

Report of the Chief Planning Officer

Report to Development Plan Panel

Date: 19th July 2016

Subject: Site Allocations Plan Consultation Outcomes & Proposed Changes

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s): All	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input 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. The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) is at an advanced stage of preparation prior to submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination. In September to November 2015, representations were invited on the Publication Draft Plan, and responses received have been considered and any implications on the SAP assessed. This is the third of three Development Plan Panel (DPP) meetings, which have considered the outcomes of the consultation of the Publication Plan and made changes as a result. Six HMCAs were previously presented to Development Plan Panel on 14th June 2016 (City Centre, East, Inner, Outer North West, Outer South and Outer West) alongside an overview of general issues raised and four HMCAs were presented to the DPP on 28th June 2016 (Aireborough, North, Outer South East and Outer South West).
2. The purpose of this report is to provide DPP members, with a summary review of the consultation outcomes for the Outer North East (ONE) Housing Market Characteristic Area (HMCA), Gypsy and Traveller sites and outstanding issues arising from the previous Panels on 14th and 28th June. This meeting also presents an opportunity to provide an update of how the overall housing and employment targets set out in the adopted Core Strategy have been met. Consistent with the reports previously presented to DPP in June 2016, the purpose of the report is not to go over and respond to each individual representation made but to identify the key issues which go to the "soundness" of the SAP – the basis upon which it will be examined in due

course. Based on these outcomes and further technical work undertaken, a relatively limited number of changes to the Publication Plan are proposed. As part of this process, a number of factual and technical updates have also been made in relation to HMCA and site information. This includes updated planning application approvals (up to 5th April 2016), which has resulted in some proposed new allocations becoming identified sites. These changes are detailed for the HMCA covered in the report. New sites have also been submitted for consideration either during the consultation process or as part of the SHLAA (which is updated annually). These have been assessed (site assessment, including comments from infrastructure providers, and sustainability appraisal) and are summarised.

3. Members will recall that, given the withdrawal of the Headley Hall proposals in the ONE HMCA, there is a need to undertake a second round of consultation with a revised Publication Draft Plan for this HMCA only. The proposals for this consultation are contained in this report. Subject to Executive Board approval, it is anticipated that representations will be invited on these proposals, between late September and early November. Under the LDF Regulations following the Publication stage, whilst the Council is not required to undertake any further consultation on the SAP prior to submission, it has been the case in Leeds that a pre-submission version of Development Plans are made available for comment prior to Submission to the Secretary of State. This final stage enables people with an interest in the Plan to make any final representations on pre-submission changes to the Inspector. This is timetabled for February/March of 2017 with a view to submit the Plan at the beginning of April following Council approval the end of March 2017.
4. All pre submission changes for the whole of the plan will be reported to Scrutiny Board and Executive Board, prior to advertising the pre-submission changes to the Plan.

Recommendation

5. Development Plan Panel is invited to:
 - i) consider the overall consultation outcomes, summarised in this report, and the revised Publication Draft plan for Outer North East together with updates to the sustainability appraisal report for Outer North East.
 - ii) recommend to the Executive Board that the revised Outer North East HMCA Publication Draft chapter of the Site Allocation Plan is approved for a period of 6 weeks public consultation (in Autumn 2016)
 - iii) agree the outstanding proposed pre-submission changes to the remainder of the Site Allocations Plan,
 - iv) consider and agree the proposed pre-submission changes to the policies and allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

- v) recommend to the Executive Board that the proposed pre submission changes for the remainder of the plan (except for Outer North East) are approved for pre-submission advertisement (in February 2017), prior to the submission of the Plan for independent examination.

1 Purpose of this Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide members of the Development Plan Panel (DPP), with a summary review of the consultation outcomes for the Outer North East (ONE) Housing Market Characteristic Area (HMCA), Gypsy and Traveller (G&T) sites and outstanding issues arising from the previous Panels on 14th and 28th June together with an overview including an outline of how the housing and employment targets set out in the adopted Core Strategy have been met. Based on these outcomes and further technical work, a relatively limited number of changes are proposed, where issues raised are considered to go to the soundness of the Plan. The purpose of the report therefore is not to go over and provide a response to each individual representation made. All of the representations will be made available to the Planning Inspector at submission stage and be made available on line in due course.
- 1.2 As part of the review and analysis of representations, a number of factual and technical updates have also been made in relation to HMCA and site information. This includes updated planning application approvals (up to 5th April 2016), where in some cases proposed new allocations have become “identified” sites i.e. already benefitting from allocation or permission which establishes the principle of development in the context of the Adopted Core Strategy. These are detailed along with new site submissions for ONE.

2 Background Information

Context

- 2.1 On the 15th July 2015, Executive Board approved the Publication draft Plans for the SAP and the Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan (AVLAAP) for consultation. An 8 week period of consultation was subsequently undertaken between the 22nd September and 16th November 2015. This followed on from the consideration of the material by the Development Plan Panel on the 16th and 26th June 2015 and earlier stages of public consultation on both emerging documents. These Plans are being taken forward within the strategic context of the Core Strategy (adopted 14th November 2014), which sets out the overall scale and distribution of housing and economic growth. The Core Strategy also reflects the City Council’s aspirations as part of the Best Council Plan and Vision for Leeds (Community Strategy).
- 2.2 Following the close of consultation on the 16th November 2015, an initial report of consultation was reported to the Development Plan Panel on 19th January 2016, together with a report outlining Emerging Issues and Next Steps. DPP considered and noted the scope, nature and communication and marketing arrangements of the consultation. This will be more fully set out in a Report of Consultation which will accompany the submission draft of the SAP.
- 2.3 At the 19th January meeting and subsequently at a meeting of DPP on 10th May specific outcomes of consultation relating to the Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan were considered, and members agreed to proceed with that Plan

in advance of the SAP.

- 2.4 This report, is the last of 3 (previous meetings held on 14th and 28th June) summarising the consultation outcomes for the SAP and outlining the Publication Draft plan for ONE, along with, for the rest of the plan, any specific changes where issues raised challenge the soundness of the Plan.
- 2.5 The previous DPP meetings detailed the level of response through the Publication draft consultation process and agreed that a comprehensive Report of Consultation (together with all of the representations received) will be provided at submission stage. DPP noted that, the majority of representations were on housing proposals (26,508 representations), followed by green space (8,815), employment (921), Gypsies and Travellers (844) and retail (14). Representations on a range of 'general' issues including the housing targets, phasing, infrastructure that were not site specific were also received and discussed at the DPP meeting of the 16th June 2015.
- 2.6 Members are invited to note that whilst there were a considerable number of individual representations most were focussed on a selected number of specific sites proposed for allocation. A number of petitions were also received against specific sites. Members are also invited to note that a petition is recorded as one representation (with many signatures). Many sites received no representations at all. A smaller number of representations in support were received. These are all detailed at Appendix 1 for ONE and will be further detailed in the Report of Consultation. For sites in other HMCAs these are detailed in previous DPP Appendices.
- 2.7 Members will recall that, given the withdrawal of the Headley Hall proposals in the ONE HMCA, there is a need to undertake a second round of consultation with a revised Publication Draft Plan for this HMCA only. The proposals for this consultation are contained in this report. Subject to Executive Board approval, it is anticipated that representations will be invited on these proposals, between late September and early November. Under the LDF Regulations following the Publication stage, whilst the Council is not required to undertake any further consultation on the SAP prior to submission, it has been the case in Leeds that a pre-submission version of Development Plans are made available for comment prior to Submission to the Secretary of State. This final stage enables people with an interest in the Plan to make any final representations on pre-submission changes only to the Inspector. This is timetabled for February/March of 2017 with a view to submit the Plan at the beginning of April following Council approval the end of March 2017.
- 2.8 This meeting will, among other things, consider the ONE HMCA. As part of representations received for this HMCA a number of general issues have also been raised both in relation to specific sites and as standalone matters. The focus of this Panel meeting is to address representations on specific sites. General issues relating to matters that have already been addressed through the preparation of the Local Plan as a whole i.e. were subject to debate at the Core Strategy Examination were discussed at the 14th June meeting. They included: Scale of Housing, Distribution of Housing, Phasing, Use of Greenfield Land before Previously Developed Land, Providing the necessary

Infrastructure to support housing growth, Highways and Transport, Flood Risk, Green Belt, Heritage issues and Landscape and Ecology issues. Consequently, it is not proposed to repeat the material again here but to note that the overview provided is also applicable to the HMCAs being considered as part of this report. Further analysis of the representations has not revealed any general significant issues, which have not already been justified in background material or discussed through DPP.

3 Outer North East (ONE) Housing Market Characteristic Area (HMCA)

Overview

- 3.1 ONE is the remaining HMCA to be reviewed in this series of Panels considering proposed changes to the SAP.
- 3.2 Members will recall that at Development Plan Panel meetings in January 2015, members considered potential development proposals across the ONE HMCA. There were particular reasons as to why a different approach was considered in this HMCA. In considering the strategic issues relating to the use of brownfield land, the potential scale of Green Belt release and the merits of a new settlement a report was put before members in regard to the Thorp Arch Trading Estate (TATE) and settlement proposals at Headley Hall, Bramham in June 2015. Members recommended that a new settlement at Headley Hall be supported and that TATE be allocated for employment use. Executive Board agreed this approach in July 2015 and these proposals formed the basis for consultation on the Publication Draft SAP.
- 3.3 Members will recall, that shortly before the commencement of the consultation on the Site Allocation Publication Draft plan in September 2015, the University of Leeds confirmed to the City Council that they no longer intended to promote the Headley Hall new settlement proposal. The public consultation ran its course and the withdrawal of the Headley Hall site was advertised to consultees. As a consequence of the Headley Hall removal, it has been necessary to consider alternative options for delivering the housing requirements within this part of the District.
- 3.4 This report therefore sets out a summary of the representations made on the proposed sites in the Publication Draft Plan and also proposes additional sites to remedy the loss of Headley Hall. This places the ONE HMCA in a procedural stage one step behind the rest of the Plan. The Council has committed to a further stage of consultation on a revised Publication Draft for Section 3: Area Proposals: 6. Outer North East. This is included in Appendix 4. The Publication Draft proposals for ONE will be subject to a six week period of public consultation prior to the pre-submission changes for the whole of the Plan being advertised for further comment. This period of consultation reflects the statutory minimum period set out in the LDF Regulations, but is two weeks shorter than was provided for the plan as a whole at Publication stage. This is considered both necessary, in order to maintain progress with the SAP as a whole, and appropriate, given the focussed nature of the consultation. The timetable is covered later in this report.

- 3.5 Consultation arrangements will accord with those adopted for the previous Publication Draft Plan, including drop in events, to be held in the area so as to discuss the proposals with local people and interested parties.
- 3.6 Members should note that all previous Publication Draft Plan material will be consulted on again even if it has not changed. This is so as to ensure that the implications arising by the withdrawal of the Headley Hall site did not prejudice those who may have wished to comment at the previous stage but did not do so. In addition, the consultation material will note that representors do not need to re-submit previous representations made where changes have not occurred.
- 3.7 Sites that have generated most objections are on a range of issues, including loss of Green Belt, lack of infrastructure (highways, schools, doctors), use of greenfield land before previously developed land and the reliance of a new settlement bringing forward the majority of the housing need in this HMCA, and subsequently representations promoting new and previously discounted sites as alternatives to the withdrawn Headley Hall proposal. This section of the Panel report responds to specific issues that are considered to challenge the soundness of the Plan and recommends where a change is considered necessary to make the plan sound.
- 3.8 Whilst officers have considered all representations made; and all representations made will be submitted to the Inspector and considered through the examination process; it is the main changes as detailed in the sections below, which are the main subject of this report. The ONE HMCA is reviewed under the topic areas of Retail, Housing, Employment and Green space. It should also be noted that a single pitch is proposed for G&T use under Section 4 of this report. The report outlines changes proposed. Appendix 1 summarises the representations on each individual site. Appendix 2 comprises plans showing changes to boundaries of sites or new sites. Appendix 3 sets out the sustainability appraisal of new sites submitted and Appendix 4 sets out a draft revised Section 3: Area Proposals: 6 Outer North East Publication Draft (excluding HMCA map, which will follow).

Retail

- 3.9 There are no retail changes to the report on Outer North East.

Housing

- 3.10 Reflecting the earlier discussions via Ward Members meetings, DPP and Executive Board officers have assessed a number of alternative proposals for this HMCA. Representors and Ward Members remain concerned about the scale of development and the impact this has on the Green Belt and other greenfield sites. It is recognised that Green Belt land is sensitive and the debate has aimed to achieve a range of sites that have least impact on the purposes of Green Belt, whilst also recognising the Core Strategy aspirations to respect local character and identity.
- 3.11 A new settlement proposal, as a strategic approach to new housing growth in

the ONE HMCA, was an accepted approach as agreed by Executive Board in July 2015 and the Publication Draft Plan was published on the grounds that the Council had prepared a sound Plan. The Adopted Core Strategy also provides strategic support for such an option in Policy SP10. This states that the focus for Green Belt release should be around the main urban area, major settlements and small settlements, but that *“exceptionally, sites unrelated to the Main Urban Area, Major Settlements and Smaller Settlements, could be considered, where they will be in sustainable locations and are able to provide a full range of local facilities and services and within the context of their Housing Market Characteristic Area, are more appropriate in meeting the spatial objectives of the plan than the alternatives within the Settlement Hierarchy. Otherwise review of the Green Belt will not be considered to ensure that its general extent is maintained.”*

- 3.12 Given the withdrawal of Headley Hall, two ‘like for like’ alternative new settlement proposals were submitted to the Council – land at Becca Hall (subsequently called Becca Home Farm) and land at Parlington Estate. The Thorp Arch Trading Estate has also been submitted as a housing site rather than as an employment site (as was proposed in the Publication Draft Plan). Officers have now completed an assessment of the strategic housing options for ONE, based on the material received as part of the consultation, further site submissions and sites previously assessed. The strategic assessment of options for the ONE HMCA is set out below with the individual site assessments contained as Appendix 1. This assessment compared and reviewed a series of options against the Adopted Core Strategy and site issues (including delivery, accessibility, infrastructure, impact on Green Belt, fit within the housing market, highways, heritage and ecology etc).

Thorp Arch Trading Estate

- 3.13 The idea of a new settlement at Thorp Arch Trading Estate (TATE) has been an aspiration of the landowners for over a decade, and previously promoted as part of the UDP Review, but there has yet to be a viable scheme which addresses local constraints. Various planning applications for residential schemes on this brownfield site have yet to come to a resolution, with deliverability and viability proving to be impediments, alongside detailed highway, ecological, heritage and other material considerations. This is a substantial brownfield site which is a sustainable location for development and can help meet Leeds’ development needs. In its current form it delivers a mix of retail and employment land.
- 3.14 Parts of the site were proposed as employment allocations in the Publication Draft Plan and no change is proposed in the revised Publication Draft Plan.

New Settlement proposals

- 3.15 Two new proposals for housing and mixed uses at Becca Hall Farm and Parlington have come forward as proposed large scale, strategic site allocations for new settlements as an alternative to Headley Hall.
- 3.16 Planning for a new settlement raises significant issues and the Headley Hall

proposal was not without constraint, but on balance was considered to represent the best alternative option for the HMCA against alternatives. Similarly, a key outcome from the revised assessment is that both new settlement proposals have specific constraints as detailed below.

1) Becca Hall Farm

- 3.17 The site is of significant scale with a potential capacity for up to 4,000 dwellings (with a reduced capacity to be within the plan period). The proposal also suggests that employment land could be provided, details a new local centre and a new primary school, alongside new greenspace provision. The Becca Hall proposal was submitted after the consultation period on the Publication Draft Plan, and in March it was resubmitted with a revised boundary which removed the eastern part of the site around Becca Hall. The site then changed its name to Becca Hall Farm. The proposal is at an early stage and there are specific details which lack clarity, partly as a result of the boundary change.
- 3.18 Notwithstanding this, the development of the site is considered to have an unacceptable impact on several significant heritage assets as well as the surrounding wider historic environment, which includes the character of the hamlet of Potterton. The site is situated within a Special Landscape Area and contains some of the highest quality accessible landscape in Leeds with footpaths crossing the site at various points. The proposed site is readily visible and prominent from key viewpoints from surrounding roads, public footpaths and nearby settlements and would have a significant adverse impact on this sensitive landscape setting. To that end, the site is a significant incursion into the Green Belt and would have a substantial impact on Green Belt principles. This impact would be further exacerbated by the future expansion areas which have been requested to be considered for removal from the Green Belt.
- 3.19 The site is some way from a public transport hub and scores poorly in terms of accessibility. Highways England raise concerns on the impact of this level of development on the strategic highways network.
- 3.20 On the basis of the proposal received and assessments carried out this site is not considered suitable for allocation as a new settlement.

2) Parlington

- 3.21 The Parlington site is again of significant scale with a potential capacity for up to 5,000 homes (with a reduced capacity of 1,750 within the plan period on the basis of particular build out rates). The land is in one ownership. The proposal suggests delivery of a primary school and contribution towards a secondary school, which may be located within the new settlement, employment land near the junction of the M1; extensive greenspaces which are also intended to open up the heritage assets on the site. The promoters also intend to provide an on-site renewable energy facility to make use of the extensive woodland, which is managed across the estate.

- 3.22 Based on the technical assessment, whilst not without challenges, a new freestanding settlement in this location could be planned to meet garden village principles. Development of the site would create a significant incursion within the Green Belt and the site currently performs an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. However, its impacts are considered to be less visually intrusive as the majority of development would be located behind the substantial mature woodland belts which cross and screen the site. Without mitigation the scale of development will have significant impact on a number of heritage assets across the site. However, the proposals would also open up these assets to the public as the site is currently private land with no public rights of way through it. The site contains a SEGI and is in an area of Special Landscape which will need to be mitigated. Further scope exists for significant landscaping works to be incorporated into any scheme, which will help to contain the development in the long term. Members may also recall that Parlington was previously allocated as part of the UDP Review as an opportunity for outdoor recreation and leisure.
- 3.23 The site would have to develop an appropriate public transport scheme given its current poor accessibility. This should involve supporting the rail stations at Garforth. There are concerns about the level of local traffic which may arise on the local network, especially in Garforth and these will need to be addressed. Highways England raise concerns on the impact of this level of development onto the strategic highways network. This concern will also need to be addressed.
- 3.24 The Outer North-East area is already characterised by numerous free standing settlements. If developed the new settlement would be situated equi-distance from neighbouring villages of Aberford and Barwick-in-Elmet and is separated from Garforth to the south by the M1. As such no merging of settlements will occur, but it would reduce the greenbelt gap between settlements.
- 3.25 On the basis of the proposal received and assessments carried out this site is considered to be a sustainable housing site subject to further masterplanning work which addresses the site requirements in Appendix 4.
- 3.26 Changes are proposed in the revised Publication Draft Plan which allocate this site as a mixed use site for housing and employment. It should be noted that the build out rates applied to Parlington may be exceeded during the plan period. The SAP will therefore allocate the site for a minimum delivery of 1,750 homes up to the end of March 2028. Any additional housing provided will assist the Council in ensuring a robust buffer of housing.
- 3.27 The Core Strategy Policy SP10 states that stand alone settlements must “within the context of their Housing Market Characteristic Area, [be] more appropriate in meeting the spatial objectives of the plan than the alternatives”. On its own it is considered that Parlington does not achieve this objective because it focusses a significant level of housing development in a part of the HMCA, which has little affinity with Wetherby – the major settlement. In his report the Core Strategy Inspector noted that growth in the HMCA should

support the settlement of Wetherby¹. To that end, it is proposed that revised draft proposals for the ONE HMCA must also contain allocations in or around Wetherby (see below).

Smaller Settlements

- 3.28 The SAP previously discounted the allocation of a range of medium and large scale sites across the hierarchy of settlements in the ONE HMCA. Given the previous endorsement by Ward Members, DPP and Executive Board for a new settlement it is considered that these sites can remain discounted. Their allocation would see significant impact on the character of these settlements, raise concerns around local infrastructure necessary to support growth and impact upon surrounding countryside. Their allocation would also necessitate a need to identify new replacement safeguarded land. On balance given all these considerations, for this HMCA, the option of a new stand-alone settlement is considered to be the most sustainable option. That is not to say that these settlements will not receive any new development to assist in meeting local needs. The Publication Plan detailed a number of smaller allocations and identified sites throughout these settlements and there are also some additional sites to be allocated following consultation (see below).

Extensions to Wetherby

- 3.29 As noted in para 3.27 above, there is a need to consider provision of housing in the major settlement of Wetherby. Options for the expansion of Wetherby are limited due to physical constraints, however the Council has, in considering revised approaches to the ONE HMCA, looked again at previously submitted sites which formed extensions to this major settlement.
- 3.30 An extension comprising merged sites 1255, 2133 and 3125 to the east of Wetherby has been assessed. These sites were originally “amber” at issues and options stage but were considered to be not necessary to meet HMCA requirements, given the Headley Hall development. In light of the withdrawal of that site, and the need to ensure that the new settlement proposal at Parlington is supplemented by development which better reflects the needs of the wider HMCA, these sites are considered to be suitable for allocation for housing as a comprehensive expansion to Wetherby.
- 3.31 The sites are in Rural Land and therefore have no Green Belt impact (although as part of the SAP the redesignation of Rural Land as Green Belt is proposed). They form an extension along a main highway and are considered to have reasonable access to the town centre and local services and would provide a new primary school.

Conclusions

- 3.32 Following the close of the consultation and arising from submissions received, officers have presented information on site options to local ward Members.

¹ “Wetherby is by far the largest settlement in the Outer North East HMCA which is mainly rural with small villages. It is for the Site Allocations Plan to make allocations but by directing 5,000 new homes to Outer Leeds the Core Strategy clearly allows for development to meet the needs of the town”

Ward members' preference remains a new settlement proposal to replace Headley Hall and an avoidance of distributed sites across the HMCA. Ward Members have agreed the suite of sites put forward as revised Publication Plan options for the ONE HMCA.

- 3.33 It is considered that a significant proportion of the supply of new development (housing and employment) in the Outer North-East HMCA is best achieved through the planning of a purpose built new settlement. The new freestanding settlement could be planned to meet garden village principles and provides a unique opportunity to deliver comprehensive large scale development including high quality new homes, local employment opportunities, new community green spaces and a range of supporting community services and infrastructure within an attractive environment. The allocation of a strategic new settlement site as part of the overall portfolio of allocations is considered to represent the best way of achieving sustainable development whilst meeting the identified development needs of the Outer North East HMCA. Only part of the settlement will be delivered within the plan period; however the site can help to ensure the stable delivery of housing in the longer term.
- 3.34 The alternative new settlement proposal at Parlington is located in a geographically different area of the HMCA, much closer to the housing market area of Garforth, than Wetherby. Both these considerations have led to the recommendation that it is necessary to balance out growth across the HMCA, in particular looking at the role of supporting the major settlement of Wetherby. There will also be a need for the proposers of Parlington to demonstrate that the delivery of their site will not jeopardise other strategic sites in the neighbouring housing markets of Garforth and East Leeds where strategic major expansions are proposed as part of the SAP. Delivery at Parlington also needs to be set within a realistic and deliverable timetable of phased housing growth, which includes detail of necessary up front infrastructure so as to ensure that the new settlement is a sustainable location from the start. In this way the generation of local trips outside of the settlement can be minimised.
- 3.35 To support the allocation of a strategic new settlement site as part of the overall portfolio of allocations previously agreed for ONEHMCA, a number of other new site suggestions are recommended so as to ensure a balanced portfolio of housing options in the HMCA. These are detailed below:

Additional New allocations

- 3.36 The land to the east of Wetherby (combining three previously discounted sites) (Site HG2-226) and two further new sites in Wetherby (sites HG2-224 Land at Micklethwaite Farm and HG2-225 Land at the Rowans) are proposed. A new site is proposed on the SW corner of Boston Spa (site HG2-220, Moor End) and a smaller element of a previously discounted site on the edge of the main urban area in Alwoodley (site HG2-223 Wike Ridge Lane) is proposed. In addition, the Homes & Communities Agency (HCA) has promoted an area of vacant land north of Wealston Prison (situated in between existing residential properties and Thorp Arch Trading Estate) (site HG2-227). These six sites, alongside a new sustainable settlement at Parlington (MX2-39); as

well as proposed changes to the Publication Draft (as identified in Appendix 1 and summarised below, form a revised solution for housing growth in the ONE HMCA.

Identified sites update:

a	There are no new sites with planning permission
b	There are 3 sites where a new planning permission has been granted which changes the capacity of the site (HG1-27: Linton Springs, Sicklinghall Road, Linton; HG1-37: Churchfields, Boston Spa and HG1-41: Harewood Village Farm)
c	There are 2 sites that are to be deleted. (HG1-29: Linton Road-Raintree Lodge, Wetherby and HG1-30: Wetherby Health Centre)

Identified sites summary:

- 3.37 The total dwelling capacity from identified sites has seen a net reduction of 39 from 1530 in the Publication Draft Plan to 1491.

Changes to housing allocations

- 3.38 Changes are proposed to the boundaries or capacities of the following sites:

a	HG2-22 and HG2-23 (Church Street, Boston Spa) are to be merged. The combined capacity remains the same (36).
b	HG2-26 (Wetherby Road - Scarcroft Lodge, Scarcroft). The capacity is to be reduced from 130 to 100 to reflect the restriction of a “Major developed site in the GB” - developing only the developed parts of the site.
c	Previously discounted sites 1233/2158/3125 (Sandbeck Lane, Wetherby/Sandbeck wood (south of), Wetherby/Carr Lane, Wetherby) are to be merged and allocated for housing (HG2-226: East of Wetherby) with a combined capacity of 1080.
d	Previously discounted site 3129 Moor End, Boston Spa, is to be allocated for housing (HG2-220) with a capacity of 65
e	Part of previously discounted site 4154 (4154B) is to be allocated with a capacity of 31 (HG2-223)

- 3.39 Changes are proposed to the site requirements of the following sites:

a	HG2-19 Land at Sandbeck Lane Wetherby additional flood risk site requirement added following flood risk assessment work
b	HG2-22 (merged with HG2-23). The conservation Area site requirement has been amended following further assessment – set out in the Heritage Background Paper.
c	HG2-220 site requirements
d	New site HG2-226 (merging previous discounted sites 1233/2158/3125) – site requirements added, including the preparation of a comprehensive design brief to be agreed prior to the development of the site. To consider pedestrian and cycle linkages to Wetherby town centre; the opportunity to retain and enhance key landscape and provision of a 2

	form entry primary school.
--	----------------------------

New housing site submissions

3.40 16 new housing sites have been submitted. 4 are proposed for allocation:

a	HG2-224 - Land at Micklethwaite Farm, Wetherby. Capacity 19
b	HG2-225 - Land at the Rowans, Wetherby. Capacity 18
c	HG2-227 – Land at Wealstun Prison, Wetherby. Capacity 142
d	MX2-39 – Parlington Estate, Aberford. Capacity 1750

3.41 An additional site submission at Deighton Banks, Harrogate, north of Wetherby was submitted. As this site lies outside Leeds administrative boundary it cannot be included in the SAP. Discussions have taken place at chief officer level between Leeds and Harrogate and both authorities have agreed the site is not suitable for allocation.

Housing allocations summary

3.42 The total capacity from housing allocations has gone from 3,437 (Headley Hall included) in the Publication Draft Plan to 3,512.

Overall summary for housing in Outer NE:

HMCA target: 5000			Total	+/- target
I	Identified sites total	Housing allocations		
Publication Draft Plan	1530	3437	4967	-33
Post Publication consultation	1491	3512	5003	3

Employment

Offices

Identified office sites update:

a	There is one new site with planning permission (EO1-40: Park Hill Farm, Walton Road Wetherby, 1050sqm.
b	There are no sites where new planning permissions have been granted which change the capacity of the site.

Identified office sites summary:

3.43 The total office capacity from identified sites has seen a net increase of 1,050 sqm from 579 sqm in the Publication Draft Plan to 1,629 sqm.

Changes to office allocations:

3.44 No office allocations are proposed in Outer North East

New office site submissions:

3.45 There have been no new site submissions for offices in Outer North East

Office allocations summary:

3.46 No office allocations are proposed in Outer North East

Overall summary for offices in Outer North east

3.47 The total capacity of offices has gone from 579 sqm in the Publication Draft Plan to 1,629 sqm.

	Identified sites total (sq m)	Office allocations (sqm)	Total (sq m)
Publication Draft Plan	579	0	579
Post Publication consultation	1,629	0	1,629

General Employment:

Identified general employment sites update:

a	There is one new site with planning permission (EG1-68 Unit 204 Avenue C Thorp Arch Estate, Wetherby, 1.12ha.
b	EG1-8 (Land at Rudgate Walton Wetherby). New planning information results in a capacity change from 0.12ha to 0.37ha – 0.25ha increase.
c	EG1-9 (Units 512 & 515 Thorp Arch Trading Estate). New planning information results in a capacity change from 1.64ha to 1.90ha – 0.26ha increase.

Identified general employment site summary:

3.48 The total general employment capacity from identified sites has seen a net increase of 1.63 ha in the Publication Draft Plan to 21.55 ha.

Changes to general employment allocations:

3.49 Following the withdrawal of MX2-33 Headley Hall Farm, the allocated 7ha of general employment land became undeliverable.

New general employment site submissions:

a	The new site submission at Parlington Estate, Aberford (MX2-39) is proposed as a mixed-use site with 11.50 ha of general employment.
b	New site submission at Park Hill Business Park (EMP00340, 7.07ha) is rejected. Details are included in Appendix xx.

General employment allocation summary

3.50 The general employment capacity of existing allocations sees a net increase of 4.5 ha from 7 ha in the Publication Draft Plan to 11.5ha.

Overall summary for general employment in:

	Identified sites total (ha)	General employment allocations (ha)	Total (ha)
Publication Draft Plan	19.92	7	26.92
Post Publication consultation	21.55	11.50	33.05

Green space:

3.51 The following 7 green space sites are deleted:

a	Sites G1456, G1457, G1468, G1555, G1559 are deleted consequential to the housing allocation HG2-227 (Wealstun Prison)
b	G1645 (Shadwell Lane) is deleted as it no longer functions as green space.
c	G1763 (Shadwell Cricket Ground) is deleted as it no longer functions as green space.

3.52 Boundary changes are made at 2 greenspace sites:

a	G1463 (Thorp Arch Grange) - is altered to reflect recent planning permission and that part of the site does not function as publicly accessible green space.
b	G1464 (Leeds United Training Ground) - is altered to reflect recent planning permission.

4 Gypsy and Traveller Sites

4.1 The Council received 844 representations on the Gypsy and Traveller proposals in the Publication Draft Plan. Of these 800 were objections to the proposals and 33 representations were supportive. Most representations were received on the proposed new Council-run sites as follows:-

Ref.	Address	Number of Representations	
		Positive	Negative
HG7-3	Bullerthorpe Lane, Temple Newsam	5	679
HG7-2	Land on the corner of Tong Road and Lakeside Road, Wortley	5	70
HG6-3	Former Moorend Training Centre, Tulip Street, Hunslet	4	26
HG7-1	West Wood, Dewsbury Road, Tingley	3	5
HG6-1	Cottingley Springs, Gelderd Road	2	5
HG6-2	Kidacre Street, City Centre	3	3

4.2 The remainder of the sites attracted very small numbers of individual representations that did not raise significant matters. Many of the representations received for proposed Gypsy and Traveller sites raised local resident concerns regarding the manner in which Gypsies and Travellers could integrate well within the local community. Most of these responses focussed on the assumed dis-benefits which would arise from the allocations. The Council has an obligation to provide housing to a high standard for all sectors and all residents. The Site Allocations Plan is seeking to meet the needs of Leeds-based families who have an identified need to live in the City. The Council has the opportunity through its management of its own sites to ensure that there is peaceful co-existence between the settled and the Gypsy

and Traveller community. The allocation of sites in Leeds helps ensure that unauthorised non-Leeds based Travellers who often pitch in inappropriate locations can be better managed.

Changes to Gypsy and Traveller allocations

4.3 Changes are proposed to the boundaries or capacities of the following Publication Draft SAP sites.

Safeguarded Gypsy and Traveller Sites

a	HG6-1 (Cottingley Springs, Gelderd Road): this existing well established local authority run G+T site is proposed to accommodate a further 2 pitches (from 41 to 43). This will be achieved through internal remodelling to make use of an area of poorly used amenity hard standing and be progressed via a planning application. Consequential amenity improvement e.g. green space will be explored via a planning application process and is likely to involve use of a small parcel of green belt land. The pitches will help meet the needs of families who are currently “doubling-up” on pitches within the site. This increase also assists in addressing the loss of site HG7-3 (Bullerthorpe Lane, Temple Newsham). Assessments reveal that increases are minor in nature with no consequential impact in amenity.
b	HG6-6 (Ninevah Lane, Allerton Bywater): the site is to be removed as a proposed G+T site as the landowner no longer wishes to pursue this. The landowner is in active talks with the adjacent landowner of site HG2-133 which is proposed for housing in the Site Allocations Plan. The Gypsy who currently occupies the site has indicated that he intends to leave the authority once his site is sold. It is therefore not considered necessary to continue to plan for his specific need and the overall private need figure can be reduced from 28 to 27 pitches.
c	HG6-13 (Urn Farm, Middleton Road) Representation from landowner requesting an increase in capacity from 2 to 4 pitches to accommodate family members. Assessments reveal that increases are minor in nature with no consequential impact in amenity.
d	HG6-10 (Thorpe Lane, Tingley): following a representation from one of the landowners it is clear that there are two landowners of this site. The landowner of the eastern part of the site wishes to increase the capacity by an additional pitch to take account of family expansion. The implications of this are that the eastern part of the allocation (now HG6-16) is proposed to increase from 1 to 2 pitches. The western part of the site (now HG6-15) remains for 2 pitches. Overall increased capacity of the two sites would be from 3 to 4. The outer boundary is also proposed to be amended slightly so as to remove land not in current landownership. This has the consequential benefit of leaving an open parcel of land as a buffer to the site from the A654 and ensuring that only the brownfield parts of the sites are developed. Assessments reveal that increases are minor in nature with no consequential impact in amenity.

Publically Managed Gypsy and Traveller Sites

a	HG7-1 (West Wood, Dewsbury Road, Tingley): the capacity of the site is increased from 4 pitches to 5 pitches to make best use of the site and to assist in addressing the loss of HG7-3 (Bullerthorpe Lane, Temple Newsham). Assessments reveal that increases are minor in nature with no consequential impact in amenity.
---	---

b	<p>HG7-2 (Land to the South of Tong Road, Wortley): the capacity of the is increased from 4 pitches to 5 pitches to make best use of the site and to assist in addressing the loss of HG7-3 (Bullerthorpe Lane, Temple Newsham). Assessments reveal that increases are minor in nature with no consequential impact in amenity. The site requirements are to be amended as follows following representations from Historic England. "This site is in the setting of a number of Listed Buildings. Any development should preserve their special architectural or historic interest and setting".</p>
c	<p>HG7-3 (Bullerthorpe Lane, Temple Newsham): delete the site from the site allocations plan. Historic England have stated that the likely harm to the Grims Ditch scheduled monument (which lies adjacent to the site) is not capable of mitigation and that the site should not be pursued as an allocation. Further feasibility assessments have concluded that the scheme is unviable. This is mainly due to the requirement to provide a pedestrian route between the site and Colton centre in order to satisfy accessibility requirements. Representations have also raised concerns about the impact of the site on the adjacent public right of way; in particular regarding safety concerns around vehicles and bridleway users. Representations from the Gypsy and Traveller community themselves suggest that the site is remote from the key Leeds based family groups.</p>

New Site Suggestions

a	<p>Castle Gate, Wakefield: A consultant on behalf of a local G+T family proposed that the Council enter into an agreement with Wakefield Council to allocate the Castle Gate site over the Leeds border in Wakefield. This site was refused permission by Wakefield MBC and the site lies outside of Leeds jurisdiction. Through the Duty to Co-operate Leeds and neighbouring authorities have agreed to meet their own local targets. Wakefield MBC have confirmed that the proposal is not appropriate. No change to the plan is proposed.</p>
b	<p>Sites along Dolly Lane, nr Primrose Valley School: A representor has suggested that this area of search should be explored for publically-run provision. Although the sites lie within the main urban area and may be appropriate for Gypsy and Traveller use they are not specific and have not been suggested by a willing landowner and so are therefore not available. Any LCC owned land would have been part of the wider search which supported the Publication Draft sites and been discounted. No change to the plan is proposed.</p>
c	<p>HG6-14 (The Old Telephone Exchange, Coal Road, near Shadwell): this has been suggested by the landowner who wishes to locate 1 pitch for his personal private use. The site is in the green belt but is brownfield in nature, located in between the main urban area and Shadwell, and whilst not situated within a settlement would have some access to local services at Red Hall or Shadwell. The site, when assessed alongside the characteristics of the safeguarded private Gypsy and Traveller sites already agreed in the Publication Draft Plan, is considered suitable for allocation as a private Gypsy site. In particular, it would assist in meeting the private requirement target set in the CS and would be allocated on the basis that a single pitch is delivered. The allocation is proposed to be substantially reduced from the red line boundary submitted so as to ensure that development is contained and set off from the junction with the A58. Site requirements are proposed to address the need for access improvements to the site with access taken from Coal Road, that the site shall only be occupied by persons who meet the legal definition of Gypsy and Travellers and that the site accommodate one pitch for one household, that</p>

	trees on the perimeter of the site are protected and that the existing building on the site is utilised as an amenity block rather than any further built development occurring so as to limit the impact of the site.
--	--

4.4 Local ward members have been notified of the new site at the Old Telephone Exchange, Coal Road. They oppose the allocation and refer to the enforcement action that has been taken in the past and the potential to harm the busy junction with the A58. Whilst the site was considered an inappropriate location given its green belt status when assessed against previous proposals national guidance stipulates that green belt may be used through the plan making process, as is the case here.

Conclusions

4.5 The pre-submission changes can be shown overall to have the following effects to the numbers.

Core Strategy Need	Publication	Pre-submission*
25 public pitches	24 pitches	25 pitches
28 private pitches	11 pitches	14 pitches

*the proposal at The Old Telephone Exchange, Coal Road, Shadwell will be consulted upon as part of a further round of Publication Consultation for Outer North East HMCA.

4.6 These changes have helped the soundness of the Plan as it now addresses the full needs for public provision and an increased level of private provision. The Council will continue to engage with the Gypsy and Traveller Exchange (GATE) as material is prepared for submission of the plan, who are generally supportive of the approach taken so far in their representation. Whilst GATE express concern that the private pitch requirement has not been positively remedied the Council can only respond to the suggestions it has received.

5 Outstanding HMCA issues

5.1 The previous Panel meetings on 14th and 28th June have considered a number of issues, some of which were deferred for further consideration and discussion in this report. In addition, some further changes in certain HMCAs have been made. These are outlined below from paragraph 5.5.

5.2 On a more general note the previous meetings have raised particular concerns and debate with Panel Members regarding the larger allocations in the SAP. These have had a particularly high volume of representation and officers have proposed changes where necessary to ensure site specific soundness. However, officers have also considered the general concerns of local people around both the scale of such new proposed development and the actions of house builders to delivering them in a reasonable time frame.

5.3 Officers have given further consideration to these concerns and propose two further amendments to the SAP. First, production of planning briefs and frameworks will be prepared for the larger sites. These will be drafted prior to

the Site Allocations Plan Examination and in liaison with Ward Members and neighbourhood groups.

- 5.4 Second, on larger sites over 700 homes that have been released in Phase 1 so as to help them build out during the plan period. On this basis it is important to ensure that they do achieve the build rates necessary to contribute to targets and land supply. To that end, sites over 700 units will be encouraged to identify at least three individual outlets operated by different house builders. This approach will help ensure that these sites make immediate and continuing contributions to the Council's five year housing land supply position.

City Centre:

- 5.5 MX2-26 'Kirkgate Phase 2' – mixed use allocation, including 65 housing units (Phase 1), with a site requirement that states "This site is allocated primarily for housing with an expectation that ground floor premises facing Kirkgate will include Town Centre uses consistent with secondary Shopping Frontage Policy" is proposed to be deleted. This is due to the fact that, with support from the Council's heritage-led regeneration programme, the uses being brought forward by landowners favour non-residential activities in particular retail and leisure, some of which are incompatible with residential uses. Since the start of the site allocations process the Licencing Cumulative Impact Zone has also changed which is likely to encourage more leisure uses, including bars. Furthermore, market research has been undertaken as part of the regeneration proposals for the nearby First White Cloth Hall with key stakeholders, local business and property agents which led to residential uses being ruled out from the options appraisal."

East

- 5.6 HG2-119 Red Hall Offices and Playing Field - It was agreed at the 14th June DPP that a decision on the wording of the green space site requirements for the site should be deferred to allow officers to give further consideration to the newly proposed wording and how it relates to the proposed Planning Brief for the site. As a result officers are proposing a re-worded green space site requirement to read "On-site green space provision to be determined through the Planning Brief."
- 5.7 HG2-203 Manston Road (capacity 103) – At DPP on 14th June Ward member concerns were raised over the proposed change of previously discounted site 5003 Manston Road to a housing allocation HG2-203, capacity 103 units, preferring the site to be retained for local employment. Officers were asked to review subject to the overall general employment position. There is no HMCA target for employment, rather a city-wide target, which is 493ha for general employment. The table at paragraph 6.11 shows that there is 11.21ha in excess of the Core Strategy target overall. The site is not required to meet the overall target. Loss of 103 units would also mean that East HMCA goes from being 1,611 under the target (of 11,400) to 1,714 under target. Notwithstanding this the Ward Members' views are noted, the site is a cleared former ice cream factory. The surrounding land is mixed employment and

residential with a neighbouring site recently being developed for residential. There are recent trends for residential development in this vicinity as the area changes in character. The SAP provides an opportunity to ensure a coordinated and consolidated approach (by focussing residential development to the west of Sandleas Way) and ensuring that remaining employment sites (to the east of Sandleas Way) are retained.

Inner

- 5.8 HG2-211, Burley Liberal Club – proposed housing allocation. At DPP on 14th June there was a suggestion to delineate the site along the rugby pitch boundary, seek local ward member views and clarify the status of the playing pitch. The boundary of the proposed housing allocation reflects the boundary of the sale of council land as detailed in a Delegated Decision Notice (Director of City Development 8th March 2016). Conditions of sale refer to the fact that securing the site will include dismantling the fence around the training pitch and constructing a fence along the southern boundary of the site to form a clear demarcation between the purchaser's freehold land and the Council's freehold land, with development on the site in question being restricted to residential use with a small amount of ancillary commercial/leisure/retail. The DDN refers to local ward members, Area Management and West Homes Leeds being first consulted on the proposed disposal in February 2014, with no objections received, with subsequent updates in October 2015 and February 2016. The site is not designated as green space on the UDP. Sport England is a statutory consultee on proposals which affect playing fields, land used for playing fields at any time in the last 5 years which remains undeveloped, or land which is identified for use as a playing field in a development plan. The site has not been in playing field use for around 9 or 10 years. The Site Allocations Plan Publication Draft proposed the site as a green space designation, but classed it as amenity green space, not playing fields. There is therefore a clear justification for the site being allocated for housing.

North

- 5.9 HG1-60 and HG2-217 Tile Lane, Eastmoor, Adel – At DPP on 28th June it was agreed that officers should further consider the proposal of the Neighbourhood Forum to increase capacity on the site. Officers have subsequently met with a local representative (an architect) acting on behalf of the Forum to explore the matter further. It was clear from this meeting and a subsequent one with a ward member that a key factor behind the approach was a desire to increase the residential capacity of the Eastmoor site, as a basis to 'de-allocate' other sites within the area (HG2-80 Church Lane, Adel, or HG2- Dunstarn Lane were referred to). Officers are supportive of the aims of the Neighbourhood Forum who want to secure homes for the elderly or young in the area and achieve a capacity higher than 67 on the site. Subsequent to meeting with the local representative, a revised layout was submitted showing a circa 120 units on the site. Any detailed layout needs to be progressed through a planning application. Whilst it is not the purpose of a strategic plan to agree specific layouts, officers agree that a higher capacity could potentially be achieved on the site. In this case, due to the building

being listed and ecological issues, the standard methodology for calculating capacity cannot be applied. However, it is difficult to give a definitive figure. The figure identified (120 units) is considered by officers to be too high, given the sensitivities of the site and uncertainties around the conversion potential of the listed building (part is being demolished). The layout as submitted does not account for car parking and satisfactory highway layout. It is considered that a higher capacity of 80 to 100 units could potentially be achieved, but this would be a matter to be resolved fully at planning application stage.

- 5.10 In relation to the 'de-allocation' of sites, Officers do not consider there is a case for removal of site HG2-80 Church Lane Adel (revised capacity 87), or site HG2-38 Dunstarn Lane, Adel (capacity 68). Both Outer North West and North HMCAs are below their housing targets (HG2-80 is in Outer NW, HG2-38 in North) and both sites are in the Publication Draft plan, which the Council and Executive Board have approved as a sound Plan. It is considered that removal at this stage would undermine the overall approach and process through which the allocations have been derived, potentially undermining the Council's overall position at Public Examination.
- 5.11 It was concluded through these discussions (with a Neighbourhood Forum representative and ward member) that the guide capacity would remain at 67 due to the issues raised and the fact that an increase in capacity on one site would not guarantee another site is removed. It should also be noted that even if a capacity of 100 could be achieved on site HG1-60/HG2-217 this is an increase in capacity of 33 on this site. Capacities on HG2-80 and HG2-38 are both higher, being 87 and 68 respectively.
- 5.12 HG2-41 South of A65 from Horsforth and Rawdon roundabout to crematorium
– At DPP on 28th June a proposed boundary amendment to this site was presented. The additional land provides flexibility which enables development to be in the least sensitive areas of the site reflecting concerns raised by Historic England and a high volume of local residents, in regard to conservation areas and potential impact on views and openness and character of listed buildings. Members requested further details on the location of the "developable" area within the site and sought reconsideration of the site within the context of the conclusions on the overall District HMCA position. As highlighted at DPP on 28th June, the SAP is a strategic plan for allocating land and as a consequence, it would not show a line on the Plan (to reflect these issues) which could also be subject to change, arising from further detailed work. The whole (enlarged site) with the same capacity (777 units) would be supported with a planning/development brief which would outline in more specific detail the requirements of any proposed development. Officers are currently finalising a heritage assessment for this site and discussions with Historic England are ongoing. The Heritage Background Paper will include plans for sites where appropriate, outlining areas of sensitivity. The indicative draft heritage assessment plan is included at Appendix 2 for illustrative purposes only. This however, does give an indication of the areas of the site that will need to be landscaped, providing buffers and open views – these considerations will need to sit alongside a comprehensive masterplan for the site addressing issues of supporting

infrastructure and community services and greenspaces, access and highways improvements, design and layout etc. Any work on a development brief should be inclusive of the adjoining Neighbourhood forums.

- 5.13 HG2-236 – Former West Park Community Centre, capacity 69 (formerly HG5-2, school designation) – This site was discussed at DPP on 28th June. There is a minor amendment to the boundary to reflect the Councils capital receipt disposal boundary. No change in capacity.

Outer North West

- 5.14 HG2-14 East Chevin Rd, Otley - No expressions of interest have been made from the land owner to develop the site for housing. As part of the SHLAA assessment process, the owner was contacted who advised there was no desire to change the use of the site at that time. No representation was made during the Publication consultation by the land owner.
- 5.15 HG2-18 Church Lane, Adel - The capacity of the site is proposed to be increased. At the Publication stage 58 units were proposed. This was calculated based on the combined number of units proposed by the refused planning applications (ref.14/01660/OT and 14/02874/OT) at 126 units with a deduction made of 68 units to allow for the provision of a 2 FE primary school. The figure of 68 units is based on the average area of a 2 FE primary school (1.93 ha) times the housing density of 35 per ha.
- 5.16 Following the Publication stage the capacity of the site was reviewed taking on board comments from Historic England to leave land to the east of the beck undeveloped and to apply the standard density calculation to the site. It was assumed that the developable area of the site was the land to the west of the beck (excluding the area occupied by the existing housing at Adel Meadows). This leaves a site area of 5.9ha.
- 5.17 Applying the approach used to other housing and school allocations, the housing capacity has been calculated based on the developable area of 5.9 ha minus 68 units to accommodate a school. This gives a capacity of 87 units. The previous figure of 102 units given in the panel paper dated the 14th June is not being used, as this applied a different approach to that used with other school allocations. The figure of 87 units is used for consistency.
- 5.18 The highway access arrangements have been reviewed in relation to the site access off Otley Road. Hallam Land Management (owners of the northern part of the site) consider that the north western boundary as drawn does not provide sufficient land to create an appropriate highway access. It is proposed that boundary is revised to provide additional land to accommodate a new junction off Otley Road. LCC highways have advised that they are in agreement with the proposed boundary change. A plan is provided with this report showing the proposed boundary change which will include land within the Green Belt. This additional land is identified solely for the purpose of providing appropriate highway access to the site. The site requirements will be revised to ensure that the additional area of land is for highway purposes only.

- 5.19 MX1-26 East of Otley - At the 14th June DPP meeting, the capacity of the site was proposed to be increased from the UDP figure of 550 units to 800 units in response to a representation submitted by Persimmon Homes and Barratt David Wilson Homes. It was agreed that officers would report back to Members following consideration of the capacity of the site in order to establish whether the increase in housing numbers could be supported. Subsequent to the panel, further information has been requested in support of the representation. At this stage officers consider that further work needs to be undertaken to fully assess the proposal and establish whether the capacity can increase. It is therefore recommended that the UDP figure of 550 units is retained, however it is acknowledged that there may be potential to increase the site capacity subject to further work in association with Persimmon Homes and Barratt David Wilson Homes. This work will continue in parallel with the site allocations process.

Outer South East

- 5.20 HG2-133, Ninevah Lane, Allerton Bywater – as a consequence of Gypsy and Traveller site HG6-6 being proposed for removal (see para 4.3 above), it is considered that housing allocation HG2-133 should be extended to include this land. The capacity of HG2-133 would increase by 8 from 57 to 65, the area from 2.52ha to 2.92ha.

Outer South West

- 5.21 Extension to HG2-171 Westerton Road, East Ardsley - At DPP on 28th June, it was reported verbally that Barton Willmore had requested that a site off Millard Way, East Ardsley should be included as an extension to proposed housing allocation HG2-171, Westerton Road, East Ardsley. In itself, this site is below the threshold for allocation (being 0.2ha in size) but as it forms a logical extension to site HG2-171 and is a brownfield site in the Green Belt (a car park) it is proposed to extend site HG2-171 to include this site. The site area of HG2-171 will increase from 8.46ha to 8.68ha and the capacity will increase by 6 from 189 to 195.

Outer West

- 5.22 New site at Troydale and site HG2-76 Hough Side Pudsey: At DPP on 14th June the proposal of a ward councillor to allocate land at Spring Lea Farm, Troydale as an alternative to housing allocation HG2-76 Hough Side, Pudsey was deferred for a site visit on 28th June, to report back to panel on 19th July. A proposed extension to HG2-76 was presented to DPP on 14th June. This would increase the capacity by 40 units, from 160 to 200 units, and site area from 6.51 ha to 7.63 ha. This follows the submission of a new site through the Publication Draft consultation, which was assessed and considered to be suitable for allocation as it was directly adjacent to HG2-76 and brownfield, so considered most appropriate to allocate it as an extension to this site. HG2-76 was a green site at Issues and Options, identified as one with the greatest potential to be allocated for housing, and subsequently allocated for housing in the Publication Draft plan. The site, whilst Green Belt, does conform with the overall strategy outlined in Policy SP7 of the Core Strategy to focus

development on the main urban area and settlements 'higher up' the settlement hierarchy. There is landowner support for allocating the site. A larger site at Troydale was submitted previously in the plan process and discounted for housing. Site 4210 which is 7.93ha and has an indicative capacity of 208 units was rejected as "does not connect with the urban area and would result in isolated development that would not relate to the settlement and would reduce the Green Belt gap between Pudsey and Farnley". The revised submission proposes residential development on part of site 4210 only, donating part of the site to provide car parking for Post Hill Country Park. It covers an area of 4.04ha (10 acres) and has an indicative capacity of 90 units.

5.23 Following a further site visit and consideration of the information provided on balance, officers do not consider that the revised proposal at Troydale should be allocated for housing, on the basis of the following points:

- Troydale is not a named settlement in the settlement hierarchy of the Core Strategy; we have sought to direct development to the most sustainable locations (with the majority of development in the main urban area, followed by major settlements then smaller settlements- consistent with the overall approach of the Core Strategy). We have generally not sought to allocate greenfield extensions to other rural settlements such as Troydale.
- Development would still not connect with the urban area and would result in an isolated development which would reduce the green belt gap and represent sprawl into the countryside. As a result, the site is not considered suitable for allocation.
- Highways do not support the allocation of the site. As regards access, the site only has limited frontage with the highway, visibility to the right is very poor and to the left visibility seems to rely on third party land. The site also has poor accessibility (there is one bus per hour to Troydale and the site fails to meet other accessibility standards).
- There are currently just over 100 dwellings in Troydale (of which 42 are part of the relatively recent development at Troydale Mills). Development of an additional 90 units would be out of scale with the settlement as it would lead to it almost doubling in size.
- The agents for adjacent site HG2-80 Acres Hall Avenue, Pudsey have submitted a representation to significantly extend the site to the east, which has been rejected (and we are proposing to reduce the size of this allocation slightly by amending the northern and eastern boundaries). Proposing allocation of the Troydale site could set a precedent for adjacent sites to be released, as it would be accepting further development in the gap between Troydale and the urban area (and the agents for this site would likely argue that their site was more appropriate as it adjoins the main urban area), with a consequent significant detrimental impact on green belt in this area.
- The capacity on Troydale Mills site is 90. The capacity on HG2-76 as amended is 200. To 'swop' sites is unjustified for the reasons given and would mean a loss of 110 dwellings in Outer West HMCA.

- 5.24 HG2-58 Airedale Mills – At DPP on 14th June officers explained that, following concerns raised by Natural England, an ecological assessment had been commissioned to establish the potential ecological impact on the Leeds-Liverpool SSSI of overshadowing arising from the construction of a replacement bridge. This work is now complete and confirms that there will not be a significant adverse impact on the SSSI.
- 5.25 However, further consideration of the bridge has been undertaken by Highways Officers. They have advised that it may not be feasible to replace the existing swing bridge without the removal of an adjacent building. It is understood that the owner of this building does not wish to redevelop their site. As a result, it will be necessary to reduce the capacity of this site to 5 units, which reflects the number of dwellings that could be acceptably accessed using the existing swing bridge.

Deferred Retail Issues (City-wide)

- 5.26 On the 14th June Development Plan Panel deferred a decision on changes to the City Centre shopping frontages. The shopping frontage changes that were proposed to Panel on the 14th June were as follows:
- Merrion Centre: Remove the secondary frontage designation to Merrion Way because there are no shops remaining along this frontage,
 - Central Road: De-allocate the frontage on the western side of the street between Kirkgate and Duncan Street because this is currently blank frontage.
 - The Corn Exchange: Remove protected shopping frontages from the 1st floor / balcony level.
- 5.27 A number of issues have been deferred from previous Panels to enable officers to undertake further work. The recommendations as a result of this further work, are as follows:
- Kirkstall Town Centre (North HMCA): No change from that proposed at the 5th April Panel, other than to correctly reflect the Primary Shopping Area that was omitted in error on the map presented on 5th April. It is considered that the proposed frontages accurately reflect the nature of the shopping facilities on the ground, and that the proposed allocation MX2-4 allows for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Kirkstall District Centre site. (please see map in Appendix 1)
 - Wellington Street Local Convenience Centre: The newly proposed boundary for this centre is shown in Appendix 1. This reflects updated information regarding the implementation of convenience related facilities as part of Central Square and Wellington Place. The boundary has been extended to include these facilities.
 - New wording to follow paragraph 2.24 of the Site Allocations Plan, to read, "*Evidence that would demonstrate such changes in shopping patterns could include data relating to changes in vacancies and footfall within the surrounding area, as well as changes in use classes within the surrounding areas.*". This is to address concerns raised during consultation

that the previous wording did not provide sufficient guidance on what evidence would demonstrate that shopping patterns had changed.

- Insert a new paragraph after 2.13 to read “*It is recognised that through the General Permitted Development Order that some changes of use within Protected Shopping Frontages may not require planning permission. However, all proposals requiring consent will be subject to the relevant policies.*”. This is to address concerns raised during consultation that the Site Allocations Plan didn’t recognise that changes to the GDPO allowed some changes of use away from A1 retail without the need for planning permission.
- Holbeck Local Centre Boundary: Holbeck Neighbourhood Forum have requested a change from the Publication draft boundary to include St. Matthew’s Community Centre and a Doctor’s surgery. Consistent with changes agreed with Burley Lodge centre on the 5th April, it is proposed that we extend the boundary to include the Community Centre but not the surgery, as surgeries are not a town centre use. (See revised boundary of centre in appendix 1).
- No further changes to other City Centre shopping centres.

5.28 It is recommended that all the changes proposed in paragraphs 6.15 and 6.16 be made and presented to Executive Board as part of pre-submission changes to the Site Allocations Plan.

6 General Issues and overview

6.1 The report to Development Plan Panel on 14th June outlined the main general issues that have been raised through the public consultation from September to November 2015. The full list of general issues raised in the public consultation will be outlined in the Report of Consultation which will form part of a suite of documents, along with updated Background Papers and Sustainability Appraisal, which will be available to Executive Board. However, no pre-submission changes are proposed in respect of any general representations, rather they will be the subject of the examination in public once the plan is submitted.

Government Decision on ‘New Generation Transport’ (NGT)

6.2 A significant matter to emerge following the production of the Publication Draft SAP, is the Secretary of State’s decision (12th May 2016) not to make the Order and not to give the planning Direction for the new Generation Transport Scheme (NGT). Whilst this has a significant implication for transport planning and infrastructure, the City Council is actively seeking alternative solutions, in conjunction with a range of stakeholders and partners.

6.3 In relation to the SAP, the NGT was a component of the Transport Strategy and infrastructure provision. In the light of the Secretary of State’s decision references to NGT will be deleted from the document, with reference instead to alternative public transport solutions being explored. At this stage further details are awaited as the Council works with its partners for these to be determined. As these are developed, an update can be provided for the SAP Inspector at the submission stage as part of the Examination process as

appropriate. It should also be noted that the allocations in the Plan are not determinant upon a single public transport scheme. Whilst the rejection of NGT is concerning this should not preclude the SAP going forward as a 'sound' plan, whilst the Council seeks to identify alternative solutions now and in the future.

- 6.4 NGT is only referenced in 3 site requirements and one of those (HG2-31) is only in relation to the possible requirement of land for a site compound at Holt Park, which is proposed to be deleted as a minor change to the plan. The two other references relate to two allocated housing sites HG2-17 in Bramhope, and HG2-173 in Rothwell, which have site requirements stating that development should come forward after delivery of a mitigating transport scheme, or completion of public transport improvements, such as NGT. Neither site is a phase 1 site and both refer to the need to wait for mitigating schemes such as NGT. A minor amendment to the plan will delete reference to 'such as NGT'.

Housing target and Distribution of Housing

- 6.5 The redrafted Publication Draft plan for Outer North East, together with proposed pre-submission changes to the rest of the Site Allocations Plan presented to Development Plan Panel on 14th and 28th June, and in this report today mean that figures for each HMCA have changed. The figures showing overall numbers against targets in the Publication Draft Plan compared with the present position are detailed in the tables below for housing and employment.

Table showing Housing Distribution By Housing Market Characteristic Area (HMCA)s

HMCA	Target	Publication Draft Plan figure (identified and new allocations)	+/- target	Post publication Draft Plan figure (identified and new allocations)	+/- target	Difference between Pub Draft & now (housing numbers)
1.Aireborough	2,300	2,231 (967 + 1264)	-69	2068 (965 + 1103)	-232	-163
2.City Centre	10,200	11306 (5710 + 5596)	+1106	11909 (5264 +6645 incl Aire Valley)	+1709	+603
3.East	11,400	10351 (6133 + 4218)	-1049	9789 (6133 +3656 incl Aire Valley)	-1611	-562
4.Inner	10,000	11800 (7317 + 4483)	+1800	13148 8970 + 4178 incl Aire Valley)	+3148	+1348
5.North	6,000	5888 (4033 +1855)	-112	5983 (4126 + 1857)	-17	+95
6.Outer North East	5,000	4967 (1530 + 3437)	-33	5003 (1491 + 3512)	+3	+36
7.Outer North West	2,000	1779 (1145 + 634)	-221	1755 (1146 + 609)	-245	-24
8.Outer South	2,600	2366 (586 + 1780)	-234	2417 (618 + 1799)	-183	+51
9.Outer South East	4,600	4080 (1302 + 2778)	-520	4378 (1352 + 3026)	-222	+298
10.Outer South West	7,200	6777 (2265 + 4512)	-423	6969 (2648 + 4321)	-231	+192
11.Outer West	4,700	4635 (2535 + 2100)	-65	4672 (2670 + 2002)	-28	+37
Overall figures	66,000	66,180 (33523 + 32657)	180	68,091	+2091	+1911

- 6.6 As can be seen from the table, the overall target of 66,000 has been exceeded. This represents a healthy position to be in moving forward to examination. A number of representations have been received criticising the approach to allocating housing land in each HMCA. There are concerns that the plan is not effective or positively prepared on the basis that not all allocated land will necessarily come forward to provide the choice and competition that house builders wish to see to enable the significant boost of housing needed. Officers disagree and consider that both the past trends of larger windfall in the district and the return of empty homes to use ensures that there is flexibility against the CS target. Nevertheless Members should be aware that this will be a particular issue at the Examination, particularly given that the HMCAs which are providing the buffer (i.e. the City Centre and Inner Area) are areas where house builders have cast particular doubt over the realistic prospects of delivery.
- 6.7 A small number of HMCAs have seen a decline in housing capacities since the Publication Draft SAP. These are Aireborough, East, Outer North West and Outer West. It is considered that changes in these areas are needed to ensure the plan is sound, because they are being made for specific reasons. The overprovision in City Centre and Inner is in accordance with the spatial strategy of the Core Strategy in general and Policy SP7 in particular and the remaining HMCAs have increased their provision since the Publication Draft SAP was produced, thus ensuring overall general conformity with the HMCA targets set in the adopted Core Strategy.
- 6.8 Within this context Members are reminded that the SAP was endorsed by Executive Board in July 2015 as being a sound plan. This advanced stage of preparation does not therefore provide the opportunity to make radical or substantial changes between HMCAs, unless those changes relate to specific issues of soundness raised during the consultation.
- 6.9 As was explained at DPP on 28th June, identified sites have been updated to reflect planning permissions granted up to 5th April 2016. Clearly, the position with planning permissions is constantly changing as new planning permissions are granted. It is not practicable to continually update a strategic plan to reflect this. However, once the plan is submitted for examination, the Inspector will be informed of the current position with regards more recent planning permissions, which will count towards the overall target of 74,000 (gross). As detailed in paragraph 6.6 above, the presence of additional larger windfall land, which, on the basis of past trends, is likely to arise between this Panel meeting and the Submission of the Plan, will form part of the evidence for the effectiveness of the SAP as a whole.

Employment supply and distribution

- 6.10 The following tables set out the total amount of office space and general employment land being identified and allocated in the site allocations plans (Site Allocations and Aire Valley Leeds) including distribution through the Housing Market Characteristic Areas (HMCAs). As the concluding report for Development Plan Panel of three dealing with different HMCAs this enables

the overall up-to-date totals to be set out in comparison with the Core Strategy requirements of 1m sqm of offices and 493ha of general employment.

Employment targets/figures

- 6.11 Offices floorspace at Post Publication Draft 1,057,814 – Core Strategy target of 1,000,000 sqm = 57,814 sqm (Surplus). See table A below.
- 6.12 General Employment at Post Publication Draft 504.21 ha – Core Strategy target of 493 ha = 11.21 hectares (Surplus). See table B below.

Table A: Offices (including office content of mixed use) sqm floorspace

HMCA	Publication Plan			Post Publication Draft		
	Identified office	New office allocations	Total	Identified office	New office allocations	Total
AVLAAP	64,640	157,225	221,865	70,833	157,225	228,058
1.Aireborough	3,510	0	3,510	6,074	0	6,074
2. City Centre	400,176	105,356*	505,532	367,973	117,283	485,256
3.East	93,285	0	93,285	93,285	0	93,285
4.Inner	73,435	66,370	139,805	74,185	66,370	140,555
5.North	52,937	7,000	59,937	52,937	7,000	59,937
6.Outer North East	579	0	579	1,629	0	1,629
7.Outer North West	604	0	604	604	0	604
8.Outer South	0	0	0	0	0	0
9.Outer South East	18,100	0	18,100	18,100	0	18,100
10.Outer South West	19,316	0	19,316	19,316	0	19,316
11.Outer West	5,000	0	5,000	5,000	0	5,000
Overall figures	731,582	335,951	1,067,533	709,936	347,878	1,057,814

Table B: General Employment (including employment content of mixed use) hectares

HMCA	Publication Plan			Post Publication Draft		
	Identified Sites	New Allocations	Total	Identified Sites	New Allocations	Total
AVLAAP	169.02	17.68 (plus 41.28 from NRWDPD; plus 4.30 from P&R)	232.28	178.27	10.04 (plus 41.28 from NRWDPD; plus 4.30 from P&R)	233.89
1.Aireborough	23.25	36.63	59.88	24.17	36.23	60.40
2. City Centre	0.98	0.16	1.14	0.68	3.26	3.94
3.East	4.66	0	4.66	3.71	10.00	13.71
4.Inner	15.10	9.27	24.37	3.80	14.39	18.19
5.North	1.23	0	1.23	0.95	0	0.95
6.Outer North East	19.92	7.00	26.92	21.55	11.50	33.05
7.Outer North West	5.29	1.01	6.3	5.29	1.01	6.30
8.Outer South	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
9.Outer South East	33.84	0	33.84	33.84	0	33.84
10.Outer South West	30.11	63.02	93.13	27.45	65.82	93.27
11.Outer West	2.92	7.48	10.39	2.92	3.75	6.67
Overall figures	306.32	187.83	494.15	302.63	201.58	504.21

Updated Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.13 All new site submissions have been subject to sustainability appraisal, using the same approach as other sites considered through the Site Allocations Plan process. A few of the scoring criteria have been revised in response to consultation comments from the Coal Authority on land instability and Historic England on the heritage value of sites. Appendix 3 outlines the SA of the new site submissions for the Outer North East HMCA and new Gypsy and Traveller sites.
- 6.14 The Sustainability Appraisal Report is being revised in response to consultation responses together with other minor changes and will be made available for Executive Board.

Further Technical work / Updates to Background Information

- 6.15 Background Papers will be updated as necessary and made available for Executive Board. These include updating of the Infrastructure Background Paper, particularly in respect of school provision and transport modelling, and the Flood Risk Sequential and Exceptions Test Background Paper.

Next Steps and Timetable

- 6.16 Paragraphs 2.7 and 3.4 above detail the specific arrangements for the Pre-Submission changes for the whole of the Plan and the revised Publication Draft consultation for the ONE HMCA section of the plan. The intention is to bring the whole plan together once the revised Publication Draft Plan consultation on the ONE HMCA has been undertaken.
- 6.17 The revised timetable is summarised below:

Stage	Date
Revised Publication Draft consultation on ONE HMCA section	September to November 2016
Pre-Submission Changes for the whole Plan advertised	February to March 2017
Submission of the Plan to the Secretary of State	April 2017
Examination in Public	Summer 2017 (date set by the Planning Inspectorate)
Adoption	Winter 2017

Neighbourhood Plans (NP)

- 6.18 A number of Neighbourhood Plans (NP) are being prepared on the basis of sites proposed in the SAP Publication Draft in the full knowledge that changes may be made throughout the process of plan-making. Officers have been working with NP groups to advise on the SAP process and the content of plans and ensure conformity between different parts of the Local Development Framework.

- 6.19 There are 17 neighbourhood areas designated in the Outer North East HMCA. The Linton Neighbourhood Plan was fully supported at referendum on 17th December 2015 but is now the subject of an appeal at the Court of Appeal. Collingham and Clifford have submitted for examination and Boston Spa and Barwick in Elmet have completed pre-submission consultation. Bardsey, East Keswick, Wetherby and Alwoodley have commenced, or will shortly commence pre-submission consultation on their draft plans. A number of other areas have produced draft policy intentions.

7 Corporate Considerations

7.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 7.1.1 The focus of this report has been to provide a summary of proposed changes for the Site Allocations Plan (SAP) Housing Market Characteristic Areas (HMCAs): Aireborough, North, Outer South East and Outer South West, where particular issues identified are considered to go to the soundness of the Plan. It is intended that these proposed changes (together with any technical updates), will be subject to a further stage of public consultation (pre-submission consultation), before the end of the year, prior to the submission of the Plan for independent examination.

- 7.1.2 The Report of Consultation will be updated and submitted to the Inspector.

7.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

- 7.2.1 In the preparation of the Site Allocations Plan, due regard has been given to Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration issues. This has included the completion of EDCI Screening of the SAP and meeting the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive, which has meant that these Plans are subject to the preparation of a Sustainability Appraisal. The purpose of such Appraisals is to assess (and where appropriate strengthen) the document's policies, in relation to a series of social (and health), environmental and economic objectives. As part of this process, issues of Equality, Diversity, Cohesion and Integration, are embedded as part of the Appraisal's objectives. The SAP material follows on and reflects the approach set out in the Core Strategy, which has also had the same regard to these issues.

7.3 Council Policies and City Priorities

- 7.3.1 The Core Strategy, the Publication SAP, play a key strategic role in taking forward the spatial and land use elements of the Vision for Leeds and the aspiration to be the 'the Best City in the UK'. Related to this overarching approach and in addressing a range of social, environmental and economic objectives, these Plans seek to implement key City Council priorities. These include the Best Council Plan (2015 - 20) (in particular priorities relating to 'Supporting economic growth and access to economic opportunities', 'Providing enough homes of a high standard in all sectors', 'Promoting physical activity' and 'Enhancing the quality of our public realm and green spaces' and Breakthrough Projects including 'Housing growth and high

standards in all sectors' and 'More jobs, better jobs').

7.4 Resources and value for money

7.4.1 The preparation of statutory Development Plan Documents or the Local Plan is a necessary but a very resource intensive process. This is due to the time and cost of document preparation (relating to public consultation and engagement), the preparation and monitoring of an extensive evidence base, legal advice and Independent Examination. These challenges are compounded currently by the financial constraints upon the public sector and resourcing levels, concurrent with new technical and planning policy pressures arising from more recent legislation (including the Community Infrastructure Levy and Localism Act). There are considerable demands for officers, members and the community in taking the Development Plan process forward.

7.4.2 For the Local Development Framework ('Local Plan') to be as up to date as possible, the Council now needs to produce the SAP as quickly as practicable, following the adoption of its Core Strategy. This is now crucially important, given the Government's statement for the need for local plans to be in place by 2017, with the threat of direct intervention if not. The SAP will provide value for money in that the Council will influence and direct where development goes. Without an up to date plan the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' by the Government means that any development in conformity with national policy will be acceptable, regardless of any previous positions of the authority, which could have implications in terms of resources and value for money.

7.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

7.5.1 The SAP will follow the statutory Development Plan process (Local Development Framework). The report is not eligible for call-in as no decision is being taken. However, because the preparation of the Development Plan forms part of the Council's Budget and Policy Framework, the Plan changes will need to be considered by Scrutiny Board, prior to Executive Board.

7.6 Risk Management

7.6.1 Without current allocations Plans for Leeds MD in place, aspects of the existing UDP allocations will become out of date and will not reflect or deliver the Core Strategy Policies and proposals (including District wide requirements for Housing and General Employment Land) or the requirements of national planning guidance. Early delivery is therefore essential to enable the Council to demonstrate that sufficient land will be available when needed to meet the Core Strategy targets. Without an up to date plan the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' by the Government means that any development or Neighbourhood Plan in conformity with national policy will be acceptable, regardless of any previous positions of the authority. The more the work progresses, the more material weight can be given to it. In addition, the Government has stated that they will intervene, unless Plans are in place by 2017.

8 Conclusions

- 8.1 The purpose of this report has been to provide Members of the Development Plan Panel (DPP), with a summary review of the consultation outcomes for the Outer North East (ONE) Housing Market Characteristic Area (HMCA), Gypsy and Traveller (G&T) sites and outstanding issues arising from the previous Panels on 14th and 28th June together with an overview including an outline of how the housing and employment targets set out in the adopted Core Strategy have been met.
- 8.2 For ONE the proposals for this consultation are contained in this report. Subject to Executive Board approval, it is anticipated that representations will be invited on these proposals, between late September and early November.
- 8.3 For Gypsy and Traveller proposals a relatively limited number of changes are proposed, where issues raised are considered to go to the soundness of the Plan.
- 8.4 For the remainder of the Plan a relatively limited number of changes are proposed, where issues raised are considered to go to the soundness of the Plan. Once all proposed changes to the Plan have been considered by DPP, these will in due course be reported to Executive Board (and then full Council), for pre-submission advertisement, prior to the submission of the Plan for independent examination.

9 Recommendation

- 9.1 Development Plan Panel is invited to:
- i) consider the overall consultation outcomes, summarised in this report, and the revised Publication Draft plan for Outer North East together with updates to the sustainability appraisal report for Outer North East.
 - ii) recommend to the Executive Board that the revised Outer North East HMCA Publication Draft chapter of the Site Allocation Plan is approved for a period of 6 weeks public consultation (in Autumn 2016)
 - iii) agree the outstanding proposed pre-submission changes to the remainder of the Site Allocations Plan,
 - iv) consider and agree the proposed pre-submission changes to the policies and allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
 - v) recommend to the Executive Board that the proposed pre submission changes for the remainder of the plan (except for Outer North East) are approved for pre-submission consultation (in February 2017), prior to the submission of the Plan for independent examination.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Summary of representations for ONE HMCA and Gypsy & Travellers

Appendix 2: Maps showing proposed boundary changes and new sites (ONE HMCA; Gypsy and Traveller; outstanding issues for other HMCAs)

Appendix 3: Sustainability Appraisal for proposed new employment and housing sites (ONE HMCA and Gypsy & Travellers)

Appendix 4: Revised Publication Draft Section 3: Area Proposals: 6. Outer North East (excluding overall HMCA plan – this is to follow).