

CITY PLANS PANEL – 9TH MAY 2013

**SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT FOR ITEM 12 –
APPLICATION 12/03401/OT – LAND AT FLEET LANE
OULTON LS26**

**THE ATTACHED REPORT SETS OUT FURTHER
REPRESENTATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN RECEIVED IN
RESPECT OF THIS APPLICATION**

This page is intentionally left blank



Originator:
Shameem Hussain
Tel: 0113 2478024

ADDENDUM

Report of the Chief Planning Officer

PLANS PANEL CITY

Date: 9th May 2013

Subject: Addendum reporting further additional representations received for Residential Development at Fleet Lane Application number 12/03401/OT

APPLICANT	DATE VALID	TARGET DATE
Hallam Land Management Ltd. DW Wilson and trustees of the Thurscaston Park Trust.	06.08.2012	05.05.2012

Electoral Wards Affected:
Rothwell

Yes Ward Members consulted (referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

ADDENDUM

Reporting further additional representations received for development at Fleet Lane

1.0 INTRODUCTION:

1.1 Further written representations have been received for Application 12/03401/OT Development at Fleet Lane. The following section outlines the representations received.

2.0 PUBLIC/LOCAL RESPONSE:

2.1 The Application was presented to City Plans Panel on the 11th April 2013. Members resolved to defer the application to allow residents and the local community the opportunity to submit their representations.

2.2 In addition to the representations outlined in the main report. The following further representations have been received:
To date a further 39 representations have been received with the following concerns and issues being raised:

- Cannot continually provide additional housing when facilities remain the same.
- Roads are very busy especially around the schools and station this will further add to it.
- Council have made a U turn when nothing has actually changed since it was turned down previously.
- Site retained as PAS. Council has approved build of 22,000 houses throughout the city. These should be considered before PAS land is considered.
- Farming land and should be retained for this purpose. Diversifying the rural economy and protecting the wildlife. Development will have a detrimental effect on the character of the conservation village.
- Services and recreational facilities cannot cope with the extra demand of more housing.
- Highway concerns of congestion and pollution.
- Developers maximising profit rather than doing what is right for the local community.
- Transport Infrastructure unable to accommodate extra demand.
- Local Path network provides a scenic route to walk.
- Oulton and Woodlesford are small settlements, quite distinct from the major settlement of Rothwell.
- As member of Oulton and Woodlesford Neighbourhood Forum, working hard to develop plan that will show where local people feel new housing should go. As the situation stands, it seems developers are in control and not the Council nor local people.
- Good quality agricultural land being destroyed which is needed for food production.
- Destroying panoramic views, and losing open feel to area.
- Council and community should have opportunity to assist in deciding where development should be allowed through the plan led system. Not in tune with Unitary Development Plan.
- Site is not sustainable, wholly dependent on the car.
- Developers concerned about financial gain and then walk away.
- Localised flooding of area, which will only be worsened.
- Effect of development on house price and ability to sell and move to more open aspect area.
- Oulton/Woodlesford was a village but now due to overbuild is becoming a town.
- Solar Panels on bungalows will be shrouded by two and half storey development and render panels useless.
- All promises in Travel Plan will have no impact on car usage.
- Developers will cherry pick PAS sites on ad hoc basis, lead to arbitrary free for all.

- Council must refuse this application to resist many more applications coming forward which would inevitably go to appeal.

Oulton and Woodlesford Neighbourhood Forum

- Pre-emptive attack on our neighbourhood plan, which we are now in the process of formulating. It is a central tenet of the Localism Act, that those who live and work or carry out business in a neighbourhood should play a dominant role in planning their future (within the framework of the local plan) and planning decisions should not be imposed from above (by developers) but there should be a bottom-up approach to planning. Approving this application would contradict requirements of the Localism Act.
- Our plan and not developers should decide our neighbourhoods housing policy.
- Fleet Lane scores badly on sustainability, Access to local facilities have been misrepresented by the applicant. Have measured distances to facilities and these have been underestimated by applicant.
- Aware that there is a number of cases that have gone to appeal, where the Inspector has agreed that a Neighbourhood Plan, even if not yet finalised, must have precedence. The Inspector has therefore found against the appeal and upheld the council's decision.
- Therefore urge that the application be refused for the above reasoning.

Oulton Society

Oulton Society wishes to make a further representation following AGM and large public meeting. Comments as follow:

- Interim Policy Criteria – carry little weight unlike approved Development policies and Supplementary Development Documents which would have substantial bearing at appeal.
- Criteria are subjective and wide open to interpretation by developers and landowners. In relation to Fleet Lane we strongly consider the site does not meet certain criteria.
- Interim Policy states that PAS sites will only be supported if the following criteria are met:

Locations must be well related to main urban area or major settlement in the settlement hierarchy as defined in the core strategy publication draft.

- No definition of the term "well related". We seek clarification, in absence of definition we consider the following points:
 - Fleet Lane site is not well related to urban area or major settlement of Rothwell
 - We have made representations on the core strategy previously.
 - This criterion discounts the possibility of PAS sites being released if they fall outside certain settlement hierarchy. This is discriminatory as we have not had a comparative analysis of all PAS sites to ascertain which should be considered.
- Criterion iv – we have seen no evidence that support the principle that housing land development opportunity is demonstrably lacking in Oulton.
- Criterion v- no clear binding linkage to the redevelopment of significant brownfield site in a regeneration area or proposals to address significant infrastructure deficits in the locality of site. This is a sensitive and valuable Greenfield site. If approved should be linked to such an agreement to send clear message that this is an important requirement of release.
- Criterion vi – Reduction of 5 years to two years is ineffectual. To put pressure on developers a minimum percentage of the development /houses ought to be built out and available to purchase in two years. Also vacant land tax.

- **Sustainability** – Fleet Lane site not sustainable
- **Economic role** -Considered for release at wrong time in councils local plan and work of neighbourhood Forums. Is pre-empting the plan led system taking place.
- **Social role** -Site not reflect community needs and will not be accessible to local services
- **Environmental role**-not protecting or enhancing the area and will increase waste and pollution and will not mitigate climate change as it is a car dependent site. Visually harm the locality. Otters and badgers have been noted on site, development will affect their existence and survival.
- Evidence around modes of transport presented to demonstrate the Applicants Transport Assessment is misleading and inaccurate.
- TA has no detailed evidence to show how Fleet Lane is well connected to Rothwell.
- Oulton and Woodlesford are just neighbourhood shopping parades spread over wide area requiring the car to travel between the facilities.
- All schools are distant and not convenient for students or families and would be accessed by car.
- Effect on landscape and visual amenity of area.
- Harm and consequences on land supply far outweigh the benefits.
- At present Local Plan and Neighbourhood plans are developer led, this is wrong and must be checked.
- Councils should be working with Local Forums to produce linked local and neighbourhood plans; premature applications must be resisted to prevent the process being undermined.
- Application contrary to many paragraphs of NPPF
- Society and Neighbourhood forum frustrated that advice is being disregarded in order to potentially boost the housing delivery by less than 0.4 % of the 5 year housing requirement on safeguarded land.
- Application does not satisfy certain policies.
- S106 needs revisiting and amending as not well thought out and requires local input.
- Questions regarding the site boundary.
- Request that the application be refused.

Alec Shelbrook MP for Elmet and Rothwell

Letter received 8th May 2013 addressed to Chair and City Panel members , with the following comments

- I write to you with reference to the suggested release of PAS land at Fleet Lane/Royds Lane in the Rothwell ward of my constituency. I have received a large number of complaints and representations from my constituents on this matter and I know you have also received representations from Ward Councillors in Rothwell. I am concerned as to whether the Council has undertaken a comprehensive and comparative analysis of all PAS sites in Leeds. This would put these safeguarded sites on a level playing field with comparable technical data from which a sound and effective assessment can be made as to which PAS sites are the most suitable for release. This is particularly important for data relating to the economic, social and environmental sustainability of all PAS sites.
- It is the view of my constituents that the Council and developers need an evidence base from which to assess PAS Sites; there would then be clear information to base applications against. Such data would lead to an impartial judgment being made on

the suitability of all PAS sites across Leeds. At present it seems that the whole system is subjective and biased towards selective sites without a valid evidence base, allowing developers to cherry pick PAS sites.

- My constituents in the Rothwell ward are of the view that should the Council have produced an evidence base on which to judge the merits of PAS site applications across the city they would be in a far stronger position to justify refusal or approval of applications as they come forward. As it is now, the fear of my constituents is that the Council has left itself wide open to PAS land applications coming forward across the city through a few biased criteria which would carry little weight at appeal. Likewise, the Council's interim policy criteria appear to be subjective and discriminatory; they are wide open to interpretation from developers who will be waiting in the wings for this latest decision. Approval will set up a dangerous precedent and a free for all across the city.
- I write with a plea to panel members to make the right decision for my constituents and recognise the strength of feeling in the community about this application; a strength of feeling shared cross-party by all elected members in the ward.

Background Papers:

Application number 12/03401/OT

Representations received

