

Plans Panel (East)

Thursday, 9th August, 2012

PRESENT: Councillor D Congreve in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,
R Grahame, M Harland, T Leadley,
A McKenna, E Nash, E Taylor, P Truswell
and G Wilkinson

39 Chair's opening remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

40 Late Items

There were no late items

41 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests

In accordance with paragraphs 19-20 of the Members Code of Conduct, the following declarations were made by Members who felt it was in the public interest to do so:

Councillor Leadley – Position statement in respect of land at Bruntcliffe Road Morley LS27 through being the Chair of Morley Town Council Planning Committee. Councillor Leadley made it clear that if the application had been for determination at the meeting, he would have withdrawn for this item (minute 46 refers)

Councillor R Grahame – Pre-application presentation – Thorpe Park – through Councillor Grahame's wife, Councillor P Grahame's involvement in the scheme as a Ward Member (minute 48 refers)

42 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Macniven, Councillor G Latty, Councillor J Procter and Councillor Finnigan who were substituted for by Councillor Nash, Councillor Anderson, Councillor Wilkinson and Councillor Leadley respectively

43 Minutes

RESOLVED - That the minutes of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 12th July 2012 be approved, subject to the recording of Councillor Campbell's attendance at the meeting

44 Application 11/04759/FU - New access road and 33 houses with landscaping - Land off Barrowby Lane Garforth LS25

Further to minute 13 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 7th June 2012, where Panel deferred determination of an application for access and 33 houses with landscaping on land off Barrowby Lane LS25, for further information, Members considered a further report

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and highlighted the issues raised at the meeting on 7th June which related to drainage; highways and the siting of the affordable housing

Members were informed that a meeting had taken place regarding drainage issues and that the developer had responded to local concerns and would now provide temporary drainage measures which would be secured by condition, prior to the final, approved drainage scheme being implemented

In respect of Members' concerns on highway issues and the number of traffic movements the development would generate, detailed information had been included in the submitted report with Officers satisfied that the transport assessment was robust and that the traffic impact of vehicles associated with the development was not considered to be significant

Concerning the siting of the affordable housing, this had now been split into two groups, although these remained largely in one area of the site

Receipt of a further letter of representation was reported

Members commented on the following matters:

- drainage details; the fact that since the last report, further local flooding had been experienced; the impact of heavy rainfall on storm drains leading to dispersal of foul water and that water butts could be provided to householders to help deal with a sudden rush of water
- the possibility of changing the split of affordable housing and having 5 social rented properties and the need for the review of the affordable housing policy to be undertaken as quickly as possible
- the requirement as part of the S106 Agreement to provide early delivery of housing on site; how this could be enforced and sanctions available if the developer did not adhere to this
- the siting of the affordable housing and the view that the developers had carried out the bare minimum in terms of re-siting the affordable properties and that this could not be regarded as being pepper potted

The Head of Planning Services, Mr Sellens, informed the Panel that the affordable housing policy was under review and would be considered by Executive Board later this year and whilst hearing Members' suggestions about an appropriate level to be requested and the split, the policy could not be amended for this application

Regarding early delivery of housing, Mr Sellens stated that this clause had been included to encourage developers to make more than a 'technical' start on site and to tie them into a delivery rate. In the event that there was an impasse on the S106, then the next step would be to take the matter to the High Court, however, as this was costly and time-consuming, Officers were keen to work with developers to avoid this situation being reached

Councillor Truswell requested further information and a briefing on affordable housing

RESOLVED –To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions specified and any others considered necessary; to advise the developer to provide a water butt to those residents requiring one and the completion of a S106 legal agreement, to include the following obligations:

- 1 – Affordable housing – 15% (5 units of which 2 to be social rented and 3 sub market)
- 2 – Offsite greenspace contribution - £59,262
- 3 – A contribution towards the funding of a Traffic Regulation Order to restrict parking around the junction of Barrowby Lane and Barwick Road
- 4 – Residential Metrocards (bus and rail) for future residents (current cost - £18,110.40)
- 5 – Agreement to the early delivery of housing on site
- 6 – Local training and employment initiatives during the construction of the development

In the circumstances where the S106 has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillor McKenna and Councillor Truswell required it to be recorded that they voted against the matter

45 Application 08/01776/FU - One three storey block of 3 ground floor retail units with 14 flats over and one four storey block of 43 flats - Site of former Compton Arms Public House Compton Road Burmantofts LS9

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting

The Head of Planning Services referred to the Officer's recommendation in the report before Panel which was to refuse the mixed use scheme. As further discussions were taking place with the applicant, it was requested that the report be withdrawn from the agenda to see whether the concerns about scale, the amount of car parking being proposed and the lack of greenspace in the scheme could be addressed

RESOLVED - That the report be withdrawn and that a further report be submitted in due course

46 Application 12/01332/OT - Outline application to erect residential development on land at Bruntcliffe Road Morley LS27 - Position statement

Plans, graphics and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

The Head of Planning Services presented the report which set out the current position in respect of an outline application for a residential development on a 7.81 hectare site at Bruntcliffe Road, Morley which was located adjacent to the M62; was mainly an allocated Phase 2 greenfield site but included part of an adjoining, unallocated, area of land previously proposed as a buffer zone between the site and the employment land beyond it

As there were outstanding issues in relation to the proposals, Panel was asked to consider the key issues of highways safety; noise intrusion and compliance with the development plan

Highways

- Members were informed that the Highways Agency had a holding direction on the site until 31st August 2012 - although this could be extended – to enable consideration of the impact of cumulative development on Junction 27 of the M62, with a mitigation scheme having been drawn up, with the proposed development for this site likely to be required to make a contribution towards the works
- the traffic assessment submitted with the planning application was based on the provision of 200 homes although this number had now been revised to 168 homes. The proposed access to the allocated site would be from Bruntcliffe Road and pedestrian access would be improved through the provision of widened footways, a pelican crossing and two additional pedestrian refuges on Bruntcliffe Road
- that the position of that part of the allocated housing site which was not coming forward at this stage (the Masonic Lodge land) would also need to be considered at this stage to ensure an acceptable access could be provided to the whole site

Noise intrusion

- To mitigate against the impact of noise from the adjacent M62, a revised layout had been provided which proposed less dwellings and the provision of a 40m strip of land adjacent to the motorway to act as a buffer. Officers within the Council's Environmental Protection Team were considering the revisions and the latest noise assessment submitted by the developer
- Members were informed that the developer considered that the issues relating to noise could be dealt with at Reserved Matters stage. However, the Head of Planning Services did not share this view and stressed to the Panel the importance of ensuring at this stage an acceptable living environment both within the houses and the gardens. This may well require additional noise mitigation measures e.g. a bund; planting and an acoustic fence

Compliance with the development plan

- Much of the site was a Phase 2 allocated greenfield site, and following the Executive Board decision after the Grimes Dyke appeal decision, acceptable in principle to release, part of the site included land which was unallocated in the UDP although this had been expected to form a buffer between the housing allocation and the adjacent employment land. In the region of 40 dwellings were proposed on this unallocated land. The test for development of unallocated sites was one of sustainability and given the close proximity of Morley Town Centre to the site and frequency of bus services past the site, it could be considered to be sustainable, although in terms of education provision, contributions would be required as part of a S106 Agreement
- In respect of the adjacent land allocated for employment use, as this was in the ownership of the applicant, the extent of the uses and activities could be controlled and the required buffer zone and extent of the open area would need to be controlled through the S106 agreement - further details on this were still required

The Panel was informed that Councillor Dawson's objection as set out in

the submitted report was not complete and provided an update for Members' information

Members commented on the following matters:

- the lack of an overall framework, as recommended in the UDP policy
- the width of the new proposed buffer zone between the proposed employment land and whether this was as wide as indicated in the UDP and whether this area would be landscaped
- whether housing had been permanently deleted from the boundary to the motorway
- the number of representations received in response to the proposals
- the noise levels on site; the impact of this on the ability of the residents to enjoy their gardens and that only substantial mitigation measures could prevent noise nuisance
- that the noise to the north of the site was also a concern and that ensuring 'quiet' employment uses, i.e. warehousing in this area was not acceptable and that the buffer needed to be enhanced rather than reduced
- that the greenspace between the housing and employment land was being squeezed
- that the site was hazardous at this point of Bruntcliffe Road, with particularly narrow footpaths and whether an Environmental Impact Assessment had been carried out
- whether in view of the access points indicated to serve the adjacent housing site, the transport assessment was based on the assumption that this site would be brought forward for development
- the highways accident record for the area and the concerns being raised by residents and Ward Members
- that there were infrastructure deficits in the area which included education provision
- the number of additional traffic movements arising from the development
- that references in the report to approved developments at Waterwood Close and Shayfield Lane could not be regarded as being directly comparable

The following responses were provided:

- that a development framework for the area had not been drawn up
- that the buffer between the employment allocation and the housing allocation was narrower and that there was significant encroachment into that area which the Inspector considered should be open and that it would be necessary to ensure the land between the employment land and the buffer zone was clear
- that the buffer zone being proposed was less than that shown in the UDP
- that the extent of development would need to be determined at outline stage to address the issue of noise
- that Panel would be updated on the exact level of representations received on the application when it came to Panel for determination
- that whilst noise mitigation measures could move noise away from the site, this could be dependent upon the effect of the wind and the local topography and that proposed noise mitigation measures would need to be modelled and their effectiveness demonstrated

- that the proposals could not be determined until the Highways Agency was satisfied on the impact of this and other developments on Junction 27 of the M62
- that the transport assessment was initially based on 200 and that this had been revised to 175 although the impact of the adjacent site coming forward for development would need to be considered as an additional entrance into that site from Bruntcliffe Road would not be welcomed
- that in terms of traffic accidents, the road was not a length of concern, although it was accepted that the data collected related to reportable accidents rather than taking into account non-reported incidents or damage to property
- that education contributions were being sought in line with the SPG but that further discussions with colleagues in Children's Services could take place in terms of education provision
- that using the well-established TRICS database, based on 200 units, the peak am hours would see 124 movements and the peak pm hours would see 138 movements

In addressing the specific questions in the report which the Panel was asked to consider, the following points were made:

- That Members did have concerns about the principle of the development of that part of the site which fell outside of the UDP housing allocation but that subject to a reasonable land swap retaining the size of the buffer, this might be more acceptable. That Members' comments on the buffer zones be noted as was the view that the buffer zone adjacent to the employment land was much smaller than proposed in the UDP and that this should be as a minimum the width envisaged by the Inspector and for there to be no development on this part of the site. In terms of planting on the industrial land at the south-west corner of the site, substantial planting could be considered together with additional planting between the site boundary and the M62, together with a bund and possibly an acoustic fence. In respect of this part of the site, the view was expressed that attempts to put additional housing in this area would be resisted
- That the character of the housing as shown in the indicative layout appeared to be acceptable but that neither the layout or number of houses formed part of the outline application
- Members were satisfied that the location of the proposed access was the most appropriate in the circumstances
- In terms of highway safety, numerous concerns remained
- That the indicative sum – approximately £133,000 – for public transport measures in the S106 Agreement would be discussed with Ward Members
- That Members were not satisfied that the proposed heads of terms of the S106 Agreement addressed all relevant matters and that the issue of land swaps and the necessary legal agreements around these together with public access to the buffer zone would need to be explored further

Having heard the discussions, the Chief Planning Officer suggested that all parties/landowners be contacted with a view to discussing the proposals to bring forward a development framework covering both the housing and employment allocations and buffer between them as envisaged in the UDP

RESOLVED - To note the report, the comments made and the Panel's responses to the questions raised in the report

During consideration of this matter, Councillor Truswell withdrew from the meeting

47 Application 11/03705/FU - Updated Position Statement - Energy Recovery Facility (incineration of waste and energy generation), associated infrastructure and improvements to access and bridge - Site of Former Skelton Grange Power Station Skelton Grange Road Stourton Leeds LS10

Further to minute 178 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 23rd February 2012, where Panel considered a position statement on proposals for an Energy from Waste Facility (ERF) on the site of the former Skelton Grange Power Station, Members considered a further position statement. Attending for this item were representatives from the Environment Agency, the body responsible for issuing permits for ERFs to provide information on the permitting process for the benefit of new Panel Members. Also attending the meeting to provide technical advice to the presenting Officer on issues relating to minerals and waste, was Ms White, the Senior Minerals Planner, who was dealing with the Council's own application for an ERF

Before the report was presented, the Head of Planning Services referred to the information in the report provided about need, in response to questions raised by Members at the meeting in February 2012 and stated that the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework suggested that need was not a material planning consideration

Officers presented the report which related to proposals for an ERF taking in 300,000 tonnes of commercial and industrial waste per annum

Plans, photographs, drawings, graphics and a sample of the proposed main cladding material were displayed at the meeting

In the light of Members' previous comments, the design of the building had been modified to include additional detail to the facades of the building and the redesigning of the office accommodation

The bridge serving the facility would be strengthened but would remain single lane. An improved footway/cycleway across the bridge would also be provided and the applicant had been asked to consider how pedestrian and cyclist access could be improved to and from the nearby Trans Pennine Trail

The Panel then heard from Tim Shaw, a representative of the Environment Agency (EA) who outlined the permitting process and provided the following information:

- that in respect of incinerators, the EA needed to ensure that the facilities were built and run to meet the strict environmental standards
- that the EA was a consultee in the planning process but that it was for Councils to decide how waste should be managed
- in terms its Environmental Permitting role, it was not necessary for planning permission to be in place before the permit was granted but that the permit had to be granted before the ERF could operate
- that the EA would only grant a permit if it was demonstrated that the facility would run in compliance with the relevant UK and European legislation and would not cause significant pollution or harm to people's health

- that the EA could require older facilities to retro-fit to ensure they were meeting best available technologies
- that receipt of an application for an ERF, once deemed to have been duly made, would be advertised and a period of public consultation on the proposals would commence. If the application was considered to be controversial, drop-in sessions would be held for the public where further information on the permitting process could be obtained. As well as public consultation, comments were also sought from a range of consultees including the Primary Care Trusts and the Health Protection Agency (HPA). Once the closing date for comments had passed and the application assessed, the EA's draft decision would be published and further comments sought. If the decision was to grant the permit, the EA would then move into regulation mode, where its role would be to ensure emissions from the ERF did not cause significant harm to human health or the environment
- strict monitoring would take place which would include checking that the equipment met the required standards and was correctly calibrated. The management of the plant would also be checked to ensure it was being appropriately operated. The energy efficiency of the plant would be checked as would measures in respect of accident prevention; noise and odour, although it was stated noise and odour were not particular problems for ERFs. Checks to ensure the facility complied with the Waste Incineration Directive and the environmental permit conditions would be undertaken
- the environmental permit did not cover traffic movements; visual impact; operating hours or light pollution
- most of the checks would be audit-based and monthly emissions data would be provided to the EA. In the event of any exceedences of the limits set, the EA would need to be informed together with what measures had been put in place to bring this back into compliance. Whilst occasionally there were issues, the EA did work with operators and the community to resolve these and there were very few complaints made about such facilities
- enforcement action could be taken against operators with the EA having a range of measures including a site warning; a formal caution; prosecution and suspension or prohibition notices

In response to questions from the Panel, Mr Shaw provided the following information:

- that the emission of dioxins from modern ERFs were extremely low; were monitored regularly and to tight limits
- that the systems used to prevent dioxin emissions were very reliable with few, if any, breaches of the dioxin limits occurring
- in order to determine an application for an environmental permit, all emissions were modelled using very conservative levels, so building in safety factors
- that the EA would not issue a permit to an ERF if there was an indication it would have a significant impact on health or the environment
- in terms of a link between health issues and living close to such a facility, the HPA had undertaken much work on this subject which was well-documented, with no link being found. To access this research, the EA had set up a link to the HPA's website

- in respect of whether the environmental permit matched the conditions on the planning permission, the permit issued by the EA was a separate process to the planning permission and any such issues would be flagged up in the EA's consultation process which included the LPA

Concerning the health issues raised, Councillor R Grahame referred to a letter from the Director of Public Health, Dr Cameron, which he would be passing to the Chair of Plans Panel East

Members then commented on the following matters in respect of the proposal:

- the colour of the proposed cladding, with a mix of views on whether this should be altered to reduce the visual impact of the building or whether for a development of this scale it should be accepted for what it was
- the landscaping proposals and the types of trees to be considered in the planting scheme
- the proximity of the site to Newsam Green and the boundary to Swillington, with Officers agreeing to provide this information directly to Councillor McKenna
- whether there was capacity to take municipal waste at this site; how it could be ensured that the applicant was recycling as much material as possible rather than burning it; the Combined Heat and Power (CHP) process and where the energy produced on the site would be used
- that the wharf should be retained
- the bridge to the site and whether a new, two-lane bridge could be constructed

Officers provided the following responses:

- that the total capacity of the ERF would be 300,000 tonnes of waste per year and the proposals for this plant was to take commercial and industrial waste. As two lines would be operating it was feasible for one line to take municipal waste, but that would then reduce the amount of commercial and industrial waste being dealt with, which would still need to be managed
- that there were economic reasons in respect of the amount of materials being recycled; the applicant wished to sell waste which could be recycled, and as incineration was a more expensive option of waste disposal, it was also cheaper for customers to recycle as much material as possible
- that there was capacity for CHP but this relied on a company coming forward to express an interest in using this, but that the electricity produced on site would be used to power the site with spare capacity being sold to power homes
- that the future of the wharf could be given further consideration
- that for technical reasons relating to power supplies, it was not possible to demolish the bridge. On this matter the Chief Planning Officer stated that the application site was within the city's Urban Eco Settlement where new and higher standards of living, employment and energy were being encouraged and that the ERF had the potential to complement this but that it was important to consider in detail how this area could be linked to the wider area. Whilst the traffic flow from the ERF was relatively light, the longer-term picture should be considered at this stage and that a temporary, single lane access did not achieve this

RESOLVED -

- i) To note the contents of the report

- ii) To note the information provided from the Environment Agency
- iii) To note the design changes and the comments now made on aspects of this
- iv) To note the comments about the vehicular access; the need for two way access and for sufficient access to be provided to open up the site to a wider area of the city to maximise its potential

48 Preapp/11/01151 - Thorpe Park Austhorpe Lane Austhorpe LS15 - Pre-application presentation

Prior to consideration of these pre-application proposals, Councillor Nash and Councillor Wilkinson left the meeting

Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Officers presented the report which outlined pre-application proposals for the redevelopment of the remaining land at Thorpe Park Business Park, Junction 46 of the M1, in LS15

Details of the residential planning permissions granted in the Crossgates/Manston area were provided with Members being informed that in the case of the former Optare site and the adjacent Threadneedle site, phasing conditions had been implemented to control the amount of development which could take place before the Manston Lane Link Road (MLLR) was required to be built

Due to the strategic importance of the site locally and the city as a whole and the issues raised by the scheme, the proposals were being brought to Members at an early stage for comment, with East Leeds Regeneration Board and East Outer Area Committee also receiving a similar presentation and the opportunity for comment

The Panel then received a presentation on behalf of the developers

With reference to the consented scheme, Members were informed that this was a product of its time; the site was unwelcoming; lacked greenspace and amenities and facilities for the 4500 staff employed there. To attract new occupiers this shortfall in amenities had to be addressed as higher standards of staff welfare were now expected from large employers

The proposals were to create a sense of place; to create amenities; to stimulate demand and by doing so, to create 5500 – 6500 new job opportunities in a broader range than the predominantly professional jobs currently available on the site. A key part of the proposals was the delivery of the MLLR

As well as providing additional office accommodation, the site would also provide new retail opportunities, including food and drink uses together with a large – approximately 12,000 sqm - supermarket in one corner of the site which was considered to be the best location for this which would add to the offer on Thorpe Park and for local residents. A landscape and visual impact assessment of the proposals had been carried out and a decision had been taken to reduce the floor level of the foodstore to minimise its visual impact

A considerable amount of greenspace would be provided. The amount of Brown Moor to be retained would be enhanced with a central area of parkland connecting to this. The nearby Barrowby Woods would be respected in the scheme and good pedestrian links would be provided, including a new footbridge. A new public park to be known as 'Green Park' would be created, with the possibility of an

additional hotel on the site to add to the increased leisure and recreational uses being proposed

Employment and training opportunities would be provided in the scheme and the creation of a successful Thorpe Park to the standard of a European Quality Business Park would reinforce the position of Leeds in the city region and could help to attract greater investment

Details of the level of consultation on the proposals was provided with Members being informed that 70 hours of face to face consultation time had been provided to supplement the letters and leaflets distributed across a wide area

Over 800 people attended the consultation events with considerable support being given to the proposals

In terms of timescale, dependent upon obtaining outline planning permission for the scheme, it was hoped to commence on phase 1 of the development in 2015

Members commented on the following matters:

- the proximity to the site of an existing supermarket and the future for this store
- whether a retail impact study had been carried out in the neighbouring wards
- the decision to site the supermarket away from the rest of the development and the reasons for this
- the need to guarantee jobs and apprenticeships for local people
- the need for early delivery of the MLLR
- the impressive images of Green Park and that such a new facility was welcomed
- car parking proposals and concerns that local residents visiting the site might park in the surrounding streets in order to easily access the pedestrian links to the retail areas
- that as sports pitches were being provided, some thought had to be given to ensuring visiting teams knew where to park
- whether discussions on the scheme had taken place with public transport providers
- that clarification of the route of the MLLR was needed, together with details about how this would be secured and how the financial contributions from other developments for the MLLR would be secured
- the concept of creating a European Quality Business Park, and that whilst the comments for the need for enhanced facilities for office workers on Thorpe Park could be understood, as could for example, the provision of a small convenience-type supermarket, the suggestion of introducing a large supermarket and bulky goods retailing would have an impact on other district and town centres
- the considerable policy objections to the proposals; the guidance contained in the NPPF which strongly defended the role of traditional town centres and concern that if a special case to deviate from policy was accepted on this site, similar applications would be brought forward on other sites

The following responses were provided by the development team:

- that in drawing up the proposals, 15 defined centres and been taken into account, 12 of these being local and that whilst there would be impacts, these were of a low order due to the catchment areas of the site and that a retail impact study had been carried out and had been submitted to the Council for consideration by its retail consultant

- in respect of the supermarket located close to Thorpe Park, if the current operator vacated, the unit would most likely be taken over by someone else
- that the location of the major foodstore had been carefully considered. As there was a move towards creating a sense of place and the provision of an urban grid, the decision had been taken to site the foodstore on the east side of the MLLR which would create minimal disruption to the street pattern and would enable more of Brown Moor to be retained
- that there was now a strong duty towards developments providing local employment and this scheme would seek to do this
- that concerns about increased on-street parking had been one of the issues raised by local residents throughout the consultation process and that whilst there was an acknowledgement of the need to carefully handle this issue, it was felt that the proposed centrally located multi-storey car park would address this issue
- that the point raised about visiting sports teams had not been considered but this could be managed by the provision of good signage and information to encourage use of the formal car parking areas
- concerning the delivery of the MLLR, a commitment had been made to deliver all of the MLLR in the first phase of development and although there were issues about the East Leeds Orbital Road linking in to the MLLR, that was a separate issue
- about how contributions to the MLLR from developers would be ensured, this might be dealt with corporately or through planning, with discussions taking place with all relevant parties and highways. In terms of third-party land issues, the possibility of the Council using its powers of CPO could be considered
- the MLLR would be provided, as previously approved with the only element of discussion on this being the possibility of some minor reorientations to the line of the link road and some possible impact on private land owners
- that the creation of a small district centre to serve the business park was not possible and would not be viable and that for a major improvement in the status of Thorpe Park and the possible benefits flowing from that, good shopping and leisure facilities were needed

In answer to the specific questions contained in the report for Members' comments, the following responses were provided:

- regarding the provision of a significant amount of retail at Thorpe Park, there were concerns relating to highways; the type and quantity of retail being proposed and how this would fit with policy requirements; the height of the supermarket and the fact that it was separated from the rest of the retailing; the need for Members to see the retail assessment and the demonstration of the special circumstances in this case to set aside policy. On this point, the question of whether retail being considered acceptable on the site was also raised
- Members considered that the approach of the concept/parameter plans and indicative masterplan for the site was beneficial
- that Members appeared happy with the nature and location of the open space on the site and how this linked through to Green Park
- that in respect of the proposed MLLR, that this should be delivered early in the scheme, if not before the start of the development and that building the

MLLR per se would not be sufficient to deal with the increased traffic coming to the development from further afield

- concerning the proposed layout and facilities at Green Park, there was the need for the parking for the sports pitches to be located in Thorpe Park and that further information on the parking/access arrangements and the timescale for its delivery be provided at the outline application stage
- that a dangerous precedent could be set if policy was set aside to accommodate the proposals
- that other proposals were being considered in the area and that it would be necessary to have regard to the combined implications of any applications which were submitted

RESOLVED - To note the report, the presentation and the comments now made

49 Date and time of next meeting

Thursday 6th September 2012 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds