

3J Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0303 444 5781
Customer Services: 0303 444 5000

e-mail: matthew@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Martin Elliot
Group Manager
Leeds City Council

Our Ref: PINS/N4720/429/15

Date: 27 August 2019

Dear Martin,

EXAMINATION OF LEEDS CITY COUNCIL – CORE STRATEGY SELECTIVE REVIEW: FINAL REPORT

Thank you for your letter. The Inspector has considered your comments in response to the fact check of the report on the local plan and has amended where appropriate.

Clearly it is now for the Council to adopt the Document at its discretion. The Inspectorate maintains a national database of Local Plans and therefore please advise the Plans Team when you adopt in order that your plan status can be updated.

We will contact you shortly to provide us with a Purchase Order Number so that we can include it on your invoice. Both the fees and expenses will be payable for all duties carried out in examining your Local Plan.

The Council should consider whether adoption could have any effect on appeals currently being considered by the Planning Inspectorate. As you know, appeals must be determined on the basis of the development plan as it exists at the time of the Inspector's (or the Secretary of State's) decision, not as it was at the time of the Council's decision. If adoption changes the policy position, the relevant Inspector(s) will need to take that into account. In addition, please ensure that your new policy position is clearly explained when submitting your Questionnaire in relation to future appeals received after adoption.

If the above circumstances apply, it would be very helpful if the Council could contact the relevant Case Officer(s) in the Planning Inspectorate dealing with any outstanding case(s) at the time of adoption.

Yours sincerely

Matthew Giles
Plans Team



The Planning Inspectorate

Report to Leeds City Council

by Claire Sherratt DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Date: 27 August 2019

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

(as amended)

Section 20

Report on the Examination of the Leeds Core Strategy Selective Review Plan

The Plan was submitted for examination on 22 August 2018

The examination hearings were held between 5 February and 25 February 2019

File Ref: PINS/N4720/429/15

Abbreviations used in this report

AA	Appropriate Assessment
AHNA	Accessible Housing Need Assessment 2018
CSSR	Core Strategy Select Review
DtC	Duty to Co-operate
EVS	Economic Viability Study
HMA	Housing Market Area
HMCA	Housing Market Characteristic Area
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LP	Local Plan
LPEG	Local Plan Experts Group
MHCLG	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
MM	Main Modification
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
OAN	Objectively Assessed Need
OBR	Office of Budget Responsibility
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SAP	Site Allocations Plan
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
WMS	Written Ministerial Statement

Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the Leeds City Council Core Strategy Select Review Plan (CSSR) provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the City, provided that a number of main modifications [MMs] are made to it. Leeds City Council has specifically requested that I recommend any MMs necessary to enable the Plan to be adopted.

All the MMs were proposed by the Council and were subject to public consultation over a six-week period. In some cases, I have amended their detailed wording where necessary. I have recommended their inclusion in the Plan after considering all the representations made in response to consultation on them.

The Main Modifications can be summarised as follows:

- Explanation of how policies reviewed as part of this CSSR will integrate with remaining policies in adopted CS and the relevant plan periods;
- Confirmation that regard will be had to past delivery of housing within each HMCA since 2012 for the purposes of Policy SP7;
- Requirement for viability appraisals to justify any departure from the policies requiring technical housing standards to be adhered to;
- Reversion to original wording of Policy EN1; and
- Inclusion of affordable housing definitions table in glossary.

Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the Leeds City Council CSSR Plan in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It considers first whether the Plan's preparation has complied with the Duty to Co-operate (DtC). It then considers whether the Plan is sound and whether it is compliant with the legal requirements. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 (paragraph 182) makes it clear that in order to be sound, a Local Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
2. The revised NPPF was published in July 2018 and further revised in February 2019. It includes a transitional arrangement in paragraph 214 which indicates that, for the purpose of examining this Plan, the policies in the 2012 NPPF will apply. Similarly, where the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) has been updated to reflect the revised NPPF, the previous versions of the PPG apply for the purposes of this examination under the transitional arrangement. Therefore, unless stated otherwise, references in this report are to the 2012 NPPF and the versions of the PPG which were extant prior to the publication of the 2018 NPPF.
3. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the local planning authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The Publication Draft Plan (CD2/1) dated February 2018, published for consultation in February 2018 is the basis for my examination. The Submission Draft Plan (CD1/2) dated July 2018, submitted in August 2018, incorporates some amendments to the Publication Draft following the consultation exercise. I have considered these amendments and where necessary for the soundness of the plan these are included as main modifications.

Main Modifications

4. In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act the Council requested that I should recommend any main modifications [MMs] necessary to rectify matters that make the Plan unsound and thus incapable of being adopted. My report explains why the recommended MMs, all of which relate to matters that were discussed at the examination hearing(s), are necessary. The MMs are referenced in bold in the report in the form **MM1**, **MM2** etc, and are set out in full in the Appendix.
5. Following the examination hearings, the Council prepared a schedule of proposed MMs and carried out sustainability appraisal of them. The MM schedule was subject to public consultation for six weeks. I have taken account of the consultation responses in coming to my conclusions in this report and in this light, I have made an amendment to the detailed wording of MM1. This amendment does not significantly alter the content of the modification as published for consultation or undermine the participatory processes and sustainability appraisal that has been undertaken.

Assessment of Duty to Co-operate

6. Section 20(5)(c) of the 2004 Act requires that I consider whether the Council complied with any duty imposed on it by section 33A in respect of the Plan's preparation.

7. There are no unresolved cross boundary issues that fall within the scope of the CSSR. Neighbouring authorities raised no concerns in relation to the calculation of the objectively assessed need (OAN) for housing or the resultant housing requirement put forward. There is no suggestion from neighbouring authorities that there would be any need for Leeds City Council to accommodate any additional need arising from those authorities. The specific location of development, having regard to the settlement hierarchy already established in the CS, will be a matter for any subsequent Site Allocations Plan.
8. I am satisfied that where necessary the Council has engaged constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in the preparation of the Plan and that the Duty to Co-operate has therefore been met.

Assessment of Soundness

Background

9. One of the key actions for the CSSR is to update the City Council's housing target, currently a requirement for the provision of 70,000 (net) homes between 2012 – 2028. The evidence of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2017 (SHMA) and the recent consultation by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) generates different housing requirement figures for Leeds ranging between 42,000 and 60,000 homes, based on the latest evidence, over the plan period of 2017 - 2033.
10. The CSSR also includes an update to affordable housing and green space policies, introduces new policies on housing standards (size and accessibility) and updates the sustainable construction / Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) reduction policies to reflect national advice.
11. Only those policies within the CS that are part of the CSSR can be examined. It was a matter for the Council to decide which policies it wished to review.
12. PPG states a preference for plans to have 15-year horizon. In this case the CSSR relates to a 16-year period from 2017 to 2033. If adopted in 2019-20 then it will have a further 13 years remaining. Whilst this remaining period will be short of the 15-year horizon, this timeframe coincides with the period of the SHMA which provides a key part of the evidence base to support the housing requirement figure between 2017 and 2033. Furthermore, the PPG does not specify that the 15-year horizon must be post-adoption. The timeframe is therefore justified.

Main Issues

13. Taking account of all the representations, the written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination hearings, I have identified 9 main issues upon which the soundness of this plan depends. This report deals with these main issues. It does not respond to every point or issue raised by representors. Nor does it refer to every policy criterion in the Plan.

Issue 1 – Whether extending the Plan Period to 2033 in relation to housing provision, in isolation of employment land, is justified.

14. As stated previously, it is for the Council to decide which elements of the adopted CS require review. The NPPF is clear that authorities can review parts of a plan in isolation. It will be a matter for the Council to determine how it addresses the differing end dates that would arise. The differing dates do not, as a matter of principle, make the CSSR unsound.
15. Whilst employment considerations and housing requirements are of course inter-linked and thus require some alignment, it is not a requirement of either the NPPF or PPG that both must be reviewed together. I shall consider what regard has been given to future employment provision within the SHMA later in this report. To conclude, reviewing the housing requirement in isolation of employment would not make the CSSR unsound.
16. For clarity and to ensure the CSSR is effectively incorporated into the remainder of the adopted CS, an introductory paragraph setting out the relevant time frames for each element of the plan is necessary [MM1]. Having considered the responses to the MM consultation I have slightly amended the wording of MM1 in section (ii) that lists the selected areas of policy that have been subject to review by deleting reference to Policy SP7 from the first bullet so that what remains only refers to Policy SP6 and adding a second bullet that lists 'consequential changes to Policy SP7 concerning housing distribution'. This will ensure the implementation and effect of the reviewed policies in the context of the adopted Plan is clear.

Issue 2 – whether the methodology for calculating the Objectively Assessed Need is consistent with national policy and the resultant housing requirement set out in Policy SP6 is justified?

Background

17. The PPG states that, 'there is no one methodology approach or use of a particular dataset(s) that will provide a definitive assessment of development need. But the use of this standard methodology set out in this guidance is strongly recommended because it will ensure that the assessment findings are transparently prepared. Local planning authorities may consider departing from the methodology, but they should explain why their particular local circumstances have led them to adopt a different approach where this is the case. The assessment should be thorough but proportionate, building where possible on existing information sources outlined within the guidance'. The PPG recognises that 'establishing future need for housing is not an exact science', although it should be informed by reasonable and proportionate evidence.
18. Leeds administrative area reflects the Housing Market Area (HMA), this being justified given its self-containment on the basis of migration and travel to work patterns. This also reflects the position of the evidence that underpins the adopted CS.
19. The Council commissioned consultants Arc4 and Edge Analytics to undertake a complete SHMA for Leeds in January 2017. Preparation of the SHMA followed the PPG in terms of methodology. In addition, the SHMA 2017 sought to

anticipate the Government's stated intention at that time to introduce a simpler method for calculating affordable housing. It produced a calculation of the housing requirement using the methodology advanced by the Local Plans Expert Group (LPEG) set up to advise the Government on a new simple methodology. The LPEG methodology generated a figure of 55,296 homes (3,456 homes per annum).

20. In September 2017, MHCLG published a consultation "Planning for the right homes in the right places". This put forward a simplified methodology which starts with sub-national household projections and makes one adjustment for local house price/income affordability ratios. Using this methodology, a figure of 2,649 dwellings per annum is produced for Leeds which would generate a requirement of 42,384 over the plan period 2017 – 2033. Notwithstanding that methodology, the consultation paper says that local authorities may plan for higher numbers.

Sustainability Appraisal of the Housing requirement options

21. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) considers four possible housing requirement options. These comprise (i) a low housing requirement at 42,384 as referred to above; (ii) a housing requirement of 51,952 (derived from a mid-range requirement without any adjustment being made for a return to headship formation rates); (iii) a mid-range housing requirement 55,648 and (iv) a high housing requirement at 60,528.
22. The mid-range housing requirement of 55,648 and the high housing requirement of 60,528 both come from the SHMA 2017. These two scenarios were fully worked up in the SHMA using a range of adjustments considered necessary to robustly reflect Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). It provides a thorough understanding of the housing needs of Leeds and its relationship with job growth and commuting.
23. The two OAN figures are based on different levels of employment growth. The main difference between them is that the mid-range figure of 55,648 draws upon the standard employment forecast for Leeds of the Regional Econometric Model (REM) Spring 2017, with other adjustments for headship rates and market signals; the high housing requirement draws upon a bespoke high growth employment forecast for Leeds that was created by officers of the West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA). It is a more aspirational forecast of employment growth aligned to the Leeds Inclusive Growth Strategy 2017–22 alongside other adjustments.
24. The 51,952 figure is the proposed CSSR housing requirement. It comprises the mid-range requirement of 55,648 set out in the SHMA, but without any adjustment being made for a return to headship formation rates to those experienced before 2008.
25. I consider these options to represent reasonable alternatives. These alternatives were set out in the Development Plan Panel report of 21st November 2017 for consideration by Council members.

OAN as determined by the SHMA

26. The SHMA expresses the resultant OAN as a range of between 44,240 and 60,528 homes over the period 2017-2033; that range being consistent with many of the alternative figures being put forward by others. In accordance with the PPG, the starting point for the SHMA was the latest 2014-based household projections. This establishes a baseline annual need of 2,534 dwellings (40,544 over the plan period). This should, the PPG advises be adjusted to reflect local demographic trends, future jobs, past delivery and market signals and other local circumstances not captured by past trends.
27. The SHMA firstly sets out the OAN calculation based on the approach set out in the LPEG report. Secondly, an OAN calculation based on the PPG methodology is undertaken. The key difference between the approaches is that the second approach introduces some economic factors into the calculation. As stated previously, the CSSR is to be examined under the transitional arrangements and so the PPG methodology should be the starting point.
28. The PPG states that it is appropriate to consider 'alternative assumptions in relation to the underlying demographic projections and household formation rates' of the local area. Accordingly, the SHMA considered what adjustments to the baseline figure, if any, would be necessary. Various 'alternative trend' scenarios were developed for Leeds to consider the impact of varying migration histories on population change. The favoured approach in OAN analysis is to consider the PG-10-year scenario¹ output which takes account of several economic and housing market cycles. This approach is also advocated by LPEG. As this would result in a reduction in dwelling requirements (2,282), it is recommended that no adjustment is made for alternative migration assumptions, and the 2014 household projections should remain the starting point.
29. A market signals uplift of 15% of the basic demographic requirement (380 dwellings each year) is also recommended. This represents a blended uplift of 10% based on house price ratio based on median process to median incomes and rental affordability warranting a 20% uplift based on a rental affordability ratio of 30.7% based on lower quartile price to lower quartile rents. This takes into account underlying affordable housing need as evidenced in the 2017 SHMA household survey. A 15% uplift is therefore justified.
30. The SHMA recognises that nationally, younger age groups have been more adversely affected by housing supply and unaffordability issues, which in some areas may have led to 'suppressed' rates of household formation. Therefore, two modified sets of 'headship rates' were generated for Leeds in which the headship rates for the younger 25-44 age groups were adjusted on the basis of headship rates returning to either 2008 based values by 2033 or a partial return whereby headship rates return to a mid-point between the 2008-based and 2014-based headship rates to 2033. A partial return was preferred.

¹ PG refers to the demographic model known as PopGroup which is explained at p.37 of Leeds SHMA 2017 Demographic Analysis and Forecasts (CD2/7)

31. The OAN needs to take account of employment growth. PPG states that 'plan makers should make an assessment of the likely change in job numbers based on past trends and/or economic forecasts as appropriate and also having regard to the growth of the working age population in the housing market area'. Edge Analytics note that 'alignment of demographic and economic model forecasts is challenging due to different methodologies, data inputs and assumptions'. However, using POPGROUP, it is possible to derive the size and structure of the labour force and the level of employment through the application of three key assumptions: economic activity rates, unemployment rates and a commuting ratio. This approach is in my view proportionate and reasonable.
32. A number of scenarios were considered. The SNPP 2014 baseline scenario supports jobs growth of 3,099 each year. The REM 2017 results in jobs growth of 3,137 each year and the high growth scenario results in jobs growth of 3,650. When the mid-point of OBR/REM economic activity rates are considered along with a headship rate adjustment, under the REM 2017 scenario, this translates to a dwelling need of 3,098. When the market signals adjustment is included, this results in an overall dwelling need of 3,478. This translates to a need for 55,648 dwellings over the Plan period 2017-33.
33. Under the High Growth economic scenario, the dwelling need is 3,403 (including a headship rate adjustment) and when a market signals adjustment is also included this results in an overall annual dwelling need of 3,783.
34. In summary, an assessment of the 'likely change in job numbers based on past trends and/or economic forecasts as appropriate and also having regard to the growth of the working age population in the housing market area' would suggest that an upward adjustment is required to take account of employment trends.
35. PPG advises on how housing needs assessments should take account of affordable housing need, stating that 'the total affordable housing need should be considered in the context of its likely delivery as a proportion of mixed market and affordable housing developments, given the probable percentage of affordable housing to be delivered by market housing-led developments. An increase in the total housing figures included in the local plan should be considered where it could help deliver the required number of affordable homes'. The analysis of housing need based on 2017 household survey evidence suggests there is an annual net imbalance of 1,230 affordable dwellings each year. This figure expresses the overall need from household survey evidence compared with the current supply of affordable housing. The 1,230 figure assumes that backlog need is cleared over a 10-year period. If the backlog is cleared over the Plan period, the annual net imbalance reduces to 931 each year
36. The Planning Advisory Service (PAS) guidance provides helpful guidance in interpreting affordable need in the context of OAN. Paragraph 9.6 states 'in practical terms, there is no arithmetical way of combining the two calculations set out in PPG to produce a joined-up assessment of overall housing need'. It is not possible to add together the calculated OAN and the calculated affordable need, because they overlap. The OAN covers both affordable and market housing, but these components cannot be measured separately,

because the demographic projections, which are the starting point for the OAN, do not distinguish between different sectors of the housing market. When paragraph 47 of the NPPF says that plans should meet in full 'the need for market and affordable housing', it is therefore referring to that component rather than the separately calculated affordable need.

37. Overall, the SHMA's assessment of need translates to a total dwelling need in the range of 44,240 to 60,528 over the Plan period 2017-2033. This range takes account of the need to deliver more affordable and market housing for an increasing number of households, takes account of the latest demographic evidence, long-term trends in migration and supports economic growth. It also takes into account potential changes to headship rates amongst younger households and a market signals adjustment.

The Housing Requirement

38. The Development Plans Panel considered the four options contained in the SA, favouring the mid-range requirement of 55,648 set out in the SHMA, but without any adjustment being made for a return to headship formation rates to those experienced before 2008. This results in the housing requirement of 51,952 set out in Policy SP6.
39. PAS guidance makes a particular comment that 'CLG 2008 rates are no longer helpful because they are based on very old evidence and anyway may not reflect the true long-term trend'. This is borne out in research which concludes that the 2008-based rates never did provide a robust view of long-term trends because societal change is slowing down historical rise in Household Representative Rates and a resulting fall in household sizes.
40. Edge Analytics state in their report that it should be noted that the inclusion of the 'Return' and 'Partial Return' sensitivities is not a recommendation, and that the current evidence is clear that the trend has changed. However, it is sensible to consider the potential impact, and for the SHMA to take a clear and balanced view on whether it is relevant and should be applied in Leeds. The 2014-based 'Partial Return' rates best align with that outlined in the LPEG methodology, however as the recent and latest evidence is not currently indicating that this 'Partial Return' is happening, the outcomes should be considered with caution. Furthermore the LPEG recommendations have no status so the obligation to make a headship rate adjustment no longer exists.
41. As recent trends in Leeds provide no evidence that headship rates will return to the rate of pre-2014, I am satisfied that any uplift to accommodate this is not necessary or justified at this time. The resultant figure of 51,952 is further corroborated because it lies around the mid-point between 42,384 (MHCLG base) and 60,528 (High Growth).
42. The proposed housing requirement, based on the SHMA 2017 scenario with an adjustment to remove an uplift for headship rates, would accord with the most realistic estimates of Leeds' economic growth prospects and ability to meet housing needs. I do not accept suggestions that it is not ambitious enough. The OAN range figure is based on realistic and proportionate evidence. It is acknowledged that the adopted CS supported a higher growth scenario. Whilst the same 2012 methodology is being used to determine a range of

housing requirements, the Council have on this occasion not supported the higher growth scenario, preferring to adopt the 2017 REM option but without the inclusion of any uplift for headship rates. It seems to me that the Council are entitled, within the range given in the SHMA, to determine which is considered to be the most appropriate figure to take forward in its CSSR. The preferred option is considered to be both aspirational but achievable and realistic. Importantly, it is not a ceiling, it remains employment led and is likely to withstand peaks and troughs of economic cycles.

43. Furthermore, Leeds City Council has been unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply for some time. This has, it feels, at least to some extent, been due to the Council's willingness, based on the evidence of the time, to support the more ambitious higher growth scenario in 2012 when setting a housing requirement in the adopted CS which has not been delivered. Accordingly a MM is proposed, which I agree is necessary to ensure the plan remains effective and positively prepared, which sets out that the Council will closely monitor the delivery and implementation of the housing requirement with the intention of ensuring that the City is as resilient as possible in delivering agreed priorities whilst managing unforeseen change against the context of national policy and its penalties for under delivery [**MM5**].
44. Some consider the figure arising from the MHCLG consultation regarding the calculation of OAN of an annual housing requirement of 2,649 should be used. Crucially, this baseline figure does not take into account jobs growth. As Leeds is the economic driver for the wider area it is appropriate that various economic scenarios were considered within the SHMA, in addition to sensitivity testing of the outcomes. Even based on the MHCLG consultation figure, an uplift of the baseline figure of 40% would possibly be recommended, which would result in a revised OAN under the new methodology of up to 3,709; a higher figure than both relevant PPG and LPEG approaches described above. In any event, for plans submitted for examination before 24 January 2019, the OAN should be calculated using the existing methodology set out in PPG.
45. Some correction of the population figures set out in the in supporting text is required [**MM2**] and to the calculated gross housing requirement when accounting for demolitions and other dwelling losses over the plan period along with a consequential amendment once the windfall allowance is applied [**MM4**].
46. To conclude, the SHMA provides a reasonable and proportionate evidence base that reflects the relevant PPG and is thus consistent with national policy. The resultant housing requirement contained in Policy SP6 is justified.
47. A revision to criterion vii of Policy SP6 setting out the sequential preference of avoiding flood risk before mitigation is required to ensure consistency with national policy [**MM6**].

Issue 3 – whether the revisions to Policy SP7 (housing distribution) are justified and effective?

48. Spatial Policy 7 (SP7) is concerned with the distribution of housing land and allocations. Table 2 sets out how the housing requirement will be distributed by settlement hierarchy expressed both numerically and as a percentage.

Table 3 expresses how housing should be distributed by Housing Market Characteristic Area (HMCA), again both numerically and as a percentage. The proposed revisions to Policy SP7 are the deletion of Table 2 and the deletion of the numerical figures from Table 3.

49. Clearly the numerical figures would no longer accord with the revised housing requirement and so it is entirely necessary and justified to delete these figures. The deletion of the numerical figures does not in itself raise any soundness concerns. Whilst setting out the corresponding numerical revised figures may make it easier to read across what proportion of the housing requirement the retained percentages in Table 3 equate to, it is not necessary to make the CSSR sound.
50. Whilst Table 2 compliments and supports other policies, in particular, Policies SP1 and SP6, its deletion will not undermine the delivery of housing in accordance with the settlement hierarchy or preferred locations given that other CS policies still set out those locational preferences.
51. In the Report of Consultation (CD1/8)², the Council explains that the original evidence to justify the adopted CS Policy SP7 was not needs based; it was based on a supply picture of potentially deliverable sites drawn from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment that established percentage targets for different areas. As the percentages were based on a picture of supply to support the CS from 2012, the retained percentages should not simply carry forward to only the new plan period (2017-33) as in some HMCAs, significant contributions to housing provision may have already occurred since 2012.
52. A MM is necessary to clearly explain that in considering proposals for new development, regard will be had to the past delivery of housing within each HMCA between 1 April 2012 and 31 March 2017 when seeking to meet those indicative targets, expressed as a percentage, in Policy SP7 [MM3]. In practice, this means that less housing land may need to be allocated for the period 2017-2033 in HMCAs that have already experienced housing development during 2012-17. This will ensure the Policy, in so far as it relates to the CSSR is effective.

Issue 4 - whether the changes to Policy H5 (Affordable Housing) are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

53. Adopted CS Policy H5 stipulates the amount of affordable housing that should be incorporated in developments within each designated zone above certain thresholds. An increase in the amount of affordable housing required within housing developments in the Zones 3 and 4, the City Centre and Inner Area, from 5% to 7% is proposed. The requirements of the adopted CS apply to developments of 10 or more dwellings in Zone 1 and 15 dwellings in Zones 2, 3 and 4. The CSSR simply refers to developments of 10 dwellings or more. However, this omits any clear direction in circumstances where the number of units to be accommodated on an area of land are not specified in an application or proposals relate to floor space created. In order to be effective

² Appendix 7

and consistent with national policy a MM is required to ensure Policy H5 relates to all major housing developments for which a definition shall be provided [**MM9**].

54. The Economic Viability Study (EVS) initially explores 4 affordable housing requirement options of which options 1 and 2 are of particular relevance. Option 1 reflects the current CS percentage requirements in each zone and Option 2 increases the requirement in each zone by 5%. The impact of Option 2 was found to be unacceptable in some circumstances, particularly in Zone 1 for large greenfield sites, 2a, 2b and Zone 4 (City Centre).
55. The Council requested a finer grain analysis of sites in the City Centre and Inner Area. In doing so, it is accepted that most of the sites within the City Centre and Inner Area will be brownfield. The assessment assumes that all brownfield sites within these areas will be 100% contaminated and will require site preparation across the entire site. This is clearly therefore a worst-case scenario. Within each scenario the level of affordable housing that can viably be delivered was tested whilst also taking into account the cumulative impact of the following policy expectations:
 - Policy H10 (housing access standards) based on a requirement for the provision of 30% of dwellings meeting technical standards M4(2) and 2% M4 (3);
 - dwellings are adaptable rather than accessible;
 - A new policy (Policy H9) on minimum space standards is 'switched on';
 - The maximum amount of Green Space being sought per dwelling, through Policy G4 (inner City Area), is capped at no more than 40sq.m. Policy G5 (City Centre) is 'switched on';
 - A new policy on electric vehicle charging infrastructure (Policy EN8) is 'switched on'; and
 - Other existing Core Strategy policy requirements.

This work supports a finding that affordable housing could be increased to 7% within the City Centre and Inner Area whilst maintaining the other policy requirements as set out above (as well as Policy EN1 in its original form and Policy EN2 as modified).

56. There is clearly a need for affordable housing as demonstrated in the SHMA. Only a small increase in the requirements for affordable housing in Zones 3 and 4 can be justified alongside a reduction in the thresholds when the policy will bite. As a high proportion of the development is taking place in the City Centre and Inner Area, this revision will be of benefit to the overall amount of affordable housing delivered.
57. A MM is required to enable a developer providing build to rent development to provide affordable housing at affordable benchmark rents administered by either a registered provider or a management company with appropriate arrangements for identifying households in need, including City Council

nomination rights, which apply in perpetuity [MM10]. This is necessary to ensure the policy is effective and consistent with national policy.

58. Unlike the adopted CS policy, as revised, Policy H5 does not include the opportunity to demonstrate that the development of a site would not be viable if the affordable housing requirement is to be met, although such provision remains in the supporting text at 5.2.20 in the Publication Draft CSSR. This is not sufficient for the plan to be effective and a requirement to justify any departure from Policy H5 through viability considerations is required within the policy itself to ensure it is clear to a decision maker how a proposal should be determined, and that the policy is effective [MM8]. Furthermore, the supporting text at 5.2.20 in the Publication Draft CSSR needs to be clear that any viability assessments should be produced in accordance with the principles set out in the NPPF [MM7]. This is necessary to ensure the policy is flexible, effective and applied in accordance with national policy.
59. Policy H5 requires that affordable units should be a pro-rata mix in terms of sizes and house types of the total housing provision, unless there are specific needs which indicate otherwise. No change is proposed to this part of the policy. There was some discussion about whether the mix should reflect Table 6.1 of the 2017 SHMA. However, Policy H4 stipulates the housing mix that developments should include which is supported by Table H4. No review of Policy H4 is included in the CSSR. To introduce a different table in association with Policy H5 would lead to uncertainty. It is not necessary to make the CSSR sound.
60. It is necessary to include the definitions of the various categories of affordable housing within the glossary to ensure Policy H5 is effective and implemented consistent with national policy [MM27].
61. To conclude, with the MMs set out above, Policy H5 as revised is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Issue 5 – whether new Policy H9 (Housing Standards for Minimum Space Standards) is justified?

62. The Council measured the size of a selection of dwellings that had been permitted between 2012–2016 to compare against the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). The Dwelling Size Measurement Exercise Background Paper (CD2-10) indicates that for Leeds as a whole 62% of dwellings meet the NDSS and 38% fall below. A geographical variation is identified.
63. NPPF states that LPAs should identify the size of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand. The PPG confirms that where a LPA wishes to require an internal space standard, they should only do so by reference in their LP to the NDSS. The PPG further clarifies that justification for the inclusion of the NDSS in a LP is required. LPAs should take account of the evidence of need, viability and timing considerations.
64. Turning first to need, the work carried out by the Council to establish the size and types of dwelling currently being built confirmed that since 2012 dwellings of all sizes and located across the Leeds administration area had been built to lesser space standards than those prescribed in the NDSS. It was accepted

that the situation had improved over the past two years since the NDSS were published. This evidence is considered by the Council to be sufficient to justify a need for the Policy.

65. Whilst there was no evidence to suggest that the construction of dwellings with less space than that contained in the NDSS was affecting house sales, that is not to say that the occupants' living conditions are not being compromised. The NPPF is clear that high quality design is of great importance. Although, the impacts of adopting the space standards, is not explained in any detail other than in terms of viability, in Leeds, the evidence clearly demonstrates that the provision of housing below the NDSS has been common place. The need for a policy that applies to all areas is therefore, in principle, justified, subject to viability considerations.
66. The EVS report generally demonstrates NDSS will have little impact on viability as the assumptions contained within it were made on the basis that floorspace would generally be provided over and above the standards set out in NDSS, the exception being 1 and 2 bed apartments. For the purpose of the assessment it has been assumed that those units which exceed the NDSS remain as per the assumptions applied in the base appraisals (i.e. sizes are not reduced to align with the space standards). Therefore, when testing the impact of Policy H9 it has only been necessary to increase the size of 1 and 2 bed apartments.
67. Strategic sites would see a marginal reduction in land values. This is because a small number of apartments were included as part of the overall mix of development on these strategic sites. On this basis it is logical to conclude that the biggest impact of Policy H9 will be witnessed in the City Centre (Zone 4) where nearly all the schemes will be apartment led. However, even in the City Centre (Zone 4) land values only fall by around 3 or 4% which is well within acceptable limits. The land values within the City Centre are also significantly higher than the minimum benchmark land values.
68. I have no doubt that the impact of the revised policy would be a positive one in terms of quality of homes built. As demonstrated, in most circumstances, it is unlikely, given the viability evidence provided, to be of detriment to delivery. Nevertheless, there could be some viability constraints if these minimum standards are to be met in Zone 4 and no separate consideration has been done in respect of Build to Rent schemes. Although the EVS demonstrates that the application of this policy in Zone 2 would be unacceptable, that is the case whether or not the policy is applied; there is no change whatsoever between the base case scenario³ and the impact of the revised policy
69. In my view, whilst the starting point should be that all developments 'must' (rather than should) adhere to the minimum space standards set out in national policy [**MM13**], the policy should nevertheless allow a developer / applicant to provide evidence to support a departure from the NDSS standards, in light of the findings set out above, if necessary [**MM12, MM14**]. There is no such flexibility within the policy as drafted. The MMs would allow,

³ Includes Policy H5 (Option 1), Updated Policies EN1 and EN2 and Index increased CIL

should a particular scheme not be viable, some consideration of local circumstances in a particular area that might warrant a relaxation of this policy requirement in preference to achieving others to make a scheme viable. These MMs are therefore required to ensure the policy is effective. The MMs would not, as some suggest, allow developers to shy away from conforming to NDSS without robust evidence and justification for doing so.

70. Furthermore, a MM confirming that any future changes to government policy and guidance on NDSS will be taken into account will ensure the policy remains effective throughout the lifetime of the plan [MM11]. It is also necessary to delete footnotes that simply duplicate part g and h of the policy and insert a footnote explaining when a reduction in floorspace will be permitted in a bathroom containing a shower rather than bath [MM15].
71. I do not consider a transitional period is required given the additional flexibility that MM14 will permit and the evidence that shows that the NDSS standards have been met to a greater extent since they were introduced.
72. To conclude, subject to the MMs discussed above, the inclusion of a requirement to meet NDSS as set out in Policy H9 is justified.

Issue 6 – Whether new Policy H10 (Accessibility standards for new housing) which introduces accessibility standards is consistent with national policy and effective?

73. As a result of the Housing Standards Review the Government announced, via a Written Ministerial Statement (WMS), a new national approach to the setting of technical housing standards in England. This was accompanied by the publication of a new set of streamlined national technical standards, which included 2 optional Building Regulation standards covering accessible housing, creating a 3-tier system of standards which is now contained within Volume 1 of Part M of the Building Regulations and is made up of:
 - M4(1) Category 1 – Visitable dwellings;
 - M4(2) Category 2 – Accessible and adaptable dwellings; and
 - M4(3) Category 3 – Wheelchair user dwellings
74. Only one of the three technical standards can be applied to a single dwelling. M4(1) Category 1 is a mandatory requirement and should be applied to all dwellings to which Part M of the Building Regulations applies, unless one of the optional standards either M4(2) or M4(3) is to apply. These Part M optional technical standards can only be 'switched on' by the imposition of a planning condition.
75. Technical standard M4(2) provides for homes suitable for a diverse population and many of the features of an M4(2) home will benefit disabled people, older people, families with young children and people with temporary impairments or injuries etc. M4(3) states that reasonable provision must be made for people to gain access to and use the dwelling and its facilities and that this provision must be sufficient to allow simple adaption of the dwelling to meet the needs of occupants who use wheelchairs; or meeting the needs of occupants who use wheelchairs.

76. A local authority should only require wheelchair accessible homes (as opposed to wheelchair adaptable homes), where they are responsible for allocating or nominating the end user of the dwelling. Only where Leeds City Council is nominating a wheelchair user as an occupier will wheelchair accessible dwellings be required. This needs to be explained in the supporting text and within the policy through a MM [**MM16, MM19**] to ensure the policy is effective.
77. PPG identifies the type of evidence required to support the introduction of a policy requiring accessible and adaptable homes including the likely future need; the size, location, type and quality of dwellings needed; the accessibility and adaptability of the existing stock, how the needs vary across different housing tenures; and the overall viability.
78. The Accessible Housing Need Assessment (AHNA) 2018 (CD2-11) draws on the Government's national summary data sheet to produce the likely disability levels within the population of Leeds. It finds that:
- 29.8% of all households are likely to contain a person with a long-term illness or disability, and
 - 3.3% of all households are likely to contain one or more wheelchair users.

It also focuses on the population groups who would benefit from the provision of accessible housing, including disabled people (which includes wheelchair users) older people, and families with young children.

79. The SHMA 2017 includes a Household Survey which was undertaken in May 2017 and provides detailed information to help provide a picture and understanding of the real housing needs and aspirations of Leeds residents. Appendix 1 presents data sourced from the SHMA 2017, specifically:
- the number and percentage of households in Leeds containing a disabled person;
 - the number and percentage of households in Leeds containing an older person (65 years +);
 - the number and percentage of households in Leeds containing a younger person (under 4 years of age);

These groups have been identified in the AHNA as they are most likely to benefit from the design features provided by the optional accessible housing standards.

80. The SHMA also provides data on households whose current home has been adapted or purpose built due to someone's disability, households whose reason for previously moving was the need for housing suitable for an older or disabled person, households who felt the reason for them moving in the next 5 years would be to move into housing suitable for an older or disabled person, households which need adaptations for a wheelchair user now and in 5 years

time, and the combined data for households who need adaptations for a wheelchair user now and households which contain a member with a disability.

81. The SHMA data is used to provide a picture of need for accessible housing in Leeds. Given that 3.3% of households cited a need for wheelchair adaptations either now or in the next 5 years, it is reasonable to say that it is likely that at least 3.3% of households in Leeds contain a wheelchair user although this figure may be higher. This is also reflected in the likely disability levels in Leeds (based on national averages) and the national picture.
82. Appendix 2 of the assessment provides data on the potential assumed 'need' via Leeds City Council's adaptation spend records for adaptations which would either not have been necessary or could have been undertaken at a reduced cost if the home being adapted were an M4(2) dwelling. Appendix 3 provides data on the potential assumed 'need' via Leeds City Council's adaptation spend records for adaptations which would either not have been necessary or could have been undertaken at a reduced cost if the home being adapted were an M4(3) dwelling.
83. The information contained within these appendices illustrates significant 'need' in Leeds for accessible housing, whether it be to an M4(2) or M4(3) standard.
84. The national picture states that 29.8% of all households contain a reference person with a long-term disability or illness, which could equate to 100,561 households in Leeds. The SHMA suggests that 15.8% of households in Leeds contain 1 or 2 members who are disabled. The likely reason for this significant difference between the national picture and the SHMA findings is stated to be the differing definitions between the two studies of 'long term disability or illness' and 'disability'. Two total need figures for M4(2) housing in Leeds are produced which have been derived from Leeds SHMA data. Two total need figures have been provided to avoid double counting of some disabled people, the first of which takes into account households containing a young person under the age of 4 and the second of which does not take into account this group.
85. Although many of the design features provided by the optional accessible housing standards would be of benefit to households with children under the age of 4, they would be unlikely to be considered essential for these households to live there. It should however be noted that some double counting will still exist, for example some households will contain both an older person aged 65+ and a young person under 4 years of age. The data presented is therefore to be taken as an indication of need and not strict and definitive figure. Data is also provided to indicate the likely need for wheelchair housing, which has been taken off the two totals as M4(2) housing is unlikely to be suitable for full time wheelchair users.
86. Taking into account households with young children, older people and disabled people 40.2% of households require/ would benefit from M4(2) housing, whereas taking into account just older people and disabled people it is 28.7% households require/ would benefit from M4(2) housing. The AHNA therefore recommended that a mid-point figure between the two totals above is taken as an indication of the current 'need' for accessible and adaptable M4(2) housing in Leeds. By drawing on both national and local data and statistics a

reasonable and realistic assessment of local 'need' for accessible housing can be calculated.

87. Furthermore, to ensure that people who require accessible housing have some level of choice, the lack of existing accessible housing stock could also be taken into account when determining a level of accessible housing to be required by planning policy. Leeds has not had a planning policy requirement for accessible housing before. It is therefore likely that very limited numbers of dwellings will have been built to an accessible housing standard (whether M4(2), lifetime homes standard, M4(3) or the standard provided by the wheelchair housing design guide). To improve the level of choice and bring forward the point in time at which people who require accessible housing will have choice in the housing they can live in, the AHNA suggests that the percentage requirement for new dwellings to be built to an accessible standard could be increased above the basic level of need.
88. Based on the evidence of need presented in this document, it is recommended that the policy requirement is:
- 35% M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings
 - 3.5% M4(3) wheelchair user dwellings.
89. In terms of viability, the cost impacts of the Housing Standards Review were considered in a report undertaken by EC Harris (on behalf of Department for Communities and Local Government) in September 2014. It also estimates these costs generated by meeting the NDSS required in Policy H9. It should be noted that for private and intermediate (i.e. sub market housing), the changes / increase in space standards can also have an impact on sales value which may offset some or all of the additional build cost. This fact was recognised within the EC Harris report which concluded that for relatively small areas (i.e. and additional 1 to 2sq.m of floor space) 90% of the additional cost is recovered via sales values. However, the ability to recover the additional costs by sales reduces as the amount of additional space increases. Given that the extra space standards associated with M4(2) are expected to range between 2 and 3 square metres it is assumed that approximately 80% of the extra space related costs can be recovered. Similarly, to meet the M4(3) technical standards, based on the findings within the EC Harris cost report, the EVS assumes that 60% of the additional costs would be recovered through increased sales revenue.
90. The EVS concludes that in isolation the impact of Policy H10 is well within acceptable limits. However, as a result of the cumulative viability testing a lower requirement than that recommended in the AHNA is proposed of 30% of dwellings required to meet the requirements of M4(2) and 2% to meet the requirements of M4(3).
91. On this basis, greenfield land values fall by between 1% and 3% if making provision for 30% adaptable dwellings. The notable exception is Zone 2a where land values fall by 6% but this is because the reduction in land value is being assessed off a much lower base land value meaning the impact (in % terms) is greater. However, even in Zone 2a the actual reduction in land value is still within acceptable limits albeit the land values remain below the minimum benchmark thresholds. The impact of Policy H10 on Brownfield sites

is similar to that witnessed on Greenfield sites. The notable exception is large Brownfield sites for which the land values generated fall below the minimum benchmark land values after the application of Policy H10.

92. Accordingly, some flexibility is required within the policy to ensure viability considerations can be properly considered on an individual site by site basis to reflect the variations highlighted in the EVS. Provided a viability appraisal satisfactorily demonstrates that a particular scheme cannot meet the accessible housing standards set out in Policy H10, without compromising delivery, then a proposal should not be found to be in conflict with the policy. MMs are therefore required to reflect this in both the supporting text and policy wording to ensure the policy is effective [**MM17**, **MM20**]
93. Where the scale of development would generate more than one accessible dwelling, Policy H10 requires the mix of sizes, types and tenures of accessible dwellings to reflect the mix of sizes, types and tenures of the development as a whole. No substantive evidence has been produced to demonstrate that only certain sizes, types or tenures of dwellings are required. However, it is clear that greater choice is likely to be required given the absence of any policy requirement of this nature before. I therefore consider it reasonable to require a mix of accessible housing that in turn reflects the mix of the overall development. However greater flexibility in the policy is required to allow a departure from this generalised approach in circumstances where the applicant can show an evidenced need locally for dwellings of a particular size, type or tenure, with locally normally meaning the designated neighbourhood area or, if not defined, the relevant settlement, or ward within a main urban area [**MM20**]. The location, in addition to number and mix of these properties should be identified on the drawings that accompany any application. It is not necessary to repeat within the policy itself how a requirement above or below 0.5 dwellings will be applied [**MM19**]. These MMs are necessary to ensure the policy is effective.
94. To conclude it is considered that Policy H10 will ensure Leeds City Council is positively working towards providing a choice of high-quality homes for many residents including disabled people and older people. This is clearly desirable. The need for the requirements contained within the policy is demonstrated by the various data produced and analysed and with the MMs set out above will not prejudice delivery and be effective. Policy H10 is thus sound.

Issue 7 – Whether amended Policies EN1 and EN2 (new national policy regarding Code for Sustainable Homes) and a consequential change to EN4 are consistent with national policy, justified and effective?

95. Policy EN1, as existing, requires development to be 20% more energy efficient than the Building Regulations standard and for 10% of the energy needs of the development to come from renewable or low carbon energy sources. To take into account the findings of the WMS in March 2015 the Council began to cap the energy efficiency requirement of adopted CS Policy EN1 for residential development to the standard equivalent to that of Code level 4. The EVS Update included the costs of Policy EN1 within the base case market values

that were then used to determine the impact of the proposed modifications / policy changes within the CSSR⁴.

96. The Government has now confirmed that it has no current intentions to enact Section 43 of the Deregulation Act. In light of this, the proposed revisions to Policy EN1 would not accord with national policy or be justified and are thus not sound. MMs are therefore required to make the policy sound; the practical consequences of which would be to delete the proposed changes and to revert to the policy and supporting text of the adopted CS [**MM23**].
97. Whilst the costs of achieving the 10% on site energy requirement (i.e. Part (i) of Policy EN1) don't change when reverting back to the existing policy the costs associated with achieving 20% above the Building Regulations Target Emissions Rate, Part L 2013 (i.e. Part (ii) of Policy EN1) are significantly less. Based on research undertaken by Evora Edge on behalf of Guildford Borough Council (April 2017), the additional construction costs associated with achieving 20% above the Building Regulation Target Emissions Rate range between 0.41 to 0.49% of the percentage difference in cost.
98. To understand the impact of these costs changes with respect to Part (ii) of Policy EN1 further viability testing has been undertaken. The results of this exercise demonstrate that reverting back to the original CS Policy EN1 will improve overall viability across all areas of the City. Even taking a worst-case scenario (i.e. cost increases of 0.49 %) the Greenfield market values increase by between circa 3% and 10.5%. A similar trend is evident with respect to Brownfield sites with values increasing by between circa 3% and 8%. Land Values in Zone 2a almost double. Reverting back to the existing EN1 Policy will improve viability and actually lessen the cumulative impact of the other suggested policy changes within the CSSR, especially within Zone 3 (Inner Area) and Zone 4 (City Centre).
99. Subject to MM23, Policy EN1 is justified. As a consequence of the MMs to Policy EN1, it is also necessary to delete the proposed amendment to Policy EN4 'District Heating' which refers to Policy EN1, effectively also reverting to the original text of ENV4 [**MM25**]. This will ensure Policy EN4 remains effective.
100. To ensure the relationship and application of Policy EN1 and EN2 'Sustainable Design and Construction' are clear and thus effective, a MM is required to the supporting text to clarify that the requirements for energy efficiency are not simply contained within the Building Regulations but also Policy EN1 [**MM24**].
101. Policy EN2 requires residential developments of 10 dwellings or more to meet a maximum water consumption standard of 110 litres per person per day. All new homes already have to meet the mandatory national standard set out in the Building Regulations (of 125 litres/person/day). However, Paragraph 14 of the PPG states: 'Where there is a clear local need, local planning authorities can set out Local Plan policies requiring new dwellings to meet the tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres/person/day'. The PPG goes on to explain how local planning authorities should establish a clear need.

⁴ Section 5 (paras 5.46 to 56.54 inclusive of Tables 9 and 10) of the EVS Update 2018 (CD2/8)

It refers to various primary sources of evidence to support higher / lower water consumption requirements of which water stress classification is one. All of the other sources referred to are contained in the Council's evidence. Since the Environment Agency water stress classifications of 2013, Yorkshire area has suffered drought. In particular unusual high and prolonged demand for water over a number of weeks was experienced in the area in 2018, suggesting an increase in the levels of water stress over and above those classified in 2013.

102. Based on the suite of evidence available, the need for a requirement to meet the optional building regulations requirement of 110 litres per person per day is justified by the evidence. Policy EN2 is sound.

Issue 8 – Whether new Policy EN8 (electric vehicle charging infrastructure) is effective and justified?

103. Paragraph 35 of the NPPF states that applications for development should 'incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles'. Consistent with national policy, Policy EN8 requires applications for all new residential development that include provision of parking spaces, to provide electric vehicle charging points.
104. In December 2015 Leeds was identified by DEFRA as one of six locations in England that is not expected to meet air quality standards by 2020. Leeds has to take action to improve air quality and is committed to the introduction of a suite of measures to do this, including a Clean Air Zone and electric vehicle charging points. The Government's Clean Air Zone Framework, May 2017 sets out the role of the local planning authority in delivering the Clean Air Zone which states that land use planning can 'encourage more sustainable behaviour, for example in the way people use electric vehicles'. To achieve this the Council wants to ensure that the infrastructure is in place to encourage more people to choose to drive electric vehicles and to ensure that the provision of charging infrastructure keeps pace with electric vehicle uptake. This accords with the Leeds Best Council Plan ambition to provide 21st Century infrastructure, including for improving air quality and reducing emissions.
105. Nationally, the number of electric vehicles on UK roads is increasing. Projections from Go Ultra Low (Part of the Government's Office for Low Emission Vehicles) see 50% of all new vehicles being plug in by 2027, which is well within the life of the EN8 policy. The Government has announced its intention for no more petrol and diesel cars to be sold by 2040. Leeds City Council therefore recognises that it needs to be ready for this by ensuring that the charging infrastructure is in place as the stock of homes which are built now will have a life beyond the plan period and it will be more expensive and inefficient to retro-fit the necessary infrastructure once dwellings are built. At present, 70% of all charging is done at home, 10% at the workplace and 20% is done using public chargers (Tom Callow, Chargemaster, 2018), the EN8 Policy will increase provision for home-charging reflecting the desire for home-owners to be able to charge at home. The National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) is guiding the installation of electric vehicle charge points. The NIC provides recommendations for Local Authorities regarding electric vehicle charging points and has ambitious targets.

106. There is a clear need and justification for a policy that requires electric vehicle charging points to be provided at dwellings, to enable home charging, given in particular the air quality mandate applicable to Leeds.
107. Policy EN8 requires one charging point per parking space and 1 charging point per 10 visitor spaces. However, the EVS assessed the impact of this policy on the assumption of 1 charging point per dwelling and 1 charging point for 10 apartments finding the impacts to be negligible. In addressing the difference, it was argued that the EVS was conservative in its approach and that at a strategic level not all developments would have more than one car parking space in any event; indeed, some would have none. Apartments will require one vehicle charging point per 10 apartments but again, in reality, some apartment schemes won't provide any car parking spaces. Accordingly, the assessment may well have taken a cautious approach as suggested by the Council with respect to Policy EN8 particularly within the City Centre (Zone 4). The viability assessment of 1 vehicle charging point per 10 apartments therefore remains valid.
108. A further assessment of how the costs might change for non-apartment schemes (i.e. traditional housing developments) when the costs are based on the assumption of 1 charging point per space rather than 1 charging point per dwelling has been undertaken. The EVS assumed a cost of £100 per charging point.
109. This additional work concludes that whilst the costs associated with Policy EN8 will inevitably increase if a charging point is required for every parking point, these additional costs will not impact on the overall viability considerations set out in the EVS for two reasons. Firstly, the additional costs are significantly less than the cost savings created by reverting back to the existing Policy EN1. The net impact is therefore still a cost saving. Secondly, the costs included for Policy EN2 within the EVS update are significantly inflated. The EVS assumed a cost of £220 per property reflecting water elements of Code Level 3. This was based on research undertaken by Waterwise. The Housing Standards review Consultation - Impact Assessment (August 2013)⁵ suggest costs of £43 per flat and £68 per dwelling. The Environment Agency estimates the cost of achieving 110 l/p/d compared to achieving the baseline building regulations standard (125 l/p/d) to be between £0-£9 per dwelling. Therefore, the cost savings associated with Policy EN2 (which could remove all of the costs included within the EVS update (£200 per dwelling) could mitigate a significant proportion of any cost increases associated with Policy EN8.
110. The original viability assessment did show some difficulties within Zone 2 (& 2a on larger sites). The Council submit that a scheme would not be unviable even though the bench mark land value contained in the EVS would not be met because the bench mark land value is set low - the viability of Zone 2a is based solely on a low value beacon settlement (Middleton) which does not represent the whole zone.
111. The policy wording requires some modification to ensure it is expressed clearly and thus effective [MM26]. I am otherwise satisfied that the requirements of

⁵ Table 12 (Page 23)

Policy EN8 are justified, viable and would not compromise the delivery of schemes.

Issue 9 - whether the revised approach to policies G4, G5 and G6 (Green Space) is justified?

112. Evidence gathered by the Council shows that the current adopted Policy G4 'New Green Space Provision' that requires 80 square metres of green space per unit for schemes of 10 units or more, is not delivering effectively. It is therefore appropriate to review the policy. The proposed policy sets out the amount of green space required per unit for developments of 10 dwellings or more, based on an increasing scale commensurate with the number of bedrooms. Where this quantity is unachievable or inappropriate on site, equivalent off-site provision, financial contribution or combinations thereof should be sought.
113. The Council initially viability tested four options of 20, 40, 60 and 80 square metres of green space provision; the proposed policy resulting in an outcome almost identical to 40 square metres. Not surprisingly, viability improves as the amount of open space per dwelling decreases. At 40 square metres of open space per dwelling the reduction in greenfield land values ranges between 14% and 18%, still well within acceptable limits (outside of zone 2a). However, the land values generated for large sites in Zone 2b become marginal. This therefore appears to be the greatest requirement for green space that could be justified and be effective.
114. The policy wording requires some modification to ensure it is expressed clearly and is, thus, effective [**MM21**, **MM22**]. In addition, to ensure there is no tension with green space site requirements that are specific to sites in the Site Allocations Plan (SAP) or Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan, a MM is required to confirm that the site-specific requirement will take precedence [**MM21**]. Subject to these modifications, revised Policy G4 is justified.
115. The proposed revision to Policy G5 'Open Space Provision in the City Centre' relates to commuted sums in lieu of on-site provision. At present, contributions are prioritised for the City Centre Park and new pedestrianisation. The revision will broaden this to contributions towards identified open space and public realm projects.
116. This is justified, the Council submits, because in the context of a dynamic City Centre with considerable levels of housing development identified and allocated through the SAP, it will be important for the Council to have flexibility in how in-lieu contributions may be spent. It is also relevant to note that when the CS was adopted in November 2014 the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) had not been adopted in Leeds. The wording of Policy G5 reflected an intention to pool development contributions that could be prioritised on the City Centre Park and pedestrianisation. The introduction of CIL essentially caps the pooling of those contributions. It is therefore necessary and appropriate to broaden the definition of open space improvements that contributions can be directed to. Policy G5 applies to the whole of the City Centre whereas pedestrianisation is focussed on limited locations and the City Centre Park is in one location, which whilst a Council

priority, is focussed on the south of the City Centre. Therefore, broadening the definition of types of in-lieu provision will make it easier to ensure that projects can be reasonably related to development schemes that are making a contribution.

117. I consider the changes to the Policy G5 reflect the most reasonable and appropriate strategy to ensure that the City Centre contributions are spent where they are needed the most in relation to current priorities. It is therefore justified.

118. Finally, turning to Policy G6 'Protection and redevelopment of existing Green Space' the revision adds "pedestrian corridors" to City Centre Open Space falling under the control of this policy. This continues the protection of pedestrian corridors in the City Centre consistent with still extant Unitary Development Plan policies. In ensuring consistency with the other parts of the adopted development plan the revision is therefore justified.

Assessment of Legal Compliance

119. My examination of the legal compliance of the Plan is summarised below.

120. The CSSR has been prepared in accordance with the Council's Local Development Scheme.

121. Consultation on the CSSR and the MMs was carried out in compliance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.

122. Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out and is adequate.

123. The Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment Screening Report (as revised) in June 2018 justifiably sets out why an AA is not necessary.

124. The CSSR includes policies designed to secure that the development and use of land in the local planning authority's area contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change such as Policies EN2 and EN8.

125. The CSSR complies with all other relevant legal requirements, including in the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations.

126. I have had due regard to the aims expressed in S149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. This has included my consideration of several matters during the examination including the provision of accessible and adaptable housing.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

127. The Plan has a number of deficiencies in respect of soundness for the reasons set out above, which mean that I recommend non-adoption of it as submitted, in accordance with Section 20(7A) of the 2004 Act. These deficiencies have been explored in the main issues set out above.

128. The Council has requested that I recommend MMs to make the Plan sound and capable of adoption. I conclude that with the recommended main modifications set out in the Appendix the Core Strategy Selective Review Local

Plan satisfies the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria for soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Claire Sherratt

Inspector

This report is accompanied by an Appendix containing the Main Modifications.

Appendix – Main Modifications

The modifications below are expressed either in the conventional form of ~~strikethrough~~ for deletions and underlining for additions of text, or by specifying the modification in words in *italics*.

The page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the Publication Draft Plan (CD2-1) and do not take account of the deletion or addition of text.

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
MM1	1	New	<p><u>Updating the Core Strategy</u></p> <p>i. <u>The Core Strategy was originally adopted in November 2014</u></p> <p>ii. <u>An update of the Core Strategy was adopted in 2019, which focussed on the following selected areas of policy:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Reviewing the housing requirement in Policy SP6, with a Plan period of 2017 – 2033</u> • <u>Consequential changes to Policy SP7 concerning housing distribution</u> • <u>Introducing new minimum space standards for new housing in Policy H9 and new accessibility standards in Policy H10</u> • <u>Updating policy requirements for affordable housing by amending Policy H5</u> • <u>Reviewing the requirement for Green Space in new housing developments by amending Policy G4 and making minor amendments to Policies G5 and G6</u> • <u>Incorporating new national policy regarding Code for Sustainable Homes by updating the wording of Policy EN2</u> • <u>Introducing a new Policy for Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Policy EN8</u> <p>iii. <u>The updated policies and text have been incorporated into this single updated Core Strategy Document</u></p> <p>iv. <u>It should be noted that the Plan period of 2017 - 2033 applies to Policy SP6. The percentages relating to the distribution of housing land and allocations contained in Policy SP7 apply to the period 2012 to 2033. Other Policies of the plan adopted in 2014 continue to work to the original plan period of 2012 - 2028. These include policies SP9 and EC2 which set out the required quantities of general employment and office space; policy H7 which sets the quantity of accommodation required for Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and policy EN6 which sets out quantities of waste to be planned for.</u></p>
MM2	3	Para 4.6.1	<p>It is anticipated that the population of Leeds will rise from <u>784,458 in 2017 to 856,819 in 2033</u> 755,136 in 2010 to 860,618 in 2028.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
MM3	3	Para 4.6.3	Spatial Policy 6 sets out the housing requirement for Leeds over the period 2017 – 2033. The requirement draws upon evidence of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2017 and Government consultation paper “Building the Right Homes in the Right Places”. The policy will be implemented through the identification of land supply in the Site Allocations Plan and a Housing Implementation Strategy. <u>Regard will be had also to past delivery of housing within each HMCA between 1st April 2012 and 31st March 2017.</u>
MM4	3-4	Para 4.6.4, Para 4.6.5 and Policy SP6	Para 4.6.4: The net requirement of 51,952 dwellings is converted to a gross requirement by taking account of the anticipated loss of dwellings over the plan period, estimated as 150 dwellings per annum based on recent trends of demolition in Leeds. To account for demolitions and other dwelling losses of 150 dwellings per annum (2,400 over the plan period) the gross housing requirement for the plan period of 2017-2033 is <u>54,352</u> 53,856 dwellings. Last sentence of Para 4.6.5: This stock of supply reduces the level of land to identify from <u>54,352</u> 53,856 dwellings (gross) to <u>46,352</u> 45,856 dwellings (gross). Third sentence of Policy SP6: Guided by the Settlement Hierarchy, the Council will identify <u>46,352</u> 45,856 dwellings (gross) to support the distribution in Spatial Policy 7
MM5	4	After Para 4.6.5 insert a new paragraph	New paragraph 4.6.6: <u>In reflecting the wider and longer term aspirations of the District (and its City Region role) the housing requirement takes into account the benefits of economic uplift. However, the Council will need to closely monitor the delivery and implementation of the housing requirement, including the roles and responsibilities of house builders throughout Leeds, seek to ensure effective build-out rates and assess any causes of under-delivery. Notwithstanding this, departure from the European Union, could potentially impact upon these aspirations, requiring a local solutions approach. This overall approach is intended to ensure that the City is as resilient as possible in delivering agreed priorities whilst managing unforeseen change against the context of national planning policy and its penalties for under delivery.</u>
MM6	4	Policy SP6	Revision to criterion vii: <u>Avoiding areas of flood risk and only where this is not possible, then mitigating flood risk</u> Generally avoiding or mitigating areas of flood risk.
MM7	8	Para 5.2.20 – Publication Draft CSSR	Applicants may choose to submit <u>demonstrate via</u> individual viability appraisals to verify that there are exceptional site circumstances which mean the affordable housing target cannot be met on specific schemes. In such cases, <u>where evidence in accordance with the National Planning Guidance principles for carrying out a viability assessment is submitted, a departure from the affordable housing provision may be reduced accordingly policy may be justified.</u> Where developments are expected to take more than five years to complete, the Council will normally expect

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			permitted schemes to make provision for a review of the scheme's viability, to determine whether the level of affordable housing being provided across the scheme as a whole is appropriate. The Government currently expects Local Plan policies to be reviewed after 5 years and the minimum targets set out in Policy H5 are likely to be reviewed in any event as part of this process.
MM8	9	Policy H5	Add a paragraph after iii) <u>Departures from this policy should be justified by evidence of viability considerations</u>
MM9	9	Policy H5	POLICY H5: AFFORDABLE HOUSING; On major* housing developments of 10 or more new dwellings , affordable housing provision should be provided on-site at the target levels specified in the following zones: And insert foot note; * Major development means either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>provision of 10 or more dwellings (or where the number of dwellings is not known, development is to be carried out on a site having an area of 0.5 hectares or more) or</u> • <u>provision of a building or buildings where the floor space to be created would be 1,000 square metres or more;</u> • <u>or development on a site having an area of 1 hectare or more;</u>
MM10	9	Policy H5	Change policy wording below as follows: ii) on-site, the percentage of affordable housing specified for zones 1-4 and mix of Intermediate and Social Rented types of affordable housing set out in the first paragraphs of this Policy <u>at affordable housing benchmark rents administered by either a registered provider or a management company with appropriate arrangements for identifying households in need, including City Council nomination rights, which apply in perpetuity or</u>
MM11	11	Insert at end of para 5.2.46 – Publication Draft CSSR	Insert ' <u>Any future changes to Government Guidance on NDSS will be taken into account in decision making in planning applications</u> '
MM12	12	New paragraph after 5.2.46 – Publication Draft CSSR	<u>Applicants may choose to demonstrate via individual viability appraisals that there are exceptional site circumstances which mean the minimum space standards cannot be met on specific schemes. In such cases, where evidence in accordance with the National Planning Guidance principles for carrying out a viability assessment is submitted, a departure from Policy H9 may be justified.</u>
MM13	12	Policy H9 wording	Change policy wording as below: POLICY H9 MINIMUM SPACE STANDARDS All new dwellings should <u>must</u> comply with the following standards:

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
MM14	12	Policy H9 wording	Insert paragraph after criteria a. – i. <u>Departures from this policy should be justified by evidence of viability considerations</u>
MM15	12	Policy H9 table column 3, row 2 and footnote	Replace 39 (37) ² with 39 (37)* Insert footnote reference*; <u>*Where a one person flat has a shower room rather than a bathroom, the floor area may be reduced from 39m² to 37m².</u>
	13	Policy H9 note iii	Delete footnote iii Any other area that is used solely for storage and has a headroom of 900-1500mm (such as under eaves) is counted at 50% of its floor area, and any area lower than 900mm is not counted at all
	13	Policy H9 note iv	Delete footnote iv Built in wardrobes and en suite bathrooms count towards the Gross Internal Area and bedroom floor area requirements, but should not reduce the effective width of the room below the minimum widths set out above. The built in area in excess of 0.72m² in a double bedroom and 0.36m² in a single bedroom counts towards the built in storage requirement
MM16	15	Insert at end of paragraph 5.2.52 Publication Draft CSSR	Insert at end of para 5.2.52, <u>In most cases it is expected that market housing for sale and specific affordable dwellings provided through planning requirements will be wheelchair adaptable. Only where Leeds City Council is nominating a wheelchair user as an occupier will wheelchair accessible dwellings be required.</u>
	16	Policy H10	Change policy wording as below: <u>2% of dwellings meet the requirement of M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings' of Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations wheelchair user dwellings', wheelchair adaptable or accessible dwellings. Wheelchair user dwellings should meet the M4(3) wheelchair adaptable dwelling standard unless Leeds City Council is responsible for nominating a person to live in the dwelling</u>
MM17	16	New paragraph after 5.2.57 – Publication Draft CSSR	<u>Applicants may choose to demonstrate via individual viability appraisals that there are exceptional site circumstances which mean the accessible housing requirements cannot be met on specific schemes. In such cases, where evidence in accordance with the National Planning Guidance principles for carrying out a viability assessment is submitted, a departure from Policy H10 may be justified.</u>
MM18	16	Policy H10	<u>30% of dwellings meet the requirements of M4(2) volume 1 of Part M of the Building Regulations 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' of Part M Volume 1 of the Building Regulations.</u>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			2% <u>of</u> dwellings meet the requirement of M4(3) of Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations 'wheelchair user dwellings', wheelchair adaptable or accessible dwellings of Part M Volume 1 of the Building Regulations.
MM19	16	Policy H10	<p>Any requirement above 0.5 would require a single dwelling for both M4(2) and M4(3)</p> <p>Where the scale of development would generate more than one accessible dwelling, the mix of sizes, types and tenures of <u>M4(2) and M4(3) dwellings</u> accessible housing should reflect the mix of sizes, types and tenures of the development as a whole as closely as possible (unless there is evidenced need for additional accessible housing in one particular tenure).</p> <p>The required number and, mix <u>and location</u> of accessible dwellings should be clearly illustrated on drawings and via planning condition.</p>
MM20	16	Policy H10 wording	<p>Change policy wording as below:</p> <p>Where the scale of development would generate more than one accessible dwelling, the mix of sizes, types and tenures of M4(2) and M4(3) dwellings should reflect the mix of sizes, types and tenures of the development as a whole as closely as possible (unless there is evidenced need for additional accessible housing in one particular tenure). <u>(unless the applicant can demonstrate an evidenced need locally to provide accessible housing in dwellings of a particular size, type and / or tenure)</u>. <u>Locally will normally mean the Designated Neighbourhood Area, or where this is not defined, will mean relevant settlement, or ward if the site lies within the main urban area.</u></p> <p>Insert paragraph at end of policy: <u>Departures from this policy should be justified by evidence of viability considerations</u></p>
MM21	22	Policy G4 text	<p>Add footnote to end of paragraph. 'Residential developments of 10 dwellings or more will be <u>required</u> expected to provide the following quantities of on-site green space per residential unit or where this quantity of green space is unachievable or inappropriate on-site, equivalent offsite provision, financial contribution or combinations thereof should be sought¹:</p> <p><u>¹. Where conflict arises between the requirements of Policy G4 and any specific green space site requirements in either the Site Allocations Plan or Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan, then the specific site requirements within the Allocations Plans will take precedence</u></p>
MM22	22	Para 5.5.14	<p>5.5.14 Factors favouring <u>requiring</u> on-site provision include <u>one or more of the following</u>:</p> <p>i) Local deficits of existing green space,</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
		Policy G4	<p>ii) Sufficiently large, suitably shaped and reasonably level sites to accommodate green space, iii) Distances from existing green spaces exceeding the standards of Policy G3. The quality of existing green space will also need to be taken into account, iv) Lack of other residential development sites nearby that could deliver green space, v) The development generating a need for play facilities that does not currently exist in the locality, <u>or</u>, vi) Potential to combine green space provision with requirements for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.</p> <p>Where the factors of paragraph 5.5.14 <u>require</u> expect green space to be provided on site:</p>
MM23	28-34	Para 5.5.38 – 5.5.45.	<p>Delete proposed amendments to Policy EN1 and supporting text of the Core Strategy Selective Review (proposed paras 5.5.38 to 5.5.44 of CD2/1) so that Core Strategy remains as follows (showing current Adopted CS numbering):</p> <p><u>Climate Change</u></p> <p><u>5.5.31 The Climate Change Act 2008 established a new approach to managing and responding to climate change in the UK. The Act created a legally binding target to reduce the UK's emissions of greenhouse gases to at least 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. This is delivered through a series of five year 'carbon budgets', designed to ensure that the Council make steady progress towards this long term target. A carbon budget is a cap on the total quantity of greenhouse gas emissions emitted in the UK over a specified time. Under a system of carbon budgets, every tonne of greenhouse gas emitted between now and 2050 will count. Where emissions rise in one sector, corresponding falls in another sector will have to be achieved</u></p> <p><u>5.5.32 In May 2009, the Government introduced legislation creating the first three legally binding carbon budgets. The budgets are 2008-2012 (22% reduction in CO₂ emissions below 1990 levels), 2013-2017 (28% reduction) and 2018-2022 (34% reduction).</u></p> <p><u>5.5.33 These carbon budgets, whilst owned and delivered at a national level, will have a profound effect on all activities at a local level. Policy tools and financial incentives have been put in place to drive down emissions from transport, housing and business across the country. Building Regulations have introduced tighter CO₂ targets and a trajectory has been put in place to reduce emissions from new housing to zero by 2016, and from non-domestic development to zero by 2019. As Leeds is forecast to grow both in terms of housing numbers and new business premises, it is particularly important to ensure that these are as close to zero emission as possible, as soon as</u></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p>possible, to avoid the need for deeper cuts in other sectors. 5.5.34 The Leeds Climate Change Strategy (2009) was developed through the Leeds Initiative in partnership with the public, private and third sector. This contains a target to reduce emissions from Leeds by 80% between 1990 and 2050. In 2010, the Council adopted a further target to reduce emissions by 40% between 2005 and 2020. In the four years to 2009, the City reduced emissions by 14.4%, requiring a further reduction of approximately 2.5% per year until 2020. Leeds is a growing City and all new development that is not carbon neutral adds to total emissions from Leeds (both on site emissions and emissions associated with transport). Therefore, there is a strong policy imperative to constrain emissions from all development as soon as possible. 5.5.35 The Core Strategy climate change Policies are designed so that new development contributes to our ambitious carbon reduction targets. However, the Council aim to do this in a flexible way that supports developers to achieve carbon reductions at lowest cost and in a way that benefits future building occupants. Building Regulations set a minimum energy efficiency standard applicable to all buildings, and in order to keep on track to achieve the 2050 target, the Government will increase this standard over the next decade. Developers currently have to demonstrate that proposed developments are within the Target Emissions Rate. However, because of the need to maintain a decent standard of living in the face of significant growth, the Council is seeking a 20% CO₂ reduction beyond the Building Regulation standard. Energy efficient buildings also reduce household fuel bills (and support initiatives for 'affordable warmth'), improve business competitiveness and create jobs in the energy service sectors. Economies of scale mean that energy efficiency measures are less costly on larger developments, and the policies are, therefore, only applied to 'major development.' It is important to note that Policy EN1(i) is highly flexible, allowing developers to choose the most appropriate and cost effective carbon reduction solution for their site. We would expect developers to take a 'fabric first' approach and, over time, supplement this with increasing levels of on-site District heating and low/zero carbon technologies. It must be remembered that the cost implications of installing carbon reduction measures are much lower when included in a new building than when they are retrofitted.</p> <p>POLICY EN1: CLIMATE CHANGE – CARBON DIOXIDE REDUCTION All developments of 10 dwellings or more, or over 1,000 square metres of floorspace, (including conversion where feasible), will be required to: (i) Reduce total predicted carbon dioxide emissions to achieve 20% less than the Building Regulations Target Emission Rate until 2016 when all development should be zero carbon, and (ii) Provide a minimum of 10% of the predicted energy needs</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p><u>of the development from low carbon energy. Carbon dioxide reductions achieved through criteria (ii) will contribute to meeting criteria (i). Criteria (ii) will be calculated against the emissions rate predicted by criteria (i) so reducing overall energy demand by taking a fabric first approach will reduce the amount of renewable capacity required. If it can be demonstrated that decentralised renewable or low carbon energy generation is not practical on or near the proposed development, it may be acceptable to provide a contribution equivalent to the cost of providing the 10%, which the council will use towards an off-site low carbon scheme. The opportunity to aggregate contributions to deliver larger scale low carbon projects would be implemented independent of the development. Wherever possible, the low carbon projects would be linked with local projects that would bring local benefits. It is likely that the approach of pooling off-site contributions through planning obligations will be replaced by CIL in April 2014. Applicants will be required to submit an Energy Assessment with their application based on expected end user requirements to demonstrate compliance with this Policy. Where end user requirements change significantly, an updated EA should be submitted prior to construction.</u></p>
MM24	32	<p>Para 5.5.45- Publication Draft CSSR</p> <p>New paragraph after para 5.5.46 – Publication Draft CSSR</p>	<p>Amend para 5.5.45 of CD2/1 to read as follows: <u>"...For residential development, requirements for energy efficiency are contained within the Building Regulations and Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy."</u></p> <p>Insert the following paragraph after paragraph 5.5.46 of the Plan</p> <p><u>'5.5.47 Growth in Leeds means extra demand for water. Additionally, climate change predictions indicate an increasingly erratic weather pattern which is likely to lead to extreme weather events including droughts. For these reasons Leeds expects all major residential development to meet the tighter optional water standard in building regulations as required by Policy EN2.'</u></p>
MM25	34	Policy EN4	<p>Delete proposed amendment to Policy EN4 which makes reference to Policy EN1 so that the final part of Policy EN4 is unchanged from the Adopted CS and reads as follows: <u>Carbon savings and renewable energy generation achieved under this policy will contribute to EN1(i) and EN1(ii).</u></p>
MM26	36	<p>Policy EN8 i)</p> <p>Policy EN8 iii)</p>	<p>i) Residential: 1 charging point per dedicated parking space and where parking spaces are unallocated (for example visitor parking) 1 charging point per 10 <u>visitor</u> spaces</p> <p>iii) Motorway Service Stations: charging points for 10% of parking spaces <u>ensuring that electricity</u></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification														
			<u>infrastructure is sufficient to enable further points to be added at a later stage</u>														
MM27	146	Para 5.2.13 Appendix 2 Glossary (Affordable Housing only)	<p>Add wording "See definitions in Affordable Housing Definitions Table at the end of glossary" after the wording "...defined in the NPPF" in paragraph 5.2.13 of the CSSR</p> <p>Add the following Table to the Glossary:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Affordable Housing definition Table</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Policy H5 (Broad Definition)</th> <th>Policy H5 (Detailed Types)</th> <th>Conformity with NPPF 2018 Annex 2 Glossary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Social Rent or equivalent tenures. This is housing rented at rates which are generally affordable to households in the lower decile of earnings. Benchmark transfer prices and rents are published annually to reflect affordability for lower decile earners in Leeds</td> <td>Social rent</td> <td>a) Affordable housing for rent. (a) the rent is set in accordance with the Government's rent policy for Social Rent</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Equivalent tenures.</td> <td>a) Affordable housing for rent. (a) the rent is set in accordance with the Government's rent policy for Affordable Rent</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Intermediate or equivalent tenures. This is housing made available at below market rents or prices which are generally affordable to</td> <td>Intermediate or submarket rent – the intermediate affordable units are rented out at rents above those of social rent but below market rents.</td> <td>a) Affordable housing for rent. (a) Or is at least 20% below local market rents (including service charges where applicable)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Affordable Housing definition Table			Policy H5 (Broad Definition)	Policy H5 (Detailed Types)	Conformity with NPPF 2018 Annex 2 Glossary	Social Rent or equivalent tenures. This is housing rented at rates which are generally affordable to households in the lower decile of earnings. Benchmark transfer prices and rents are published annually to reflect affordability for lower decile earners in Leeds	Social rent	a) Affordable housing for rent. (a) the rent is set in accordance with the Government's rent policy for Social Rent	Equivalent tenures.	a) Affordable housing for rent. (a) the rent is set in accordance with the Government's rent policy for Affordable Rent	Intermediate or equivalent tenures. This is housing made available at below market rents or prices which are generally affordable to	Intermediate or submarket rent – the intermediate affordable units are rented out at rents above those of social rent but below market rents.	a) Affordable housing for rent. (a) Or is at least 20% below local market rents (including service charges where applicable)
Affordable Housing definition Table																	
Policy H5 (Broad Definition)	Policy H5 (Detailed Types)	Conformity with NPPF 2018 Annex 2 Glossary															
Social Rent or equivalent tenures. This is housing rented at rates which are generally affordable to households in the lower decile of earnings. Benchmark transfer prices and rents are published annually to reflect affordability for lower decile earners in Leeds	Social rent	a) Affordable housing for rent. (a) the rent is set in accordance with the Government's rent policy for Social Rent															
	Equivalent tenures.	a) Affordable housing for rent. (a) the rent is set in accordance with the Government's rent policy for Affordable Rent															
Intermediate or equivalent tenures. This is housing made available at below market rents or prices which are generally affordable to	Intermediate or submarket rent – the intermediate affordable units are rented out at rents above those of social rent but below market rents.	a) Affordable housing for rent. (a) Or is at least 20% below local market rents (including service charges where applicable)															

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification		
			<p>households in the lower quartile of earnings. Benchmark transfer prices and rents are published annually to reflect affordability for lower quartile earners in Leeds.</p>	<p>Shared equity/shared ownership – the occupier buys part of the house and pays a discounted rent on the remaining part, which is owned by a RSL.</p>	<p>c) Discounted market sales housing: is that sold at a discount of at least 20% below local market value. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Provisions should be in place to ensure housing remains at a discount for future eligible households. d) Other affordable routes to home ownership: is housing provided for sale that provides a route to ownership for those who could not achieve home ownership through the market. It includes shared ownership, relevant equity loans, other low cost homes for sale (at a price equivalent to at</p>
				<p>Low cost homes for sale / discounted sale – the occupier buys the house at a fixed percentage below its cost on the open market. When the house is sold on, this same percentage discount is passed on to the next buyer</p>	

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification		
					<p>least 20% below local market value) and rent to buy (which includes a period of intermediate rent). Where public grant funding is provided, there should be provisions for the homes to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for any receipts to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision, or refunded to Government or the relevant authority specified in the funding agreement.</p>