

NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 22ND JULY, 2021

PRESENT: Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors E Nash, N Sharpe, M Midgley,
B Anderson, G Almass, E Flint, A Lamb
and D Cohen

19 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against the refusal of inspection of documents.

20 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no exempt items.

21 Late Items

There were no late items.

22 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary or other interests.

23 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr R Stephenson. Cllr D Cohen was in attendance as substitute for Cllr Stephenson.

24 Minutes - 24th June 2021

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 24th June 2021, be approved as a correct record. There were no matters arising.

25 19/07608/RM Reserved Matters application for residential development up to 129 dwellings, Land At Leeds Road, Collingham, Wetherby

The report of the Chief Planning Officer requested Members consideration on a Reserved Matters application for residential development of up to 129 dwellings on land at Leeds Road, Collingham, Wetherby.

Slides and photographs were shown throughout the presentation.

Members were informed of the following points:

- Factual errors were noted within the report at paragraphs 12 and 13. These were:
 - Paragraph 12 – should read 88% instead of 81% and 12% instead of 19%
 - Paragraph 13 – should read 45 affordable properties, 24 semi-detached two bedroom terraced units, 15 tri-terraced units and 6 two bedroom semi-detached units
- The application before the Panel was for the determination of reserved matters only, which comprised appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. The reserved matters were to be the focus for the Panel's decision-making, as the principle of development and means of access had already been established.
- The application had been brought to Panel at the request of the Harewood Ward Members who were concerned about the design and layout of the scheme in light of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Outline planning permission was granted on appeal in December 2016 and established the principle of development at the site alongside means of access to the site from Leeds Road (A58).
- The application site was identified within the Site Allocation Plan (SAP ref HG1-519) with an indicative capacity of 150 units. It was noted that part of the application site was within Green Belt, however, the residential units would be located on non-Green Belt land.
- It was noted that planning permission for a bridge across Collingham Beck had already been granted as part of the outline consent.
- The applicant was Miller Homes and Albert Hills.
- The southern most part of the site is within flood zones 2 and 3. It was noted that the Environment Agency had introduced new and additional flood mitigation measures along the beck by strengthening the banking and erecting concrete barriers to prevent further flooding.
- Comments had been received from the community, Harewood Ward Councillors and Collingham with Linton Parish Council.
- The site layout had been amended numerous times with a reduction in dwellings from 139 dwellings to 129 dwellings, increased space standards, more amenity space and better connectivity through and around the site including pedestrian and cycle routes.
- This site had provision for three green spaces, it was noted that landscaping would be via condition. Proposals were for a wildflower meadow, hedgerows and soft planting and the addition of 108 trees to be planted. Developers had engaged with Officers in relation to species types for this area.
- Proposed materials for this site were for buff reconstituted stone, gold buff bricks with a 50/50 split of orange and grey roof tiles. Examples of the materials were shown during the presentation.
- Character assessment of the area had been undertaken by officers so that the development would be within keeping of the character of the area.
- The developers had taken account of climate change, affordable units, flood defences, and increased the use of stone on the site, open

spaces, natural wet land, wildflower and tree planting, character of the local area and accessibility and connectivity.

- Since the publication of the report 4 more representations had been received – one from the Parish Council and three from residents. It was noted that most of the points raised were a repeat of those already listed and included: number of houses, no bungalows, no two bed houses for downsizing, density, flood mitigation and no engagement with existing residents.
- It was acknowledged that the developer had engaged with Officers to make a number of changes since the plans were originally submitted, so as to reflect representations received and reflect the Council's current planning policies and priorities.

Members were advised of a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework which now has a strong emphasis on local design guidance, policies and codes. Members were provided with clarification on what this entailed.

It was also noted that it was intended to seek two additional conditions from those stated in the Officer Report. These would comprise:

- Electric vehicle charging points being provided for all properties, not just those with garages
- Provision of visibility splays to internal roads of 2.4m x 25m

In addition to this Cllr Nash requested that water butts be provided to all the dwellings and the applicant confirmed their agreement to this request.

Cllr Julian Holmes of the Collingham and Linton Parish Council attended the Panel along with Harewood Ward Councillor, Ryan Stephenson, and informed the Members of the following points:

- Mr Holmes said that he had been involved with this application and the Neighbourhood Plan since 2012 and was of the view that the proposals were not appropriate.
- The Panel were advised that since the outline plan had been approved the Neighbourhood Plan had been checked by an experienced Inspector and approved. As such, it should be given appropriate weight in the planning process. Policies within the Neighbourhood Plan specifically relevant here were those relating to maintaining distinct local character, height, scale, spacing and landscaping
- He said that the engagement by Miller Homes had been 'woeful' and he could not identify one change incorporated into the current proposals that had been requested by the Parish Council or the community.
- Mr Holmes made reference to his presentation that had been emailed to the Plans Panel with the agreement of the Chair.
- Mr Holmes was of the view that the density within the site had been made worse instead of better and much needed open space had been reduced.

- The Neighbourhood Plan and SHMA set out a need for two bedroom houses or bungalows given the aging demographic in the area. It was noted on the original application that had been looked at by the inspector had proposed bungalows.
- He raised concerns in relation to the proposed flood mitigation, saying that it needed to be free draining. He was also of the view that the proposed attenuation tank was not appropriate for this development.
- He noted that the open space to be provided would be unusable and was unimaginative, as well as being only 35% of what had been originally proposed to be provided for greenspace in the early iterations of the scheme.

In response to questions from Members the Panel were informed of the following:

- The Neighbourhood Plan states the need for smaller houses, bungalows and sheltered housing to provide for the housing needs in the area. At the outline planning stage, developers had shown plans which indicated that this site would have bungalows, therefore residents were of a view that this would assist with housing need in the area. However, the bungalows have now been removed from the planning application and this was disappointing.
- It was noted that Cllr Stephenson was of the view that the bridge access was not appropriate but acknowledged that this was to be considered at a future date. However, Cllr Stephenson felt that taking a 'masterplan' approach to the development – and looking at the bridge in conjunction with that – would have been beneficial.
- It was the opinion of Mr Holmes that the developers had paid little regard to the Neighbourhood Plan in relation to density, materials, design or landscaping. Mr Holmes stated that the scheme comprised a pastiche design that does not reflect Collingham.
- In addition, Mr Holmes and Cllr Stephenson stated that the development is not appropriate to the area's demographic needs. The Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that development will need to take place in the area, but wishes to ensure the area's housing need is met when new development comes forward.
- The objectors provided Mill Beck Green and Church Fields, Boston Spa, as good examples of appropriate development in Collingham and the surrounding area.
- There had been no opportunity to engage with either the developers or officers.
- The three proposed open spaces did not appear appropriate for play or leisure activities.

Jonathan Dunbavin, the agent for the applicant, and Dr Kevin Tilford, flood risk management advisor for the applicant, attended the meeting and provided the following information:

- There had been two meetings with the Parish Council in relation to the design aspects of this scheme and the Neighbourhood Plan. The design had evolved as a result of those meetings.

- The number of dwellings had reduced from 147 to 129, with layout changes and amendments to the house types, and all the changes complied with policies A, D and G of the Neighbourhood Plan. It was noted that all the designs also meet with the criteria of Neighbourhoods for Living.
- Open Space currently exceeds that set out in the Core Strategy, and the scheme is policy compliant in relation to mix, space standards and affordable housing and accessible homes. The scheme improves connectivity with Collingham with a footpath and provides flood mitigation for the wider area of Collingham.
- The applicant had consulted fully with the relevant agencies in relation to flood risk management regarding flood risk and drainage. The principle source of flooding risk to the area is Collingham Beck. It was noted that 75% of the development platform was in flood zone 1 and that this area was in a low flood risk area – hence it was proposed that this would be where the majority of houses would be built. For the other 25% of the site, ground levels would be raised, taking the development platform across the site into flood zone 1 and hence all houses would therefore be built in flood zone 1. All properties will have a raised floor-level.
- To ensure that flood risk did not increase elsewhere, compensatory flood storage (by way of an attenuation basin) would be provided on land adjacent to the development platform, this storage would not be in use most of the time. It was noted that the flood mitigation proposals would alleviate flood risk to houses on other developments such as Mill Beck Green, as it would have additional capacity for flood water storage if needed.
- A new hydraulic model had been developed for Collingham Beck as part of a wider flood mitigation scheme of the River Wharfe catchment area. A review of this model had confirmed that this would not affect flood mitigation for this area. It was noted that the Environment Agency agreed.
- The development access road would be a dry access road and a flood wall would be constructed to reduce flooding on Leeds Road.
- Surface water run-off from the development would be discharged to Collingham Beck at a restricted rate and would exceed the natural run-off rate.
- A below ground storage tank would be used to ensure that the development would not flood.
- Bungalows had been shown on the plans when the application was made for outline planning permission, but the plans were indicative only. At that stage, planning permission had been granted for the principle of development and means of access, but with details of the scheme for later determination. There had been an aspiration to provide bungalows, but there was no policy basis on which this had to be provided. In addition, the Inspector on appeal had not sought to condition the provision of bungalows or two-bed properties – seeming to be satisfied that smaller scale housing would be adequately provided for within the City Centre.

In response to Members questions, the Panel were provided with the following information:

- The meetings with the Parish Council had taken place 2-3 years ago.
- All open space met with policy and would be usable for recreation purposes.
- Developers would consider adding water butts
- In response to a request for CGI's, Mr Dunbavin provided the example of a development in Bramhope of house types to be used. It was the view of the Panel that this was not the best example as there had been complaints about the design and water mitigation system at this development.
- Members' frustration was noted regarding there being elements on the illustrative plan that were then not coming forward as part of the reserved matters application. In terms of the provision of bungalows, the applicant was correct that there were no policy basis upon which a demand for this type of accommodation could be made. However, Policy H5 was complied with as part of the proposals – such that all homes would be accessible for a residents' lifetime.
- Regarding density, Members were reminded of the Inspector's view on appeal. The Inspector had found nothing exceptional about the surrounding area that necessitated a lower density than 30 no. dwellings per hectare, so as to ensure that a sufficient number of homes would be provided on the site to meet housing need. The proposal coming forward therefore ensures an efficient use of the land.

Members discussions included:

- Density of site
- Housing need for the area
- Waste management
- Use of open space and wish that this could be provided in a way that would ensure it was interactive for residents
- Biodiversity net gain and intention to secure this by way of condition, with local engagement envisaged
- Types of affordable housing
- Landscaping and tree replacement in compliance with 3:1 replacement policy
- Design of proposed dwellings, including hope that they could reflect surrounding roofscapes (for instance, with the inclusion of chimneys if appropriate)
- Compliance with policies within the Neighbourhood Plan
- Request for CGI's, with the lack of detail on images provided to date being such that it was difficult for Members to come to a decision
- Need for further engagement with local residents and local demographic need

The Plans Panel requested the application be deferred and for the following changes:

- Further negotiations on density including exploring the inclusion of housing for the elderly/bungalows.
- Revisit the Neighbourhood Plan and look to see if design can be revised to reflect local architectural characteristics.
- Look at roofscape to ensure variety and interest.
- Provide CGI's to show streetscenes.
- Open spaces – how pedestrian access is to be provided to and through spaces and provision for informal play.
- Open spaces – details of scheme to prevent unauthorised access by vehicles.
- Affordable Housing – improve mix (this could be achieved through changing the design of smaller units to provide accommodation in the roofspace).
- Engagement with local community, Ward Members and Parish Council.

- **RESOLVED** – To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to consultation with Ward Members. If no agreement is reached with ward Member on revisions to the scheme then the application is to be reported back to Panel for determination.

26 Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED – That the date of the next North and East Plans Panel will be on Thursday 19th August 2021, at 1:30pm.

The meeting concluded at 15:55