @ 10 am	Response to queries Q3 performance reports Consultation Section 106 agreements Community Infrastructure Levy	
<b>Budget &amp; Policy Framework Plans</b>		Report on Housing Revenue, General Fund Regeneration and Capital Programme Period 2	
<b>Recommendation Tracking</b>		Recommendation Tracking Private Rented Sector Housing	
<b>Performance Monitoring</b>	Quarter 4 performance report SB 18/06/12 @ 10 am		

**Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration) 2012/13 Municipal Year   Revised 10.04.13   Appendix 1**

Area of review	Schedule of meetings/visits during 2012/13		
	September	October	November
<b><i>Consultation Major Change to Housing Policy</i></b>	Consider a summary of the responses received from all consultees on the proposals with a view to making any recommendations the Scrutiny Board wishes to make before Executive Board considers the matter in November	Recommendations to Executive Board	Executive Board consider a proposed new Housing Policy
<b><i>Development of Browfield Sites</i></b>			
<b><i>Development of Guidance/protocol for Developers</i></b>		Board to consider guidance/protocol	
<b><i>Council houses being used as offices and the Directorate's approach to the disposal of property in general</i></b>	To consider a report of the Director of Housing on Council houses being used as offices including the Directorate's approach to the disposal of property in general	To consider a list of non Council owned land that are brownfield sites that have been declared not viable and the reasons why they are not viable and what has been offered to move those sites forward for development	
<b>Briefings Inquiry Report Recommendation Private Sector Housing Recommendation</b>		Recommendation 1 Private Sector Housing Report back on outcome of adopting a more proactive and targeted integrated management approach in addressing those areas of the city that have greater housing and environmental needs. Report on SHLAA Process & Membership	Recommendation 3 That a progress report on the delivery of the Empty Properties Action Plan be brought back to Scrutiny before December 2012.
<b>Budget &amp; Policy Framework Plans</b>		+	Budget report to half year month 6
<b>Recommendation Tracking</b>		Housing Growth	Affordable Housing by Private Developers
<b>Performance Monitoring</b>	Quarter 1 performance report SB 10/09/12 @ 10 am		

Key: SB – Scrutiny Board (Housing & Regeneration) Meeting

WG – Working Group Meeting



Area of review	Schedule of meetings/visits during 2012/13		
	December	January	February
<b>Development of Guidance/protocol for Developers</b>		To consider a final draft of the good practice guide to pre-application engagement	
<b>Affordable Housing Variations in Bench Mark Figures</b>		To consider a report of the Director of Environment and Housing variations in bench mark figures between authorities concerning affordable housing	
<b>Internal Audit Report officer declarations – planning investigation &amp; lessons learned from Doncaster</b>			To consider a report from Internal Audit on officer declarations
<b>Delivery of Brownfield Sites</b>	Update on <i>Council houses being used as offices and the Directorate's approach to the disposal of property in general</i>		Revised strategy for delivery of brownfield sites in the city including EASEL
<b>Strategic Housing Land availability Assessment(SHLAA)</b>		To consider a report on completion of the review of the SHLAA process and Membership	To consider a report on completion of the review of the SHLAA process and Membership -
<b>Community Infrastructure Working Group</b>	At the 30 <sup>TH</sup> October Board meeting the Working Group was established but deferred to allow officers the opportunity with consultants to develop the position	To arrange a meeting of this Working Group - Check on progress	
<b>Briefings Inquiry Report Recommendation 4 Private Sector Housing</b>		That the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods report back on the findings from work undertaken analysing current housing market trends within the Leeds 6.	
<b>Performance Monitoring</b>	Quarter 2 performance report SB 10/12/12 @ 10 am		

Area of review	Schedule of meetings/visits during 2012/13		
	March	April	May
<b>Consultation Major Change to Housing Policy</b>			
<b>Development of Brown field Sites</b>			
<b>Critical friend to the Strategic Partnership Board</b>	To consider a report on outcome of the workshops organised by Leeds Initiative responding to the questions set out in the constitution		
<b>Briefings</b>		<p>To consider the Council's policy regarding student accommodation in the city (Requested by the Board on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2013)</p> <p>To consider a briefing paper on the Local Enterprise Partnership</p> <p>To consider a paper on what engagement there has been with building owners following the opening of the Trinity development and what affect this will have on other areas in the city centre</p>	
<b>Budget &amp; Policy Framework Plans</b>			
<b>Recommendation Tracking</b>			
<b>Performance Monitoring</b>	Quarter 3 performance report SB 11/03/13 @ 10 am	Report on progress in reviewing Performance Indicators(Requested by the Board in March 2013	