

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 14TH MARCH, 2013

PRESENT: Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors P Gruen, D Blackburn,
M Hamilton, S Hamilton, G Latty,
T Leadley, J McKenna, E Nash,
N Walshaw, J Hardy, T Murray and
J Procter

74 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting

75 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED – That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following part of the agenda designated exempt on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as designated as follows:-

Appendix A referred to in minute 86 under Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972 and the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds it contains information relating to the financial or business of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). It is considered that if this information was in the public domain it would be likely to prejudice the affairs of the applicant. Whilst there may be a public interest in disclosure, in all the circumstances of the case maintaining the exemption is considered to outweigh the public interest in disclosing this information at this time

76 Late Items

The Chair admitted one late item to the agenda, these being the minutes of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 17th January 2013 (minute 79 refers). The minutes which had been circulated prior to the meeting required urgent consideration to enable them to be presented to the next available meeting, in the interests of transparency.

Although not a formal late item, the Panel was in receipt of a colour drawing which had been circulated prior to the meeting in respect of the pre-application presentation relating to proposals for Plot C, Sovereign Street (minute 84 refers).

77 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests

Minutes approved at the meeting held on
11th April 2013

Councillor Nash declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Application 12/03788/FU – 29 Wellington Street LS1, through being in receipt of a small income from the Co-op which had a store immediately opposite the site (minute 82 refers)

78 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor R Procter who was substituted for by Councillor J Procter.

The Chair also informed Panel that the Head of Planning Services and the North East Area Planning Manager were unable to attend the meeting because of health reasons.

79 Minutes

RESOLVED – To approve the minutes of the City Plans Panel meetings held on 17th January 2013 and 7th February 2013.

80 Matters Arising from the Minutes

With reference to minute 71 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 7th February 2013 in respect of Application 11/03705/FU – ERF, site of former Skelton Grange Power Station, the Chief Planning Officer informed Members that in view of the concerns expressed about the lack of a response to the proposals by the Fire Authority, this had been investigated and comments had now been received. Whilst there were some issues to be addressed by way of the Fire Certificate, there were no issues which had a material effect on the application

81 Application 12/03402/FU - Erection of 364 dwellings with ancillary retail and community facilities - land at Grimes Dyke, Off York Road, Whinmoor

Further to minute 23 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 25th October 2012 where Panel considered a position statement on proposals for a residential development at Grimes Dyke, LS14, Members considered the formal application

Plans, photographs, graphics and drawings were displayed at the meeting. Officers presented the report and advised that in view of the comments made by Panel in October, the scheme had been revised with the retail element being deleted from the scheme in favour of a more robust district centre to be provided as part of the adjacent Northern Quadrant proposals. In terms of community facilities, Ward Members had expressed the view that providing funds to enhance existing facilities in the area was more appropriate, therefore a commuted sum of £150,000 had been agreed

Minutes approved at the meeting held on
11th April 2013

with the applicant for this. In view of the deletion of these uses from the scheme, a further 6 dwellings would now be provided on the site

Other revisions to the scheme were outlined, these being the deletion of the two and half storey properties; the redesign of the apartment block; the removal of rear access ways and a reduction in the number of rear parking courts

In terms of affordable housing, the application granted on appeal included 30% affordable housing. Although Officers had pursued the higher level, the costs of the scheme and particularly the site access rendered a level of 30% unviable. What was now being offered by the applicant – 15% - was in line with the current policy and because of the increase in the number of dwellings to 370, a further affordable dwelling would be provided to reflect the increase in units

In respect of education contributions, Members were informed that Children's Services had sought a full secondary education contribution as whilst there would be capacity in local high schools in the early years of the development, over time, these places would be filled. The developer having originally not agreed to a secondary education contribution had now agreed to provide this at a figure of £323,364.49. In view of the additional 6 dwellings on site, the primary education contribution had increased and would now be £1,073,008.42. The S106 Agreement had been discussed with Ward Members and on balance, Ward Members were comfortable with the package

An issue raised at the October meeting had been the possibility of land contamination through the burying of animal carcasses on the site. The Environment Agency had been consulted on this but records prior to 2001 – the last major foot and mouth outbreak – did not exist. However, since 2001 there were no records of carcasses being buried on this site

Members commented on the following matters:

- the need for assurances that the education contributions would be available to local schools rather than used city wide
- the provision of jobs and skills, including apprenticeships and that this should be clearer in the S106 Agreement
- the need for the developer to give assurances that they would work with local Councillors on the issue of jobs, skills and apprenticeships
- the proximity of a primary school to the site and that opportunities existed for curriculum initiatives arising out of the construction process
- the need to clarify the meaning of 'local' in terms of employment,
- the play area provision and the need to ensure this was overlooked to avoid the possibility of anti-social behaviour and requests for CCTV cameras
- safety issues in respect of the attenuation basin, with concerns being raised that mitigation measures were needed to prevent accidents from occurring
- the design of the spine road, whether the intention was to link this with the East Leeds Extension (ELE); concerns that traffic from the proposed development in the Northern Quadrant could use the spine road for access and that this road should not be open to general traffic
- the need to ensure there was sufficient land available if in the future the junction required improvement

- the possibility of introducing 20mph zones as standard in new residential schemes
- provision for cyclists including those less confident to use the major roads
- that there was an opportunity to consider greater use of shared spaces
- the design of some of the properties, with concerns that these were poor and uninspiring; that this was the first of a number of major residential proposals in East Leeds and that it was important that this set the standard for what could follow
- the need for Officers to address design issues at an early stage and to establish general principles about how new estates should look in respect of cycleways, design, sustainability etc
- the position of the front doors on some dwellings and that these should be separated, although there were mixed views on this
- the need for a reduction in the amount of hardstanding and that dormers should be considered instead of attic windows
- the possibility of further improvements to the design of the dwellings but the need to protect the package of contributions achieved
- that all the sustainability issues included on the extant permission should be included in this application
- affordable housing provision, with concerns that the developer was seeking an open-ended agreement with no commitment to increasing the level of provision in the event the policy changed and the required levels increased, with concerns that if allowed, other developers would seek similar agreements
- that the S106 Agreement should specify a commitment for delivery of housing on the site within 2 years

Officers provided the following comments:

- that for the education contributions where these were spent was not usually so restrictive but that Ward Members' requirements were noted and that Children's Services would liaise with Ward Members regarding where this funding would be spent (this would be reflected in the S1.06 Agreement)
- that local employment within the S106 Agreement could be specified as being a priority for local people in the immediate and neighbouring wards
- that the play area was overlooked by properties
- concerning safety issues to the attenuation basin, that the detailed landscaping drawings had not been submitted but Members' concerns could be picked up at the detailed landscaping stage
- that the scheme had always been designed to have a surface spine road to link to the ELE in the future but that no detailed assessment of this junction in relation to ELE had been made
- that in terms of future proofing, the wish was to connect these sites and Metro wished to run buses from ELE through the Grimes Dyke site. However the spine road would be designed to discourage general through traffic and in addition to the spine road there would be many

- other routes to and from the ELE so it was not anticipated the spine route would become the route of choice for drivers. The quickest routes through the area would remain the major ones bounding the site
- that there were no plans to increase the width of the junction as a three-lane exit was not being considered
 - that in the Street Design Guide which was a Supplementary Planning Document, 20mph zones were promoted on all new residential roads, except through routes and that Officers would ensure that 20mph zones would be included in this development
 - that provision for cyclists in this scheme was on the main roads, although there were segregated and designated cycle links from York Road and that more segregated and separate provision was being considered at the rest of ELE
 - that the use of grey water could be taken up with the developers but in any event, the scheme would need to meet Code Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes

The Chief Planning Officer welcomed the debate and the detailed issues which Members were focussing on and which would be a feature of the additional meeting to consider position statements on several proposals relating to ELE. In terms of design issues, further discussions would take place with the developers with a view to raising the standard of some of the units and that these discussions would be referred back to Ward Members for Crossgates and Whinmoor. These would be dealt with at the same time as the re-advertising and the completion of the S106 agreement

The Case Officer was thanked for his presentation and Officers and the developers were acknowledged for their efforts in bringing this scheme forward

RESOLVED – To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the resolution of outstanding layout issues as specified in the submitted report; the expiry of any re-advertising (as may be appropriate and subject to no new substantive issues being raised) further discussions with the developer on design issues, with these being reported back to Ward Members and imposition of the specified conditions and following completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following additional matters:

- affordable housing – 15% (of which 40% social rent and 60% sub-market)
- two new bus stops with ‘Real Time’ information on York Road (£20,000 each)
- residential MetroCards – Scheme B (bus only) (current cost £717.20 per ticket)
- travel plan review fee - £3,280
- public transport improvement contribution - £884.94 per house and £283.06 per flat
- education contributions (primary - £1,073,008.42 and secondary - £323,364.49)
- community facilities - £150,00 by way of commuted sum

- provision of footways/cycleways linking the development to Whinmoor Way
- public access areas scheme, including children's playground
- sustainable drainage scheme – including commuted sum of £183,00 for future maintenance
- commitment for delivery of housing on site within 2 years of the date of the grant of planning permission
- local training and employment initiatives to be prioritised for people in the immediate and neighbouring wards

In the circumstances where the Section 106 Agreement 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 unless following the further design discussions, Ward Members have outstanding concerns, whereby the application will be returned to Panel for determination

Councillor Murray joined the meeting during consideration of this matter

82 Application 12/03788/FU - Hybrid application for full permission for 11 storey office building and outline application for office/hotel building up to 8 storeys with ancillary ground floor A1,A2,A3,A4 and A5 uses - 29 Wellington Street, Leeds, LS1

Having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this matter, Councillor Nash withdrew from the meeting

Further to minute 38 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 22nd November 2012, where Panel considered a position statement on proposals for a mixed used development on the former Lumiere site on Wellington Street/Whitehall Road LS1, Members considered the formal application

Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting. Officers presented the report and provided for context, details on the scale and type of the surrounding buildings, some of which were Listed

Members were informed that the application was a hybrid one in that whilst it was for two buildings, one was a full application and the other was in outline and was seeking design parameters which were supported by the design statement which had been submitted with the proposals

The 11 storey building was for office use and had been well received when the scheme had been presented in November 2012 and there had been few design changes since that time. The creation of a new public space was also part of the application

Members were informed that a wind survey had been commissioned and this had been assessed by the Council's independent consultant. The survey had indicated there were two points of distress conditions on Wellington Street which could impact on cyclists and elderly people. These conditions were due to existing wind conditions and were not caused by the development, however in view of this it was considered appropriate for the proposed bus stops and pedestrian drop off point to be deleted from the scheme and pedestrian guard rails to be included. Metro had stated that

Minutes approved at the meeting held on 11th April 2013

there was not a capacity issue and that there were other stops in the area which could be utilised. In terms of the deletion of the drop off point if the use was a hotel, smaller buses and coaches could use the service area and as some hotels did not provide a drop off point, the deletion of this could not be considered as a reason to refuse the application

Members commented on the following matters:-

- that with the outline application it was not clear what height the finished scheme would be, with concerns about this
- that as part of the Lumiere scheme, it had been proposed to reinstate the bus stops on Wellington Street, why this had changed and the possibility of reconsidering this in due course, subject to the wind issues being satisfactorily resolved
- that it was not possible to attribute all of the wind issues on Wellington Street to one application
- the legal position in respect of culpability in the event that a satisfactory wind assessment proved to be incorrect
- the possibility of utilising the signage on the building to warn of high wind conditions
- the time limits of 5 and 7 years being proposed and why shorter timescales were not being required
- the need for the public area to be well lit and be properly managed
- jobs and skills, the merits of specifying priority for people in specific wards with mixed views on this

Officers provided the following responses:

- that the design parameters were to ensure the building took its queue from City Central and that it was set back at the correct point
- that in respect of wind issues, wind studies were being independently assessed and that risk conditions were being taken into account. In terms of liability, the general legal position was that where the Council exercised a regulatory function, i.e. as a Local Planning Authority, liability will not result and, the responsibility remains with the developer
- concerning the proposed time limits, that the scheme was a hybrid one; the economic situation was still difficult and the development was speculative as no end user had been identified. Officers felt that the developer's request for 5 years to implement the full application was reasonable and for the outline scheme, there would be a delay whilst the Reserved Matters scheme was submitted, so 7 years was also considered acceptable
- that lighting in the scheme was conditioned and that the public open space would be a managed area
- that when specifying jobs and skills priority for residents in specific Wards, the intention was to address those areas of most need, but that this could be looked at further

RESOLVED – To approve in principle and to defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the

submitted report and following completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following matters:

- open space areas to be maintained by the applicant and retained as open 24 hours a day save for one day a year to prevent it from becoming a public right of way
- public transport contribution (full application) – for the full application element of B1 offices, £176,011 on first occupation of the office – for the ground floor commercial element of the full application – possible £11,438 dependant on use, to be assessed in line with the SPD on Public Transport Improvements and Developer Contributions – trigger on occupation of each unit
- public transport contribution (outline application) – to be assessed in line with the SPD on Public Transport Improvements and Developer Contributions – minimum £60,240 for hotel and £85,000 if B1 office – trigger on occupation of each unit – for the ground floor element of the outline application to be assessed in line with the SPD on Public Transport Improvements and Developer Contributions – trigger on occupation of each unit
- travel plan items
 - agreed travel plan
 - travel plan review fee £11,230
 - car club spaces
 - funding for free trial membership and usage of car club for office works - £11,000
- highway works: - financial contribution towards laying out of Whitehall Road/Northern Street junction to be 2 instalments of £32,401.95 for the office building and £23,398.05 for the office/hotel building triggered on first occupation of each building
- provision of off site highways works consisting of:
 - relocation of pedestrian crossing on Wellington Street
 - relocation of 2 bus stops on Whitehall Road
 - pedestrian guard railing to Wellington Street frontage (or may be required by condition if considered appropriate)
- jobs and skills priority for local people in City and Hunslet, Beeston and Holbeck and Armley Wards

In the circumstances where the Section 106 Agreement 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

Following conclusion of this matter, Councillor Nash resumed her seat in the meeting

83 Application 13/00288/RM - Reserved Matters application for 189 houses, one block of 9 flats and one block of 6 flats including associated landscaping - Optare, Manston Lane, Cross Gates, LS15 - Position Statement

Minutes approved at the meeting held on
11th April 2013

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

Officers presented a report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out the current proposals in respect of the Reserved Matters application for a residential development on Manston Lane Cross Gates LS15. The Panel noted that the outline application for up to 256 residential units had been agreed by the former Plans Panel East at its meeting held on 7th June 2012 (minute 22 refers)

Officers presented the report and informed Members that the scheme would be delivered in two phases, the second phase being dependent upon the delivery of the Manston Lane Link Road (MLLR). Members were informed that the dwellings would be sited around a central area of public open space (POS), with the highways layout revolving around that to give a good order to the streets

Concerns remained about the lack of separation between dwellings which created high density and a terraced feeling to many of the areas. Whilst it might be possible to accept less than the standard 3.5m distance between dwellings in some cases, distances of 2.00m were being generally proposed across the site, with in some cases, distances of 1.00m being shown. In addition, some of the gardens did not comply with the requirements set out in Neighbourhoods for Living and in relation to some properties, there were no active frontages which also was a concern for Officers

Regarding the delivery of the POS, the developer proposed commencing on this when 25% of the scheme was introduced and that half of the POS would be completed when 50% of the units were occupied, with Members' views on this being requested

Receipt of a letter of objection from a local resident was reported with Panel being informed that the issues raised in the objection would be outlined when the scheme was brought for determination

Members commented on the following matters:

- the separation distances and that across the site these were not acceptable
- the public open space and whether this was considered to be in the correct place. Officers were of the view that the central area was the most appropriate location for the POS and that it ensured it was easily accessible from all properties
- that the report referred to ginnels and that these must be removed and there should be no alleyways
- the phasing of the scheme and the number of properties to be delivered in the first phase. Members were informed that the first phase was restricted to 138 units, although the condition could be varied slightly to accommodate the 115 houses the developer wished to bring forward in the first phase
- the need for the square to be a major feature in the scheme, that this had been achieved successfully in several London boroughs and that a quality scheme was needed for this area which provided more than benches
- that the proposals represented overdevelopment

- that there was a need to ensure there was a masterplan for this area
- the symmetry of the site and that this was not enhanced by the proposed house types and materials; that much more work was needed to improve the quality of the design of individual units and the layout generally and that it would be helpful for Members to see this site in context with the development on the adjacent site
- the position of driveways and parking which created a much too linear scheme
- the need to ensure that if the density of the scheme was reduced, that the same amount of POS, i.e. 10% of the site, was being provided
- that the proposed house types were of a poor standard from a volume house builder and that further discussions were needed between Officers and the developer to devise a more acceptable scheme
- the need for some consideration to the provision on site for homes for older people
- the need to adopt a common approach to landscaping and boundary treatment along the whole of Manston Lane

RESOLVED – To note the report, the comments now made and that Officers be asked to continue discussions with the applicant to address the concerns raised by Members

84 Preapp/13/00105 - Proposals for office development - Plot C Sovereign Street, Leeds, LS1

Plans, graphics and photographs, including an historical image showing the former Queens Hall, were displayed at the meeting

Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out pre-application proposals for an office development at Plot C, Sovereign Street and received a presentation on behalf of the developers

Members were informed that the proposals were for a 6 storey office building with ground floor retail and food and drink uses which would provide active glazed ground floor frontages to Swinegate, the new Swinegate Link, Sovereign Street and the recently approved Sovereign Square greenspace

The elevational treatment to Sovereign Square and Swinegate would be a 'sawtooth' glazed façade, with brick and glazing elevations to the Sovereign Street and Swinegate Link

Basement car parking would be provided for approximately 40 cars

The office entrance would relate to the entrance on the new KPMG building and the possibility of using a corner of the building to create a terrace overlooking the greenspace was being considered

The 'sawtooth' treatment enabled maximum glazing and would help to control solar gain. On the Swinegate elevation coloured elements could be introduced to emphasise the sweep of the building which was reminiscent of the Queens Hall

Members discussed the proposals and commented on the following matters:-

- the roofline, with mixed views on the appearance of this
- the position of the vehicular access

Minutes approved at the meeting held on
11th April 2013

- the opportunity to open up the area beyond the north end, possibly for open-air dining if the existing restaurant required this

In addressing the specific points raised in the report, the following comments were provided:-

- taking into account the views about the roofline, the general form and siting of the building was acceptable
- that the building successfully addressed Sovereign Street, Swinegate and the new greenspace
- that the proposed elevational treatment and materials were considered to be appropriate to the character of the surrounding area
- that taking vehicular access from Sovereign Street was appropriate
- that the glazed ground floor treatment indicated on the proposals would create openness and activity around the building once it was occupied and that there appeared to be adequate provision for bins, kitchens, chiller cabinets, store rooms and other back of house functions away from the window frontages, to avoid the need for tenants to use window vinyls to conceal them
- that more information was needed on the screened rooftop plant enclosure

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

85 Preapp/13/00159 - Proposals for hotel development - Whitehall Road, Leeds, LS1

Plans, graphics, precedent images and sample materials were displayed at the meeting

Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer on pre-application proposals for a hotel adjacent to No Whitehall, on Whitehall Road

Officers presented the report and informed Panel that an application for mixed office and hotel use on the site had been approved in 2012 but that there were now revised proposals for a hotel use only. The Panel then received a presentation on behalf of the applicant

Members were informed that the scheme being proposed was for a 128 bed hotel which would complement the building style and materials of developments on Whitehall Road by the use of solid, robust materials in clean lines

The whole site would not be required to deliver the hotel so an area of landscaping would be provided which would include mature trees along the Whitehall Road frontage to provide privacy and protection

Service access would be from Whitehall Road with the main entrance to the hotel being off Northern Street

Active, transparent uses would be sited at ground floor level to provide interest and the layout of the hotel was in line with the client's brief for the building

A green roof would be provided which would also include a water tank, with all plant being screened from view

Minutes approved at the meeting held on
11th April 2013

A separation distance of 21m would exist between the hotel and the nearby office building

The main elevational treatment would be anodized aluminium in different shades, ie dark and silver which would create different effects of the day. Anodized aluminium was hardwearing and any scratches to its surface could be polished out, so ensuring the quality of the finished structure was retained over time

Members commented on the following matters:-

- uncertainty about the metal cladding on this site; that natural materials as proposed in the previous scheme for the site might be better and concerns that the ground floor was reminiscent of a 1960s shopping parade
- the large windows being proposed, including windows to one side elevation and the welcome effect of these in the overall scheme
- that the quality of the workmanship was a key factor when considering metal clad buildings
- the high quality of the adjacent No1 Whitehall and whether the design of the proposed building was right for this site
- that metal cladding used elsewhere within Leeds had not always proved successful and the effects of colour changes which occurred during the day could be questioned
- the possibility of including renewables on the roof

In summing up the discussions, the Chair, whilst noting the mix of views about the cladding and the proposed colours, felt there was much merit in the scheme which had been presented and whilst accepting that it was right to compare the scheme in relation to No1 Whitehall, the site was also adjacent to the Novotel and that it was felt this was an appropriate location for the proposed use

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

86 Preapp/11/00459 - Proposals for laying out of access and erection of circa 1700 houses - Thorp Arch Estate, Wetherby, LS22

The Chair stated that although the Press and Public had been excluded, he would on this occasion use his discretion to enable a community representative, Parish Councillor Brown, Chair of Walton Parish Council, to address the Panel and to remain in the room to hear the discussions on the understanding that the confidential nature of the discussions was respected

Further to minute 10 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 27th September 2012, where Panel considered a pre-application presentation on proposals for the redevelopment of part of the site up to 1150 residential dwellings, with new primary school, access, landscaping and public open space, Panel considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and further pre-application presentation providing details of discussions on the proposals at the newly-established community forum

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

Minutes approved at the meeting held on
11th April 2013

The Chief Planning Officer presented the report and Panel then received a presentation on behalf of the proposed developers

Members were informed that the developers had listened to the views expressed at Panel and had taken on board the wish for an integrated masterplan for the whole estate and the setting up of a consultative forum

A revised scheme had been presented to the forum where it became clear that the main priority was the provision of a relief road, with the Parish Councils indicating their support for housing, including the possibility of increased levels of housing, if the relief road could be delivered

A heart was also required within the scheme, comprising community shopping centre, playing fields and a separate sports centre

Following on from this a further scheme was devised which was more favourable to the Parish Councils, however one particular issue was the location for the possible additional housing, which currently was part of an industrial estate. Funding and deliverability of the relief road was also an issue which would need to be addressed by the developer working in conjunction with the Council. In terms of the route of a relief road, two options had been drawn up with the Parish Councils being unanimous that the route should be along the western route. Whilst the delivery of the relief road would ideally be at the start of the scheme, the funding issues alluded to needed to be taken into account and work currently was being done on this. In answer to a point raised by Panel, no specific costings for a relief road had been drawn up

The Panel then heard from Councillor Brown, Chair of Walton Parish Council who was speaking on behalf of Walton, Boston Spa and Thorp Arch Parish Councils

Councillor Brown stated there was local support for in the region of 1700 properties and the provision of a relief road on the western route and that the proposals would bring a brownfield site back into use; provide a new, self-contained and sustainable community; would segregate industrial use from residential use and encourage the evolution of local retail facilities and create employment

Of the two routes proposed for a relief road, the route over the Ministry of Justice land was not acceptable as it would cut through and sever the community of Woodlands and Walton and would sever the Grange Park/Rudgate Park community. It would also not relieve traffic problems in respect to of Thorp Arch and Boston Spa nor address the issues with HGV traffic. The western route for the relief road would however provide a total solution for Boston Spa and Thorp Arch and had total support in the community

The timing of the road was crucial in the scheme as currently at peak times the local road network was heavily congested and that erecting further housing before the implementation of the new road was not acceptable

Concerns were also expressed about construction traffic and the need for some land remediation works, and that traffic and materials from this should not be passing through existing communities

Councillor Brown urged Panel to encourage all parties to work together to devise a scheme whereby the relief road could be delivered upfront and also highlighted the need for Yorkshire Water, which owned land in the area,

to be brought into the discussions to ensure that any planning application submitted was a complete one, for Members' consideration

The Parish Councils were also keen to be involved in discussions on the planning obligations package and there was a need for the consultative forum to be retained after the planning process and be continued until the forum itself felt it was no longer needed

Members discussed the proposals and commented on the following matters:-

- the western route, with mixed views about the suitability of using the railway cutting to site the relief road. Members were generally concerned about impact on listed structures and ecology and questioned the suitability of this route
- that no detailed transport assessment had taken place and that this should be commenced as soon as possible and should include an assessment for the relief road to the Wetherby Bypass
- that the provision of a relief road was a crucial factor in the proposals

Councillor Gruen declared a significant interest as he felt it was in the public interest to do so, in view of the meetings he had attended with Officers and the developers about these proposals

- the benefit of consultative forums and the hard work done by Ward Members in informing the community about the scheme and its wider, strategic interests
- that the proposals could make a significant contribution to the Council's Core Strategy and that community benefits could flow from the scheme and that, whilst accepting there were some major issues to be resolved, this could be a scheme which could be supported, particularly in view of the public support it had, dependent upon the delivery of the relief road and other planning matters
- affordable housing, that in this location the requirement was 35% and that an open-minded approach might be adopted in view of progressing the proposals in terms of the costs associated with the scheme and the wider benefits it would bring to the city

The Panel's highways representative stated that there were two major issues when considering siting a development of this size in this location; that the traffic access to Boston Spa would be managed and the existing roundabout at the Wetherby By pass would need to be improved. These matters will need to be looked at in detail

In response to the specific questions posed in the report, Panel provided the following responses:-

- that subject to the provision of a relief road, the revised scheme represented the comprehensive and sustainable form of development which Members were looking for
- that a relief road was essential and that more work was needed on this, including costings, with there being mixed views on the suitability of the site of the old railway line; to note the views of the Parish Councils that

Minutes approved at the meeting held on
11th April 2013

- only route B could be supported locally and the need for the assessment to include from the relief road to the Wetherby Bypass
- that Members were satisfied with the quantum of development but a set of proposals and options were needed and consideration had to be given to the timing of the delivery of the relief road
 - that it could be appropriate in this case to apply a 'roof tax' to contribute to the funding of the relief road
 - mixed views on the principle of the use of a proportion of monies that would have otherwise been used to deliver affordable housing to be used to finance a relief road and the need for further information and options to be provided
 - That a co-operative approach was supported and that this should include the Yorkshire Water site, with it to be designated for housing development
 - Members were of the view that an explanation of how the co-operative scheme for the whole of the estate will be delivered should form part of the planning application

Members encouraged Officers to address the issues of design, house types, cycle ways etc at an early stage and the need to link this with the sense of place discussions at the consultative forum, together with issues relating to Keyland Development's extant permission for industrial use on a nearby site

RESOLVED – To note the report, the presentations and the comments now made

87 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Tuesday, 26th March 2013 at 2.00pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.