

## **Development Plan Panel**

**Tuesday, 15th October, 2019**

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

Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,  
A Carter, C Gruen, J McKenna, D Collins,  
R Finnigan, L Mulherin and K Ritchie

The Chair welcomed approximately 20 students from Leeds Beckett University in attendance. Following this, brief introductions were made.

In addition, the Chief Planning Officer congratulated Martin Elliot on his newly appointed position, Head of Strategic Planning.

### **19 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

There were no appeals.

### **20 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There was no exempt information.

### **21 Late Items**

There were no late items.

### **22 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

### **23 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor S Arif.

### **24 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to an amendment to minute 7, of the Development Plan Panel meeting held 24<sup>th</sup> June 2019, to read

*'Most sites adjoining the A65 are no longer proposed for allocation. The major site near Horsforth roundabout did have a site requirement for widening the A65 however this site is not now allocated for housing. For the few remaining allocations (HG2-46 Horsforth Waste Water Treatment Works, HG2-234 extensions to Kirkstall Forge), specific site requirements for road widening have not been applied in the SAP as there are no plans to widen the A65. The Quality Bus Initiative has been introduced up to Kirkstall Forge. Any future transport improvement schemes would be taken into consideration in the determination of any planning applications affected',*

the minutes of the DPP meetings be approved:

- a) 24<sup>th</sup> June 2019
- b) 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2019 (additional meeting)

## **25 Matters Arising**

### Minute 7 Site Allocations Plan –

- Haigh Wood North (HG2-168) and Haigh Wood West (HG2-169). A Member referred to a previous request, that the history of these sites in regard to the Unitary Development Plan (UDP), be provided. Officers confirmed that information can be provided at a later date.

### Minute 16 Bradford Core Strategy Partial Review –

- A Member sought clarity on the steps that had been taken since the previous meeting. In response, officers informed the Panel that:
  - I. Plan making process - an update will be provided when Bradford Council have considered Leeds' Response to Bradford's Core Strategy Partial Review (CSPR) Preferred Options. In addition, it was confirmed that Leeds' have had a conversation with Bradford Council, to reinforce the consultation comments; in response to this, Members' requested that the responses which had been sent to Bradford, be circulated to Panel Members.
  - II. Continuing the conversation through the Duty to Cooperate process.
- A Member referred to a recent planning seminar which had taken place, and sought clarity on whether joint meetings could be set up between officers, and Elected Members. The Panel agreed this would be something they want to explore, and the Chief Planning Officer agreed to report back on the position of this at a future Panel meeting.

### Minute 17 Core Strategy Selective Review –

- Officers confirmed that the date in which a person could make an application to the High Court under Section 113, would expire on the 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2019 (this is the period of six weeks starting the day after the date on which the Plan was adopted).

## **26 Site Allocations Plan (SAP) Review**

Further to the minutes of the meeting held, Monday 24<sup>th</sup> June 2019, the report of the Chief Planning Officer invited the Panel to note the initial considerations in reviewing the SAP housing allocations.

The report details that the Core Strategy Selective Review (CSSR) was adopted by Full Council on the 11<sup>th</sup> September, and the SAP Policy HGR1 requires the Council to undertake an immediate review of the SAP, to look at whether there is a need for additional housing; this would be in light of the lower housing target.

The Head of Strategic Planning presented the report, and provided some background context and history on the position of the SAP, and highlighted:

- The Adopted Site Allocations Plan (2019) identifies land for 59,718 homes between 2012 and 2028;

- 46,352 (net) homes will be needed as set out in Policy SP6 and this takes into account the need to add demolitions of housing and discount a windfall allowance;
- The technical exercises of work required to be completed to inform the evidence base will include:
  - Extending the plan period
  - Discounting housing sites already built between 2012-2017
  - Taking account of past delivery rates in individual market areas
  - Look at the up to date deliverability of the housing supply
  - Consider the effect of any permissions granted since adoption of SAP (check for changes to SAP site capacities or large windfalls)
  - Consider the need for buffers and flexibility
- The indicative timetable – Submission by late 2020, and adoption by mid-2021.

Discussions with the Panel, highlighted the following matters:

*Brownfield Sites.* A Member commented that in order to come forward with any additional housing sites to meet the housing needs up to 2033, a comprehensive review of brownfield sites would be needed. In response, the Head of Strategic Planning explained that the infill of brownfield sites would be reviewed against the Spatial Policy 1 (SP1): Location of Development; it was averaged that over the last 5 years, brownfield permissions averaged at approximately 74%. In addition, Members were informed that sites they wish to recommend for allocation, or on which they have further information, officers can assess these against existing records. In addition to this, a Member queried the formalities of replacing a Greenfield site for a Brownfield site in the SAP; it was confirmed that those Greenfield sites already adopted as housing allocations, will remain allocated, and this wouldn't be an option through the SAP review.

*Gypsy and Traveller site provision.* A Member requested to receive further clarity on the terminology of a 'Gypsy and Traveller site'. In responding, officers explained that the term related solely to permanent caravan provision. Additionally, it was reiterated that the Inspector had agreed the plan is sound, subject to those sites being monitored, and should the required 13 sites not be met by 2023, an individual site review for provision will be required.

*CS Spatial Policy 7 – Housing Distribution.* Further information was sought on how all of the Housing Market Characteristic Areas (HMCA) would benefit from the distribution of housing, and raised concern around the deliverability in providing additional sites before 2033. The Head of Strategic Planning explained that officers would take into account the level of need, the availability of sites and the infrastructure in each HMCA; the SAP includes 50k homes which the Inspector considered deliverable. Additionally, it was added that the Inspector considered and accepted those sites put forward from Members of the Panel.

*Climate Emergency.* Following the Climate Emergency declaration, Members' sought clarity on how climate issues will be fed into future planning applications, and identified the need to introduce recommendations which reflect the future sustainability of developments. In responding, the Chief Planning Officer explained

this would be an on-going process, taking on board the Inspector's and Members' comments, and identifying broader issues. Moving forward, it has been acknowledged that policies would be embedded in a more strategic fashion.

Density. A Member suggested that the density of residential land use be reviewed, as an extra technical exercise for officers to undertake as part of their remit of work. The Panel were informed that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) strengthened the council's available land supply; providing a stronger indication on the additional land needed. It was noted that site capacities were indicative and could be higher. Furthermore, the Chief Planning Officer added that an integrated approach would be taken, and work would be undertaken with the university to model density.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) To note the contents of the report and the discussions held at the meeting;
- b) To note the intention to receive a further report in due course.

#### **27 Housing Delivery Plan**

The Principle Planner, City Development, introduced the report of the Chief Planning Officer which set out the purpose of the Housing Delivery Plan (HDP) and how this presents the Council's strategic approach to policy implementation of the Local Plan; it highlighted the Best Council Plan priorities for housing growth alongside inclusive growth, health and well-being and the climate emergency.

Appendix 1 to the report included a copy of the draft HDP – setting out a range of projects, programmes and strategies that are in place to boost the delivery of new housing across the City; further ensuring how the homes delivered will meet the needs of the City's existing and future residents.

General discussions covered the following topics:

Viability – a Member referred to a scheme which had been marginally viability funded, and raised concern that this would set a precedent for future applications. In response to this, the Head of Strategic Planning explained this specific example, was a result of not having a 5 year land supply and going forward, now with a 5 year land supply the Council can seek a full range of policy requirements. In addition, the Panel were informed that officers play a key part at the outline planning application stage, in ensuring there are no key viability issues of concern.

Further to this, the Chair and Panel requested and agreed that an item at a future DPP meeting be added to the work schedule to review the position on viability.

Leeds Joint Health & Well Being Strategy (2014 - 2015) – a Member suggested that this be incorporated into the HDP to add additional weight to the document.

Climate Emergency – as well as discussing planning applications which had previously been allowed at plans panels which were below the minimum standards, Members' agreed that climate policies were now a very important consideration in considering planning applications. In light of this, a Member specifically referred to the Citu housing developments across Leeds, and them being in line with the climate

emergency ambitions, and identified these developments as being an example of what requirements the HDP should endorse.

Additionally, on page 7 of the HDP draft document, a Member requested that the inclusion of a word be added, for the sentence to read ‘...the protection and enhancement of green and blue infrastructure and the management of waste flows...’

Policy H5, Affordable Housing – further clarity was provided, and the Panel were informed 60% of affordable dwellings are needed for affordable or social rent, and 40% are needed for intermediate tenures (as defined in the NPPF). It was noted that this provides affordable homes to those on very low earnings. Intermediate affordable housing sits between the price of market housing and the price of social rented affordable housing.

Further to this, it was requested that the terminology of affordable housing be provided in the HDP draft document.

Land Banking - In responding to a query on whether the HDP draft document reflected the Independent Review of Build out Rates Report – Letwin Review, the Panel were informed that policy changes would be carried out through National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance changes (NPPG).

Delivery of Greenfield & Brownfield permissions – in responding to a query in regard to the permissions granted on greenfield land in 2016, and these being almost equal to those on brownfield land, officers confirmed this was due to the number of appeal losses on safeguarded greenfield sites, and not having a 5 year housing land supply or up to date plan. The Council is now in a stronger position to resist such speculative greenfield developments.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) To note the contents of the report and discussions held at the meeting;
- b) To note the contents of the HDP document (attached at Appendix 1 of the submitted report);
- c) To note the work planned to review viability issues, as an addition to the work schedule and that this be brought to a future DPP meeting;
- d) To request that the information outlined in the minutes, be actioned.

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

**RESOLVED –** To note the date and time of the next meeting as Tuesday, 12<sup>th</sup> November, 2019, at 1.30pm.