

NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 11TH OCTOBER, 2018

PRESENT: Councillor N Walshaw in the Chair

Councillors S Arif, D Collins, M Dobson,
R Grahame, D Jenkins, E Nash, K Ritchie,
S Seary, A Wenham and G Wilkinson

SITE VISIT

The site visits were attended by Councillors: Walshaw, Collins, Grahame, Nash, Ritchie, Seary, Wenham and Wilkinson.

48 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

49 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no late items.

50 Late Items

There were no late items.

51 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made.

52 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

53 Minutes - 6th September 2018

RESOLVED - That minutes of the meeting held on 6th September 2018 were approved as a correct record.

54 Application 17/07970/OT - Land off Walton Road, Walton, Wetherby

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an outline planning application for a residential development comprising up to 119 dwellings at land off Walton Road, Walton, Wetherby.

Members were advised of an additional condition: Scheme for delivery of renewable energy to be submitted and approved.

Members were also advised of additional representations:

Additional objection from a Wetherby resident on the grounds that:

- Need for development not justified;
- Fails to meet accessibility standards;
- Impact on public services and public transport;
- Increased traffic and queues over the bridge at Boston Spa and at roundabout on edge of Wetherby;
- Wetherby congested and polluted at peak periods;
- S106 payments and benefits from Travel Plan questionable;
- Will encourage further infill development;
- Change from rural to urban character;
- Justification is flawed and should be refused.

Representation from the Wetherby Liberal Democrats:

- Provision of 35% affordable housing is welcomed;
- Does not offer the best site for a new community hall;
- Concerns noted about school provision;
- Support residents only parking scheme on Bridge Road;
- Concerned over traffic in Boston Spa and discussions should continue;
- Support comments made by Sport England, and oppose the conclusion that the pitch is surplus to requirements, and pitch should remain with a new pavilion for community use.

Members had visited the site earlier in the day, photographs and plans were shown at the meeting.

The application was brought before the North and East Plans Panel as this is a major and sensitive development.

The application was in outline with all matters reserved, save for access which includes two vehicular access points. Members were informed that the site was currently partly undesignated within the development (UDPR) however, part of the application site was allocated as a protected playing pitch under save policy N6 of the (UDPR). It was noted that the pitch had formed part of HMP Wealstun but had become surplus and had been transferred to Homes England in January 2015.

Members were advised that the overall site was being put forward as a housing allocation within the advanced Site Allocation Plan (SAP). The SAP put forward a target of 142 dwellings on this site alongside an area of land within the allocation which is already subject to a positive resolution to grant permission for 23 dwellings and if combined with the 119 proposed dwellings would meet the 142 dwelling allocation target.

The proposed layout would split the site into two component parts, with the southern most portion comprising of 32 dwellings which would be served by Grange Avenue and the remaining 87 dwellings would be served by a new access onto Street 5 within Thorp Arch Trading Estate. Members were

advised that there would also be pedestrian links between the two sites and that there would be bus stops for travel towards Wetherby and Boston Spa.

Members were advised that provision for land to the south eastern boundary be designated as Site of Ecological Interest (SEGI) and that this area should not be transferred to private ownership. It was noted that to the south east corner of the application site allotments were proposed, adjacent to the SEGI.

Members were informed that 35% of the site would be affordable housing with a mix of 2, 3, 4 bed houses.

In attendance at the meeting to speak against the application were:

Cllr. Alan Lamb

Peter Locke

John Richardson

Howard Alderton

The Panel were informed of the following objections to the proposals:

- Misrepresentation of the planning case;
- Site not sustainable;
- Highways problems;
- Impact on traffic;
- Urbanisation of a rural area;
- Proposal fails Core Strategy requirements;
- Report was incomplete;
- Site on green space provision;
- Site not suitable for SAP;
- The proposal was not in line with Neighbourhood Plan;
- Site premature to be considered for development;
- The proposal would merge two existing settlements;
- Impact on bridge at Boston Spa which already has traffic issues;
- Traffic around and through Thorp Arch Trading Estate already busy especially at rush hour;
- Proposed houses would over look existing houses;

In response to Members questions the Panel were advised of the following points:

- Debate had taken place between all parties and the Inspector in relation to SAP site;
- The neighbourhood Plan has been adopted;
- Permission had been given for the 23 houses. However, no work had started on the site;
- It was the opinion of those in attendance that the proposed residents parking scheme near to the bridge at Boston Spa would not solve the traffic issues along this road or over the bridge;
- There was a lack of parking particularly on race days and weekends. It was noted that often people drive along the pavements, or queue in oncoming traffic;

- 1 school at Thorp Arch which had capacity to extend small amount. However, it was the view that should the development take place children offered places at the school from the new development would block places for children in Walton. It was noted that there was currently no spaces at Lady Elizabeth Hastings Primary School, St Mary's at Boston Spa had some spare capacity;
- The High Schools in the area had spare capacity;
- 1 GP in Boston Spa which it was noted was already full;
- Concerns were raised that this was a rural area and the size of the development would urbanise the area and change the character of the area;
- Boston Spa had some facilities and shops but Walton had no shops or post office;
- Members were advised that this size of development would merge the two settlements and this was not allowed in planning policy;
- The Inspector was only weeks away from providing their views on the development of the site;
- Currently no football pitches in Walton, Thorp Arch or Boston Spa would like to encourage young people to play football and re-establish the football pitch;
- The Neighbourhood Plan proposes 43 – 45 new houses for the area;
- The site proposed for the agreed 23 houses is part of brownfield site.

Mr Walton the agent and Mr O'Brian the applicant were at the meeting and addressed the Panel:

- Homes England had acquired the site from HMP Wealstun when it was no longer required. It was noted that the site would stay in the control of Homes England until the development was completed;
- The proposal meets sustainability and suitability tests;
- The site was adjacent to other houses and had been allocated in draft for housing development;
- SAP is due to be updated in the near future and as part of SAP this should add weight to the proposal;
- Prematurity would not prejudice the size and scale of this development;
- Playing field land was now redundant and had not been used for 5 years;
- There is a half hour bus service and the developer would provide contributions towards the local transport system;
- Members were advised that Lady Elizabeth Hastings Primary School would be able to absorb children from the new development.

In response to questions and comments from the Members the following points were noted:

- Public footpaths and cycle ways would be provided;
- The site was on white land;
- Bungalows could be considered at reserved matters stage should there be found to be a need for them;
- The development would not impact negatively on already existing traffic issues;

- The consultation event had been well attended at the Community Hall where comments had been taken on board and revisions had been made to the plans in light of the comments put forward;
- Consultation had taken place with GP's and dentists;

The Lead Planning Officer for the Panel commented, with reference to central government planning policy and guidance, on some of the points raised by objectors and the applicant. This included that the starting point for the consideration of any planning application was against the policies of the development plan, that central government planning policy guidance sets out that in the absence of a 5 year housing land supply there is a tilted balance in favour of granting planning permission for sustainable development, that it would be difficult to sustain a planning argument that the development is premature in light of the tests set out in government planning guidance, that as the SAP is at an advanced stage towards its adoption government advice is that weight should be attached to that document, the council in proposing to allocate the site for housing in the SAP has set out that the council considers it to be a sustainable and suitable form of development at this site, that the implications that arise from the failure of the development to fully comply with the council's accessibility standards need to be weighed against other factors including the scale of development, the proximity to sources of employment and that the site is close to other residential properties.

The Panel also discussed:

- Public transport
- Impact on traffic in the area
- Neighbourhood Plans
- 5 Year Housing Land Supply

At the conclusion of discussions Councillor Nash moved a motion to defer the application for further work to be undertaken and information to be provided to Panel in respect of the sustainability of the site and the proposed development. The motion was seconded by Councillor Arif. On being put to the vote, Councillor's Nash's motion was passed.

RESOLVED – To defer the application for further work to be undertaken on the sustainability of the site and the development and particularly:

- Sustainability:–
 - How the proposal sits accessibility standards including including details of the bus service and days and hours of operation.
 - Information in respect of the sustainability credentials of the site including proximity to employment opportunities, local schooling and local facilities.
 - Details of what measures the applicant propose to improve the sustainability credentials of the site and development and how these would be secured.
- To set out the impact of traffic associated with the development on Thorp Arch Bridge. What measures are proposed to mitigate that impact and what processes need to be gone through to deliver the mitigation measures.

- Further detail to be provided on how the proposal sits with against the policies of the relevant Neighbourhood Plan and plans from neighbouring areas.

Councillor Dobson left the meeting at 15:45 at the end of this item.

55 Application 18/00907/FU - 374 Alwoodley Lane, Alwoodley, Leeds, LS17 7DN

The report of the Chief Planning Officer requested Members consideration for the partial demolition of existing house and erection of 5 flats at 374 Alwoodley Lane, Alwoodley, Leeds.

Members were advised of additional conditions:

- Construction management plan
- Maximum gradients as part of condition 14
- Vehicle spaces to be laid out

The proposal sought to erect a building that would contain five flats with underground car parking for 11 vehicles in a basement building. Members were informed that the ground and first floor of the building would contain 2 flats each with the fifth flat located on the second floor. It was proposed that the building would be sited on the side garden of 374 Alwoodley Lane.

The Panel were advised that the proposal was for the side extension to 374 Alwoodley Lane to be demolished, therefore the distance proposed between the retained part of 374 Alwoodley Lane and the proposed flats would be 2.75 metres.

Members were informed that currently the site has two access points. However, the proposal would divide the site so that the access closest to Harrogate Road junction would provide the access / egress for the proposed development whilst the access further along Alwoodley Lane would provide the access/ egress for the current dwelling.

Members acknowledged the fact that there was a small brook between the east boundary of 374 Alwoodley Lane and the adjoining property.

Members had attended a site visit earlier in the day. Photographs and plans were shown throughout the presentation.

Members acknowledged that the Alwoodley Neighbourhood Plan had been adopted and should be given full weight.

In attendance at the meeting were Mrs Adcock who lived in the neighbouring property and Cllr. Dan Cohen, both raised concerns informing the Panel of the following points:

- The houses along Alwoodley Lane are large family houses with large gardens. Mrs Adcock said that this was the reason that they had extended their property to be their forever home. However the properties on either side of Mrs Adcock were looking to demolish the houses and build flats. She said that her family were facing the prospect of an over dominant monstrosity being shoe horned into the space between her house and that of next door on an undersized plot;
- Mrs Adcock said that she realised that family homes were needed but did not feel that flats were family orientated or that these were affordable homes;
- The scale and bulk of the proposed flats made for over development of the site;
- Mrs Adcock was of the view that this application was garden grabbing and not in the spirit of the Neighbourhood Plan;
- Mrs Adcock explained that her family would suffer loss of privacy due to the height of the proposed balconies facing her bedroom and that of her daughter's room would give direct view into their bedrooms. She said that the front and side proposed balconies served no purpose other than maintenance access according the submitted report and requested that they be removed;
- Impact of increased traffic including extra traffic from the Eden House flats which are in development;
- The Alwoodley Neighbourhood Plan set out that there should not be any on street parking. Mrs Adcock and Cllr. Cohen were of the view that there would not be enough parking on the proposed development and deliveries and visitors to the proposed flats would have to park on the street;
- It was the view of Mrs Adcock that the proposed flats were too close to the boundary with her property she pointed out that the significant gap as at point 10.4 of the submitted report relating to the stream was her private land not that of the applicant;
- The design of the roof of the proposed flats was out of character with the area;
- The proposal was out of keeping with the Neighbourhood Plan and also out of character with the area;
- Real highways issues due to the amount of development in the area;
- Cllr. Cohen referred to the rear of the proposed development as a 'carbuncle' and out of keeping with the local area;
- Policy BE3 of the Alwoodley Neighbourhood Plan refers to the fact that development must not lead to on street parking.

Responding to questions and comments from the Panel Mrs Adcock said that the applicant had not spoken to her about the application. Mrs Adcock explained what the traffic was like on both Alwoodley Lane and Harrogate Road clarifying how busy it was and that there was already parking restrictions with a single yellow line outside the property.

It was noted that within the Alwoodley Neighbourhood Plan it gave a guiding principle that family homes should not be demolished for flats. It was acknowledged that this was only a partial demolition of the family house.

Mr Johnson of Dsign House Architects was in attendance at the meeting and addressed the Members informing them of the following points:

- He had taken on board the comments of the neighbour
- He acknowledged that Alwoodley Lane was a busy a road. However he said there was already an issue with on street parking especially for deliveries as most of the houses along that road had electronic gates.
- Can't control the parking of those who are picking up or dropping off at the school
- Extensive negotiations had taken place with officers
- Parking on the site did address parking as there were more spaces than required;
- 'Carbuncle' this was a question of architectural design and preference;
- The development does not overlook other properties the site is substantially screen by a number of trees;
- 376 had been a separate site until 374 had been extended into 376. It was Mr Johnson's view that another building on this site would therefore not look out of character;
- Mr Johnson said that there was a demand for quality flats in the area for those older people who wanted to downsize but not move away from the area.

Mr Johnson in responding to Members questions and comments informed them of the following points:

- The scale and massing of the whole site when taken in context of the properties either side was not too large for the character of the area;
- The parking within the basement was bigger than required and any further parking could be dealt with within the site;
- The balconies could be changed to either restrict view or be removed;
- The site would probably be gated on a night time;
- Proposed materials were natural flat faced stone, soft alloy for the roof, aluminium window frames, there would be Juliet balconies to the front but there was a substantial screen of trees, and the side windows would be obscure glazed;
- It was noted that the development would not use solar panels but a sustainable heating and hot water system;
- There was a 15 metre gap between properties which exceeded the minimum standard;
- Side of balconies could be screened with 2 metre high screens to limit overlooking
- It was noted that the properties on Alwoodley Lane had been built at different times and therefore were of differing design including style of roof;

Members were advised that an oral update as suggested at point 10.6 of the submitted report had been provided at the start of the item and referred to the additional conditions.

Clarifications was provided on how the car parking was compliant with car parking standards. Car parking standards are included within the Core Strategy and the UDPR.

Members were also advised that the remaining house would still have Permitted Development rights. It was currently considered not to be reasonable to impose removal of PD rights on the remaining dwelling.

Members requested additional parking to the front of the application site and also the removal of balconies to the side of the flats and screens made higher on the balconies to the rear of the flats.

RESOLVED – To defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer with the additional amendments listed below:

1. Provision of privacy screens to the side of the rear balconies
2. Removal of the side walkway/balconies to the second floor of the building
3. To maximise provision of parking including the provision of a surface level parking space to the front of the development

Additional Conditions included:

- Construction management plan
- Maximum gradients as part of condition 14
- Vehicle spaces to be laid out

56 Preapp/17/00631 - Scarcroft Cottage, Wetherby Road, Scarcroft, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer set out a pre-application enquiry submitted by Gaunt Francis Architects on behalf of Audley Court Ltd for the demolition of buildings and redevelopment of site for a community care village including conversion of a Grade II listed building at Scarcroft Lodge, Wetherby Road, Scarcroft.

Attending the meeting to present the pre-application enquiry were Gavin Birt of Audley Court Ltd and Ben Krauze of Gaunt Francis Architects.

Members noted that the application was for the development of a brownfield site. Mr Birt informed the Panel that there were 19 of these community villages around the country. He said that the company had started out offering care homes, however, it was felt that care homes institutionalised people and they had realised that people enjoyed pleasant surroundings such as park land. Mr Birt explained that the communities provided care for people with an average age of 79-81 years of age but the community was open to all ages with 77% of people from the local area.

Members heard that the community village would have communal facilities which included: swimming pool, sauna, steam room, gym, salon and treatment rooms, lounge, library, hobbies room, restaurant, and bistro and meeting rooms. Mr Birt informed Members that it was important that residents stayed part of the local community therefore they had an open door policy with residents of the local area welcome to use the communal facilities. It was hoped that the local Parish Council would consider holding events in the meeting rooms and that there would be interaction with the local schools.

Members were informed that the proposal was for 172 units of which 148 would be apartments and 24 would be cottages. These would be located across 9 blocks within the site. The proposal included 172 parking spaces for the village residents plus 13 spaces for staff and visitors, 1 minibus space, 9 private parking spaces, 2 single private garages serving the private residential dwellings and 48 spaces were to be allocated to the cricket club. It was noted spaces would also be available for scooters.

Members heard that 75 permanent jobs would be made available with training provided. They had their own care training academy.

Members were advised that the grade II listed building would be used to house the wellbeing spa for residents and that all listed elements of the building would be retained. The 1950's elements of the building was to be demolished.

It was noted that this would not be a gated community and that all the spaces would be interlinked with the street running through the heart of the development.

Members were informed that the materials to be used were stone, render and slate. Members heard that a combined heating and water system which was gas fired was proposed to feed all the site.

Responding to Members questions and comments the Panel were informed of the following points:

- There was to be a 10 metre tree buffer with the addition of more trees;
- Proposed landscaping would include as many as possible of the trees already on site;
- Research had found that parking 1 space to 1 unit was sufficient it was also noted that the community would have their own bus service;
- All properties would be accessible including the three storey apartments which would have lifts;
- Character courtyards were to be created in the village to assist people to feel safe and meet other people;
- The application was for C2 provision and therefore couldn't afford to provide affordable housing within this development. However it was suggested that a piece of land could be provided to the Parish Council to develop affordable housing;
- The development would recycle as much as possible from the existing site.

Members were asked to answer the following questions:

1. Do Members support the principle of development?
2. Do Members support the repair, refurbishment, extension and conversion of Scarcroft Lodge, Grade II listed building?
3. Are Members content with the design approach?
4. Do Members support the highway comments?
5. Do Members agree to landscaping proposals and biodiversity?

RESOLVED – To note the report on the proposal, to provide initial views in relation to the pre-application and answer the following questions to aid progression of the application:

- Do Members support the principle of development? Yes
- Do Members support the repair, refurbishment, extension and conversion of Scarcroft Lodge, Grade II listed building? Yes
- Are Members content with the design approach? Yes
- Do Members support the highway comments? Yes, subject to the outcome of discussions with the Cricket Club in respect of their parking provision.
- Do Members agree to landscaping proposals and biodiversity? Yes

Councillor Arif left the meeting at 16:50 during discussion on this item.

57 Date and Time of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the North and East Plans Panel will be on 8th November 2018, at 1:30pm.