

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 28TH OCTOBER, 2021

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors K Brooks, C Campbell, P Carlill,
D Cohen, R Finnigan, A Garthwaite,
C Gruen, G Latty, E Nash, N Walshaw and
B Anderson

SITE VISIT

A Members site visit was held in connection with Application No. 19/01988/RM - Reserved Matters application for the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for 450 new homes to land off Lane Side Farm, Victoria Road, Churwell, Morley, Leeds and was attended by the following Councillors: J McKenna, C Gruen, K Brooks, B Anderson, E Nash, C Campbell and R Finnigan

81 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

82 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public

There were no items which required the exclusion of the press or public.

83 Late Items

There were no late items of business identified.

84 Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

85 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors: D Blackburn and P Wadsworth.

Councillor B Anderson was in attendance as a substitute Member.

86 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Members considered the minutes of the previous meetings held on 30th September 2021.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meetings held on 30th September 2021 be approved as a true and correct record.

87 Matters Arising from the Minutes

There were no issues raised under matters arising.

88 Application No. 19/01988/RM - Reserved Matters application for the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for 450 new homes, pursuant to Outline Application 16/02988/OT Land off Lane Side Farm, Victoria Road, Churwell, Morley, Leeds

With reference to the meeting of 8th July 2021 and the decision to defer determination of the application to await further information on the drainage issues, clarification around the provision of a Primary School, details around biodiversity and climate change measures and further discussions to take place on design quality including the street scene.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which indicated that the applicant had discussed the above issues with the Local Planning Authority and had carried out further investigations and were now providing additional information to demonstrate that the proposal were acceptable in these regards.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

The Planning Case Officer addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal with emphasis on the following issues, raised previously, at the meeting held on 8th July 2021:

- Drainage Strategy
- Location of the School
- A further Ecological Assessment of the site
- An Energy Efficiency and Renewables Plan
- A Car Charging Point Schedule and a Highways Technical Note

The Planning Case Officer reported the receipt of 44 further representations from members of the public, there was also a further representation from former Councillor T Leadley. All representations received raised no new issues, all material considerations having been previously considered and dealt with.

Members raised the following questions to officers:

- Referring to the drainage requirements, Members asked if the run-off calculations had been finalised
- The provision of a school within the site, how many pupils would it accommodate and how many children could this development put into the school? What was the potential for the school use by those living in the surrounding area?

- There was one access road onto the site plus a track and entrance which could be used by emergency vehicles, were there any measures to be put in place to stop local residents using the emergency entrance
- The character/ design of the dwellings, was inspiration taken from the nearby 1970's buildings
- Would the build period for the whole site result in three different building standards (environmental policies we were in a period of transition)
- How would the off-site biodiversity area be managed
- The segregated cycle path and foot-links, what means would be put in place to stop motorists using segregated spaces or parking on the grass verges in between
- The first 50 dwellings would be constructed using existing building standards and would require retrofitting as new building standards are introduced, why not pause development to await the introduction of new standards, reducing the need to retrofit
- Would a fund be set aside by the developer to assist in the retrofitting of properties constructed in earlier phases.
- Would it be correct to assume that this development would not be sufficient to feed a two-form entry school, if that was the case, would a school be required
- If the school was not required (up to 10 years to make that decision) what would happen to the land after that
- Referring to the computer-generated images (CGI's) provided by the developer, it was suggested that the images presented may not resemble the finished development.
- It was highlighted that some dwellings would not be complete until 2030, could there be a requirement for future energy sources to be included
- A number of Members expressed disappointment with the design, the type/ colour of the materials to be used and layout of the scheme and asked if further discussions could take place with the developer
- Were there any measures to be included which would make it a safe area (Designing out crime)

In responding to the issues raised, officers and representatives of the applicant said:

- The Principal Engineer (Drainage) reported that the discharge had been fixed at 4.7 litres per second
- The Planning Manager (Children & Families) suggested the school would be a two-form entry accommodating up to 420 pupils. Based on 450 dwellings which would equate to 150 pupils, 16 per year group (Reception – Year 6)
- The LCC Highway Officer said full details were still awaited (Conditions 31 & 33 referred) but it was intended that bollards would be incorporated into the emergency access route to prevent general vehicular egress onto Victoria Road

- The LCC Design Officer suggested that a development of 450 dwellings would form its own character, the brick and stone detailing was not driven from one concept but would be linked to the wider area
- Members were informed that environmental policies and Building Regulations would change throughout the course of the build, resulting in new standards in terms of renewables and insulation
- The Principal Engineer (Drainage) said the intention and requirement was to produce a Management Plan for the entire site, the management for the off-site biodiversity area would be included within the plan following consultation with the ecology consultant
- The Planning Case officer said the segregated area could be controlled through Traffic Regulation Orders or alternatively by possible condition requiring a physical measure
- The applicant's representative said to pause the development (everything) to await the introduction of the new standards would be "taking a leap of faith", continuing with the development was in line with existing planning policy
- The Planning Case Officer confirmed there were no additional funds for retrofitting, the development was in line with existing policy and outlined within the Section 106 Agreement
- The Planning Manager (Children & Families) said the proposed school was always seen as taking children from the wider area, not just this development. Members were informed that since 2017 the birth rate had dropped by 10% in the Morley area so there was less need for the school in this area in the near term. The Planning Manager (Children & Families) suggested that "as things stand it was unlikely that a school would be required"
- The Planning Manager (Children & Families) said the land does not transfer to the local authority, should they not take up the offer. The Planning Case Officer suggested that the developer may then seek approval for an alternative use or development, but the Authority would have the control to determine this at the time.
- The applicant's representative said the development would create its own character. The CGI's highlighted the open space / greenspace which were generated from key locations within the site
- The Planning Case Officer said the Developer was currently trialling other energy sources at different locations in the country
- The Planning Case Officer said lengthy discussions on design had taken place, with the consensus that good quality materials were to be used. The design, with three character areas within the site was looking at the setting as a whole and could be subjective to different individuals
- The applicant's representative said creating a safe area was about more than just good lighting but also "having eyes on site" and not creating high boundaries. The grouping of, and orientation of houses means that they would look out onto open spaces and each other and lead to natural surveillance a safer environment.

In offering comments Members stated the following:

- Members noted that this site had been identified as a site for housing within the Site Allocation Plan (SAP). The site also met the Planning Policy Framework requirements of sustainable locations
- Members were aware that outline planning consent for this site had already been granted, which included details of the means of access
- In general Members considered the application before them to be a vast improvement on the scheme presented previously and was possibly the 'greenest' scheme they had so far dealt with.
- Members noted that in terms of environmental policies, we were in a period of transition
- Several Members expressed disappointment at the design and layout of the scheme suggesting more contemporary design would have been preferable. It was further suggested that the design incorporated too many dark colours particularly the red brick houses with grey slate roofs and grey window frames.
- One Member said this site was not sustainable with only one access point, it breached the City Council's own policy on access requirements
- One Members asked if it was possible for each dwelling to be provided with a water butt (this had previously been agreed).

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion, the Chair suggested that the scheme had improved significantly since last presented.

It was moved and seconded that the application be approved in accordance with the report recommendation.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was passed; 7 votes in favour, 4 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions specified in the submitted report with the inclusion of an additional condition requiring the details of any boundary treatments within the public realm to prevent car parking on the grass verges boundary (and any amendments or additional conditions that the Chief Planning Officer may consider appropriate). Officers to undertake further discussions with the developer on house design including the type/ colour of the materials to be used, to discuss with Members the provision of a Construction Management Plan (the implementation of other plans to also be incorporated) and to the establishment of a Local Liaison Group to look at the phasing/rolling out of the scheme (The Developer confirmed they were supportive of the last proposal).

89 Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED - To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 25th November 2021 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.