

Councillor Dawn Collins

Councillor Jonathon Taylor

Councillor Jackie Shemilt

Conservative Group Office

2nd Floor East

Civic Hall

Leeds

LS1 1UR

Tel: 0113 5350285

Fax: 0113 3367008

Dawn.Collins@leeds.gov.uk

Jonathon.Taylor@leeds.gov.uk

Jackie.Shemilt@leeds.gov.uk

Date: 29 September 2020

Cllr James McKenna

By Email

Dear Cllr McKenna,

Ref: 19/05272/FU | Development of 152 affordable dwellings (C3) with associated access and landscaping | Horsforth Campus Calverley Lane Horsforth Leeds LS18

We (Cllrs Jonathon Taylor, Jackie Shemilt and Dawn Collins) wish to object to the planning application that will be considered at City Plans Panel on Thursday 1st October 2020.

We object on two grounds;

1. There are still a lot of problems with regards developing this site that have not been fully addressed. Questions that the review of this scheme raises have not yet been fully answered or properly resolved. We have attempted to highlight some of our concerns within the following pages, but answers to questions often generate follow up questions, so we ask you to be mindful that this is not a definitive list.
2. The decision to bring this application to panel appears rushed and ill considered. It was confirmed to us that the site was removed from the SAP (after the legal challenge) on 7th August 2020. Notice that this application would still go ahead and be considered by City Plans Panel came through on Friday 18th September 2020. The planning officer's report to plans panel and many missing documents were then not posted onto Public Access until much later the following week.

This has given us and our residents very little time to respond to the sudden switch from a protected Greenbelt site to one that is up for consideration.

We are concerned that this will reflect badly on the council and will raise questions about whether or not the process has been fully transparent and fair.

The outline planning application 15/02901/OT for up to 72 dwellings was acceptable to local Horsforth councillors at the time it was submitted. It complied with the guidelines of the NPPF with regards to development within the Greenbelt. The footprint, mass and height of the properties being proposed did not exceed that of the college buildings that were already present, in the middle of the site, and that would be demolished and replaced with the 72 new dwellings.

We have no objection with this old planning proposal progressing provided it still is no greater than the footprint, mass and height of the old college buildings (buildings only; not the carpark or playing fields).

We request that panel refuses this planning application.

Yours sincerely,



Councillor Dawn Collins
Horsforth Ward



Councillor Jonathon Taylor



Councillor Jackie Shemilt

Please see questions and notes on following pages;

Greenbelt and Green Space Provision

1. The site is Greenbelt and only offers 'Affordable Homes' as the reason for requesting 'special circumstances' for development. Have officers also considered that this site is also included in the Core Strategy as part of the city's Strategic Green Infrastructure (Map 16) and Leeds Habitat Network (Map 18) and should not, therefore, just be considered as 'in fill'?

Extract from Map 16:



Extract from Map 18:



We (Horsforth City Councillors) are concerned that this site is being brought forward, despite it having been removed from the Adopted Site Allocations Plan. This decision may have lasting effects on Greenbelt across our city, with the Chief Planning Officer able to overrule a document democratically voted on to bring forward sites he deems appropriate to develop. Having less than two weeks notice to Prepare for this Panel, on a site we considered to no longer be available for development, is grossly unfair on the people we represent, and brings this Council's Planning Process into disrepute.

Given its significance as the first Greenbelt site removed from the SAP by the Courts to be considered, we would anticipate the Council to be subject to legal challenge and greater scrutiny by the Secretary of State by way of call in.

2. Why wasn't the applicant expected to provide a Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) and to include a Biodiversity Metric so that we had a quantitative figure regarding the Net gain (or loss) for Biodiversity as per Policy G9 and the NPPF?
3. What is the future maintenance plan for the green spaces on site and who will manage them?

Note: The wildlife area that the college developed to the south of the site (left on the developers images) has now been retained but no details about what this site will become have been put forward. Planning officers response (24/09/2020 14:01pm) when asked this question was;

"These areas will be managed and paid for by the developer or maintained by our own Parks and Countryside Service for which we would require a commuted sum payment"

But the same officer also said (24/09/2020 10:27am);

"Green Space Commuted Sum (S106) / Management Plan – this will all be on site as the provision is well in excess of policy requirements"

4. Why wasn't there a written report from our officer who looks at the biodiversity aspects of a development. I.e. a before and after appraisal?
5. Can we have a low level fence running the length of the boundary between the road and the greenspace on the left to stop vehicles accessing?

Planning officers response (24/09/2020);

"It is perfectly possible but I need to think about that one and take some further advice"

6. We asked the developers if they could include a simple play area (swings, slide and seesaw) within their development so that there wasn't the temptation for younger children to travel to Horsforth Hall Park every time. Is there going to be something?

Note: There isn't going to be any S106 for greenspace nor any CIL.

Horsforth Hall Park isn't far away but you do have to cross the A65 and the Ring Road to get there.

Highways

7. What will be the nature of the alterations and mitigations on the Horsforth and Rodley Roundabouts? If the developer contributes £250,000 through S106 as proposed will there be further funds to find and where will those funds come from?

Note: Highways have stated in their report that Horsforth Roundabout will require alteration if this development takes place. They also state that it will have a cumulative impact on the operation the A65, A657 and A6120 (Ring Road) and mitigation improvements will be required.

Highways accept that the two roundabouts closest to the development (Horsforth and Rodley) are 'identified hotspot junctions'

Highways also state in their report that both roundabouts are 'close to capacity being made worse by the development'

8. Is there a reason why the comments made by West Yorkshire police have not been posted on public access?

Only the 'header' document is posted

9. Why haven't all of the concerns, raised by our Highways Development Engineer, on 05/05/2020 been addressed?

10. Will the developer be providing S106 towards a travel plan?

Proposed by our Influencing Travel Team

- Review fee £3,138
- Travel Plan Fund £61,561
- Provision of Leeds City Council Car Club provider parking space

School Places

11. The level of school places required to support this development still hasn't been clearly established. Only an estimate of need has been available, based on an average mix of homes. Is this issue going to be ignored or can Children Services review other locations of high affordable homes to give a more accurate picture regarding how many new children will move into this location?

We know the criteria Leeds has set for allocating properties of this nature but have concerns that the Pupil Product Ratio (PPR) cannot be relied upon to provide an accurate picture of need. On 19 May, we asked the case officer and Planning Officer for work to be completed examining existing developments of a similar nature and the number of children they produced requiring school places. An update was not offered until 25 September, after we asked the Chief Planning Officer for the outcome of this work. Further work was then scrapped on 28 September when officers advised that their previous calculations were not comparable and that they were not able to determine a true picture of need.

There are 300 Primary places in Horsforth at each intake, and in 2019/20 there were no surplus places. 13 children with a Horsforth postcode were allocated places in schools outside of Horsforth with our schools remaining oversubscribed. This development will add to that pressure, and is contrary to Chapter 8 of the NPPF paragraph 94 which states that "It is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities". As demonstrated, Horsforth is already under provided with school places.

Expanding Newlathes Primary School has been included in the Site Allocation Plan however the Council have so far not been able to provide a cost to us for that work. An estimate has been suggested by the Sufficiency & Participation Team on 14 July of

£2.8million for 1 additional Form of Entry. It was also confirmed on that date that no feasibility study has so far been done, making expansion a distant hope.

Remaining S106 contribution to education stands at £911,620, leaving the Council to find nearly £2million to expand Horsforth Newlaithes to accommodate children from this new development

Housing / Site Design

12. Why are there no bungalows being proposed?

There is affordable housing need within Horsforth Ward but much of the need is for bungalows. Our population is older than the city average (see census data) who wish to downsize and release a family home.

13. Have all of the concerns raised by our Access Officer been addressed? They don't look like they have from what I can see on the posted drawings.

Site Layout

14. Some plots appear particularly unacceptable and the proposal to accept them should not have been put forward. Were these discussed with the developer?

The development could have achieved a much better design than proposed; more off street parking; access to the rear of all properties for bin location; better front gardens; reduced noise between neighbours;

e.g. the following plots appear problematic

75	A	n.b. 2 bedroom, 2 storey
72	A	“
78	A	“
150 or 151	A	“
86	A	“
90	A	“
105	A	“
143	A	“
68	A	“
61	A	“
50	I	n.b. 3 bedroom, 3 storey
40	I	“
45	I	“
35	I	“
30	I	“
27	I	“
qty	16	

Carparking

15. How will on street parking be managed?

All properties appear to have the bare minimum. Questions about visitor parking has already been raised in officer reports.

Concern that integral garages (Type I) will be converted into family living space as family lounge and kitchen/dining rooms look small (no bigger than the garage) under permitted development. First floor lounge could then also be converted into 4th bedroom. This will then mean these modified homes will only have one off-street parking place for a 3/4 bed roomed home.



Bins

16. Have officers discussed with developers who should pay for brown bins on the site and when a brown bin service will be introduced?

It will not be acceptable for these homes, just because they are 'affordable', not to have a brown bin service as the rest of Horsforth does. Previously officers have missed this issue. Eg it now falls to LCC to pay for the brown bins within Horsforth Vale as this was not addressed prior to permission being granted.

Now that the developers have squeezed more into the site by making many of the houses terraced, where will the bins be stored? Experience shows that residents are unlikely to wheel their bins to the back of the properties via a 'roundabout' route. Proper bin storage is required to keep the estate looking maintained and tidy.

Schedule of Accommodation

17. A previous old drawing showed what the split was going to be between 'Shared Ownership', 'Rent to Buy' and 'Affordable Rent' was going to be for each individual house style. It is no longer on the new equivalent drawing so please can you let me know where I can find this?

Shown in Affordable Housing Statement; 53% will be provided as 'Shared Ownership' and 'But to Rent'. 47% will be provided as 'Social Rent' and 'Affordable Rent'.

Inaccuracies in report

S106 not up to date (Note; no CIL due to the nature of the development)

Number of objections not up to date and inaccurate