

# Public Document Pack

CITY PLANS PANEL  
9<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2014

Supplementary document for agenda items 7 and 8 – Application 14/01660/OT – Land east of Otley Road Adel and Application 14/01874/OT – Land off Church Lane Adel

This page is intentionally left blank



**Report of the Chief Planning Officer**

**CITY PLANS PANEL**

**Date: 9<sup>th</sup> October 2014**

**Subject: APPLICATIONS 14/01660/OT AND 14/01874/OT - OUTLINE APPLICATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON TWO PARCELS OF LAND FOR UP TO 80 DWELLINGS AND UP TO 46 DWELLINGS EAST OF OTLEY ROAD AND OFF CHURCH LANE, ADEL ON A PROTECTED AREA OF SEARCH ( PAS) SITE**

**UPDATE REPORT**

<p><b>Electoral Ward Affected:</b></p> <p><b>Adel &amp; Wharfedale</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No Ward Members consulted (referred to in report)</p>	<p><b>Specific Implications For:</b></p> <p>Equality and Diversity <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Community Cohesion <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Narrowing the Gap <input type="checkbox"/></p>
--	--

**UPDATE TO MAIN REPORT ON HIGHWAY MATTERS**

- 1.0 Since the Panel Paper has been published a letter from the Managing Director of Barratt / David Wilson ( BDW) Homes has been received requesting that the report on 14/01847/OT where they are applicants be withdrawn from the City Plans Panel agenda of 9th October to enable highway modelling relating to the NGT proposals on the A660 corridor to be completed by the NGT team, work which has been funded by BDW Homes and which has not yet been completed or feedback given. As such BDW Homes consider it is unreasonable to refuse an application on potential highway impact when the work to model that impact has been funded by the applicants but the work is being carried out on behalf of the Council and is not complete.
- 1.1 Highways officers requested that the Developer's of the Adel and Bramhope PAS sites fund work by the NGT transport modelling consultant's to assess the impact of development of the PAS sites in Adel and Bramhope and committed development sites of the former Bodington Hall site and the Department for Work and Pensions

(DWP) sites. This work could not reasonably be carried out by the Transport Consultants for the development sites so a cost sharing agreement was made between the three landowners to cover the total estimated cost of the modelling work. This work was initiated by Leeds City Council on payment of part of the fee in July 2014. The applicant has funded some modelling work by the NGT team's transport modellers to assess the impact of the scheme at the Church Lane / Farrer Lane / Otley Road, St Helen's Lane / Otley Road, Otley Old Road / Otley Road and Otley Road / Ring Road junctions. A preliminary output report was received from the NGT team in September 2014 with further work needed to address model assumptions relating to future development sites and background growth. A further meeting was held with the NGT team on 8th October and the results of the modelling work is expected to be available in the next few weeks. Until the results of the NGT modelling is fully understood it is recommended that reason 2 of both applications is amended to read the following:

***2. The Local Planning Authority considers that the applicant has so far failed to provide the necessary information to demonstrate that the proposals can be accommodated safely and satisfactorily on the local highway network in relation to impact on the proposed NGT junction designs.***

- 1.3 There are other aspects of the highways position which continue to be unresolved and so to cover the other impacts on the local highway network apart from NGT an additional reason is suggested to be added on both applications;

***The Local Planning Authority considers that the applicant has so far failed to provide the necessary information to demonstrate that the proposals can be accommodated safely and satisfactorily on the local highway network. Specific issues relate to the validity of the traffic count data used, the lack of future traffic growth applied to future year scenarios and validity of queue length modelling at the Church Lane / A660 junction. In addition no assessment has been made of impact at the Long Causeway / Adel Lane or Weetwood Lane / Ring Road junctions.***

- 1.4 Two further letters have recently been received from the Transport Consultant's Optima representing both BDW Homes and Hallam Land dated 7 October 2014. These letters respond to the Highway Authority's consultation response dated 23 September 2014 and the Plans Panel reports and make further responses which can be summarised as follows;

1. It is agreed to provide a surfaced pedestrian / cycle link to Church Lane which would emerge just south of the existing (northern) lay-by where a crossing facility would be provided to tie into the proposed Church Lane traffic calming scheme.
2. It is agreed to fund a traffic calming scheme on Church Lane between Holt Avenue and Back Church Lane (cost to be shared between both applicants).
3. A pedestrian / cycle access link will be provided to the boundary of the BDW Homes site to the south and to the boundary of the Hallam site to the north ( giving a pedestrian /cycle link between the two sites).

4. A £20,000 contribution towards a new northbound bus stop shelter on Otley Road and a real time information unit for the existing southbound shelter is agreed.
5. Agreement to provide Metrocards

They further state that they do not agree that the proposed Site Access signalised junction on Otley Road raises any capacity or highway safety concerns and include a revised junction design amending some design details including the extension of the 30mph limit some 140m north of the southbound stop line on the traffic controlled junction to ensure that queuing traffic from the proposed traffic signals does not extend outside the 30mph speed limit. They also agree to provide a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, but this is not currently available.

In relation to the dwellings accessed from Holt Avenue they do not agree that access should be limited to ten additional dwellings and that road capacity is sufficient.

Optima do not agree that the extent of junction modelling is inappropriate or that traffic growth should be considered beyond that associated with consented developments. They state that their junction modelling validates against the existing queue length shown on Google Mapping and provide traffic count data from Thursday 1st May 2014 for review. The consultant suggests that all modelled junctions are within capacity except for the Farrer Lane signals but that these can be brought back within capacity by amending the existing signal timings.

Other matters raised in the highways response can be dealt with by condition such as the construction access and management, the internal layout is a reserved matter and the travel plan will be contained within a S106 agreement.

- 1.5 The letters from the highways consultant were received very recently and have not yet been fully assessed. The offer now on the table is welcomed but is very late in the day. It is now considered that reason 4 suggested for both applications can be deleted subject to adding the words “cycle and pedestrian connections” in reason 5 of both applications in relation to the lack of a signed section106 agreement. This is because it is considered that the pedestrian and cycle connection concerns between the sites and how the sites connect with local facilities have been addressed in the latest highways consultants letter subject to them being delivered via a signed legal agreement.

## **2.0 Recommendation**

Members are asked to note the additional representations made on behalf of the applicants. Given the length of time the applications have been with the Council and that they are clearly contrary to policy N34 and the interim policy on the release of PAS sites with remaining concerns about highway matters it is recommended that both applications are refused without further delay. This does not prevent ongoing work to address the highway modelling and other highway concerns outside the application to address the reasons for refusal.

- 2.1 **14/01660/OT** - Refuse for reasons 1, 3 and 5 as set out on page 14 of the main agenda with the addition of the words “ cycle and pedestrian connections” after

“public transport” in reason 5 and the two additional reasons set out in bold type above in paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3.

- 2.2 **14/01874/OT** - Refuse for reasons 1,3 and 5 as set out on page 48 of the main agenda with the addition of the words “ cycle and pedestrian connections” after “ public transport” in reason 5 and the two additional reasons set out in bold type above in paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3.