

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 14TH APRIL, 2022**

**PRESENT:** Councillor E Taylor in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,  
S Hamilton, D Ragan, P Wray, R Finnigan,  
S Burke, D Collins, T Smith and D Jenkins

### **88 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

There were no appeals.

### **89 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There was no exempt information.

### **90 Late Items**

There were no late items.

### **91 Declarations of Interests**

Councillor Finnigan declared an other registerable interest in Agenda Item 8, Application 21/09404/FU, 5 Church Gardens, Drighlington as he was a Member of Drighlington Parish Council. The Parish Council had been consulted with regards to the application but he has had no previous involvement in the matter.

### **92 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies.

### **93 Minutes - 17 March 2022**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2022 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **94 Application 21/03265/FU - Belmont House, Round House and Coach House, 20 Wood Lane, Headingley, LS6 2AE**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the conversion and extension of Belmont House to create 9 residential apartments and 1 town house; demolition of Round House and the construction of one block of 8 residential apartments; demolition of the Coach House and the construction of one block of 6 residential apartments; associated parking and landscaping.

The application had been considered at the meeting held in February 2022 when it had been deferred. Members had visited the site prior to that meeting.

Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The application had been deferred to explore options to reduce the height and dominance of the proposed extension to Belmont House. The loss of accommodation would be mitigated by increasing the size of Bray House. Further information was also sought with regard to the use of Vacant Building Credits on this application.
- It was proposed to add an additional storey to Bray House. There would still be 24 units available in the scheme.
- There had been additional objections and these included the need for additional landscaping to screen the development.
- It was considered that that the proposals addressed the concerns raised at the meeting in February.
- All space standards had been exceeded and there would not be any overlooking or loss of privacy to existing residential properties.
- The scheme was compliant with affordable housing policy and further information on Vacant Building Credits was detailed in the report.
- Further conditions had been included for tree protection and compliance with policies EN1 and EN2.
- The application had been recommended for approval subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions outlined in the report and also the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the following obligations:

- Affordable housing provision of 1 unit on site as discounted market sales housing.
- Public green space financial contribution of £33,499.22 based on the requirement of 805m<sup>2</sup> green space.
- Sustainable travel fund contribution of £12,276 to provide bus only residential metrocards.

**95 Application 21-09404-FU - 5 Church Gardens, Drighlington, BD11, 1NF**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the erection of two storey extensions to side and rear of property, new entrance porch/canopy to front and new gate in boundary wall at 5 Church Gardens, Drighlington.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed during the discussion of the application.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The property occupied a prominent position in the corner of the Church Gardens development on the junction of the A58 and Back Lane.
- Trees on the south-west boundary were covered by a Tree Protection Order (TPO).
- There would be a 'lean-to' front porch and a wrap round two storey extension to the south east and south west of the property. Materials to be used included a timber frame and zinc roof.
- There would be alterations to the boundary wall to include pedestrian access and a gate. The wall would also be raised to a height of 2.3 metres.
- The proposals were considered to significantly detract from the host dwelling due to the corner position and the differing materials to be used. The area was characterised by stone buildings. The proposals would also interrupt the existing building line and the significant amount of glazing proposed was not sympathetic to the area.
- Alternative suggestions had been proposed for the siting of an extension at the property but the applicant had wished to proceed with the current proposal.
- The proposals would impact the canopy and root protection area of a protected tree.
- The application was recommended for refusal due to the impact on the character of the area and impact on protected trees.

The applicant addressed the Panel in support of the application. The following was highlighted:

- The intention was to provide an external and internal living space to enjoy the garden and views.
- The architect selected was nationally recognised and had produced award winning designs.
- The tree survey from the previous development had been considered when the proposals had been designed.
- There had not been any objections to the application and there was support from neighbouring residents. There had not been an objection from the Council's conservation team.
- In response to the reasons for refusal, it was felt that the proposals did add to the character of the host building and this was also supported by neighbours. Other properties in the area also had timber framed and glazed extensions.
- The applicant had a tree report produced by an arboriculture consultant and their findings differed to those of the Council's landscaping officer.

In response to comments and questions, the following was discussed:

- There had been communication to the applicant advising that the possibility of siting an extension to the southern section of the property away from the tree line should be explored.
- The Principal Landscape Officer advised the Panel that the root protection area for the tree that would be affected and this had been submitted as part of the arboricultural impact assessment. This had been done within the national standards and code of practice for trees in design and planning guidance. The proposed extension would impact on the root system and the canopy would have to be trimmed back.
- There had not been any objection from the conservation team. They were only consulted on the potential impact on the listed building and not the design of the application.
- There needed to be sufficient space between the tree and the building to take account for growing space and light to the building. There was some scope to alter the proposals which would not conflict with the tree.
- The contemporary design was not the main issue and a similar development to the south side of the property would be more suitable as it would be less prominent to the street and away from the trees.
- An engineering solution for the tree root protection area would be difficult to achieve and there would still be issues with the proximity of the tree to the extension.
- There was some support for the design and materials proposed.
- The proposed extension was in the wrong place due to the trees. An extension elsewhere on the site would be more suitable.

A motion was made to defer the application for further discussion with the applicant as to whether the location for the extension was appropriate with the acceptance of the contemporary design. An amendment to this motion was made that the application should be refused due to the location not being suitable and the impact on trees. The amendment was carried and the substantive motion was voted upon .

**RESOLVED** – That the application be refused as the proposed side and rear extension is considered to pose both significant short-term and long-term impacts on the adjacent trees, protected by a Tree Preservation Order, as a result of its proximity to the proposal and associated construction and future maintenance. As such, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policies P12 of the Core Strategy (as amended 2019), Policy LD1 of the Unitary Development Plan Review, Policy LAND2 of the Natural Resources and Waste Local Plan and the NPPF in these respects

**96 Application 21-07156-RM - Nook Farm, Haigh Moor Road, Tingley, Wakefield, WF3 1EF**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a reserved matters application for the erection of 289 dwellings with access within the site, garaging, parking, landscaping and public open space at Nook Farm, Haigh Moor Road, Tingley.

Members attend the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed throughout the discussion of the application.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- Outline planning consent was granted at City Plans Panel in May 2020. This was dealt with by City Plans Panel due to the scale and nature of the application.
- The outline planning approval granted development for up to 299 dwellings.
- There were four parcels of land to be developed.
- Issues including highways, sustainability, impact on local amenities and accesses to the sites had all been discussed at the outline stage and were not for consideration with this application.
- Affordable housing and highways contributions had been agreed at the outline stage. There would also be enhancement and management of Haigh Wood under the legal agreement.
- Members were asked to consider the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping.
- The general character of the area is rural. There was a consistent use of materials on buildings in the area using stone, brick and render.
- Haigh Wood was under the ownership of the applicant and there was intention to enhance and preserve the woodlands.
- There would be buffers of landscaping between the developments to maintain the rural surrounds.
- The layout was broadly in line with the masterplan that was proposed at the outline stage.
- The applicant had carried out a housing needs assessment and there would be a mixture of house types
- The proposals would achieve a 10.08% biodiversity net gain across the sites.
- CGI images of the differing house types were displayed.
- The open spaces would be used for a variety of purposes and would provide good visual amenity.
- There would be connecting footpaths between the sites.
- The proposals were considered to be well designed and were policy compliant. The application was recommended for approval.

Local residents addressed the Panel with objections to the application. These included the following:

- There were no approved masterplans at the outline stage. These were just for illustrative purposes.
- There had not been effective consultation with the local community.
- The housing mix does not reflect the needs of the local community. There had been no assessment of local future housing need.
- The only local information used was the Strategic Housing Market Assessment which was five years out of date.

- Too many houses were proposed with regard to the open character of the area.
- Access from Upper Green Avenue was in a location that was already problematic with traffic.
- There was key information missing such as a consultation statement and a local housing needs assessment.
- The Panel was asked to defer the application for further information and to allow proper consultation with the local community.
- In response to questions, the following was discussed:
  - There was a need for more affordable housing and bungalows.
  - Local people's housing needs will not be met by this development.
  - The number of houses proposed was a major concern.
  - Housing would change the character of the woods and the open character of the area.
  - There had been a lengthy meeting with the developer in February but no exhibition/workshop style consultation for the community.
  - The developer was asked to consider further public consultation.
  - There had not been sufficient consultation with Ward Councillors.
  - Density was not the main issue for the objectors but one of several issues.
  - Local needs have not been addressed.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- The proposals were considered to be an exemplar of a collaborative approach to development.
- There had been detailed scrutiny of the application at the outline stage when it had been approved for up to 299 houses.
- The following benefits would be delivered:
  - £7 million affordable housing contribution
  - £2.5 million towards the enhancement and management of Haigh Wood
  - £1.12 million towards improvements at Junction 28 of the M62 and other local junctions
  - £0.75 million towards bus improvements.
  - £143k to encourage sustainable travel
  - £46k for bus shelter provision
  - £2 million for Community Infrastructure Levy
- Public consultation – 1,269 homes had been leafleted and invited to comment. There had been meetings with the West Ardsley Action Group.
- The layout benefits from the topography of the setting and creates distinctive character areas.
- There would be areas of functional open space and improved connectivity.

- The development would add value to the character of the area.
- Nearly 60% of the properties would be one or two bedroom homes.
- There would be extensive landscaping and hedge planting with an overall biodiversity net gain of over 10%.
- In response to questions, the following as discussed:
  - It was not possible to reach 100% of the public for consultation. There had been voluntary consultation with West Ardsley Action Group and Save Haigh Woods.
  - There had been communication with Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward Councillors.
  - There had been a detailed housing mix report and it was recognised that there were already a lot of bungalows in the local area.
  - The proposals would make use of air source heat pumps and be gas free which would enable carbon reduction targets to be met earlier than required.
  - The possibility of offering photo voltaic panels.
  - The housing mix was based on policy and developer requirements. It was policy compliant with the core strategy.
  - There would be a management company established for the future maintenance of Haigh Wood. The legal agreement would ensure its perpetuity.
  - The housing mix including the amount of affordable housing was considered to be appropriate for the area. There had not been anything from planning or housing to contradict this.
  - The biodiversity assessment has been done in line with Natural England guidance.
  - There would be an assessment for photo voltaic panels should the application be approved. Orientation of the properties needed to be considered to identify solar gain. With regard to affordable housing having panels, this could be considered with the landlords.
  - Further consideration could be given to save the trees that were situated off Upper Green Avenue although some would be lost due to access requirements. There would be replacement tree planting.
  - Affordable housing would be spread throughout the four parcels of land.
  - 30% of properties needed to be adaptable and 2% needed to be accessible for disabled. The accessible properties would be two bedroom apartments.
  - The future management of Haigh Wood would be covered by the Section 106 agreement.
  - The applicant did not own the remainder of the land within the SAP allocation.
  - There was a transitional period for future home standards – the applicant would always build to meet compliance and aspire to do further. Full details of future home standards were not yet known.

- There were no four or five bedroom houses included in the affordable housing as the applicant had been informed that the proposals would meet local need.
- There would not be the use of modular building.
- There would be 6 apartments used for affordable houses and the rest would be two or three bedroom homes.
- The developer would need to comply with the building regulations that were in place at the time of development.

In response to questions and comments, the following was discussed:

- Policies EN1 and EN2 and provision of affordable housing had been covered in the outline planning permission and the Section 106 agreement. Concern was expressed that figures were not available for water usage and carbon reduction.
- Biodiversity – there was a comprehensive landscaping scheme with enhancement and management of woodlands. Natural England had been consulted and felt the proposals were acceptable.
- Density – the proposals did meet the H3 density policy.
- The layout of the affordable housing was to be determined under this application.
- The housing needs assessment considers the need for the kinds of affordable housing.
- There was no requirement for a masterplan for this site but at the outline stage there was an indicative masterplan of how the site could work.
- Concern that there was not the full information available with regard to trees and the housing needs assessment.
- Drainage was considered at the outline stage and was subject to conditions. The finer details of the drainage strategy could not be confirmed until this application had been approved.
- Concern regarding the design and layout and the need for further discussion on place making.
- More clarity was requested on connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Could there be more consultation with Ward Councillors.
- The need for more affordable properties for low income families.
- The remainder of the SAP allocated land not covered in this application remained available for housing.
- There would be a Section 38 agreement with regard to the layout which would take account of finer details such as visibility splays and pedestrian access.
- There was an extensive footpath network across the site and woodlands. It was proposed to improve these and there would be facilities such as trim trails.
- The width of the footpaths would enable use by cyclists. Further details would be needed regarding segregation from pedestrians.
- Need to focus more on the internal layout and flexibility with the provision of affordable housing.



- There was a need to improve the housing mix including the affordable housing and further discussion regarding design and the possible provision of bungalows.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred for the following:

- Consider the provision of four and five bedroom homes for affordable housing.
- Consider the provision of bungalows.
- Further information on trees including a full tree survey to include the quality of trees and detail regarding carbon capture.
- Further information on compliance with street design guidance.
- More detail on placemaking.
- More clarity on cycle segregation and the footpath network
- Invite a policy officer to discuss policy H4 and the housing mix.
- Further consultation with Ward Councillors.