

Comments for Planning Application 17/02594/OT

Application Summary

Application Number: 17/02594/OT

Address: Land Off Racecourse Approach Wetherby LS22

Proposal: Outline application for 800 dwellings, primary school, convenience store, PoS and landscaping

Case Officer: Mr Adam Ward

Customer Details

Name: Mr Clive Smithson

Address: 3 Montagu Mews, Wetherby LS22 5PY

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour response

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The Site Allocations Plan (SAP) is a key document in the Local Plan for Leeds. The SAP identifies sites for housing, employment, retail and greenspace to ensure that enough land is available in appropriate locations to meet the growth targets set out in the Core Strategy.

This includes, as appropriate, any onsite requirements developers will be expected to provide, for example greenspace and local infrastructure (roads, schools, and flood storage). It also sets out which sites will come forward at what stage (known as phasing).

One of the onsite requirements for the site HG2 - 226 which includes the application site was :-

Highway Access to Site:

Access points must be created onto York Road and Racecourse Approach B1224, possibly requiring widening for ghost island junctions. The access points will need to be linked within the site. Highway quality pedestrian and cycle routes are to be provided within the site. A pedestrian and cycle link to York Road shall be provided to the south-west of the site, providing safe, practical all year round links to Wetherby town centre from the new housing. These links should involve improvements to Bridleway No.7 and Footpath No.8. In addition, a link to the public right of way and A1(M) junction 46 to the north-west of the site should also be provided and along the northern flank of York Road between Racecourse Approach and Bridleway No.7.

The requirement for the York Road access has been confirmed by the planning panel on numerous occasions most recently 30/1/2020. The applicant's position now is that they cannot comply with this requirement as a third party who owns part of the land over which the access would have to be built will not sell at the price offered. This is simply a question of price. The third party will sell but considers the amount offered by the applicant is too low. This is not a planning

problem. Every developer has to decide what they can afford to pay for a site; it is their bread and butter. To suppose that this SAP requirement should be abandoned to enable the developer to save money is ridiculous.

The applicant has failed to produce any meaningful plan for the requirement for a SAFE cycle and pedestrian link to Wetherby town centre from the SW of the site. The only facility shown is a dropped kerb at the junction of Carr Lane and York Road, this on the B1224 where the above York Road vehicular access is intended and where most of the circ 1600 cars from the SAP site will access the town. The failure to appreciate the danger this constitutes for school children seeking to cross to Wetherby High and St James Primary schools is breathtaking.

Masterplan

On the 28/03/2019 the panel resolved among other things that a Masterplan of the whole SAP site was required in order to ensure the development of the land outside the application was not prejudiced. This has been confirmed as a necessary step prior to approval by the panel at a number of panel meetings since.

The 'illustrative Masterplan' offered up by the applicant is not a Masterplan. It is at best an artist impression of the layout of the application site. The detail is woeful and does not even show 800 dwellings, more like 550-600. The Living with Beauty report of January 2020 states :-

A Masterplan sets out proposals for blocks, buildings, spaces, street hierarchy, movement strategy green infrastructure and land use in three dimensions and matches these proposals to a delivery strategy.

There are probably other accepted definitions but not in any circumstance could the applicants drawing be seen as such.

What is more it only relates to the application site not the whole SAP site thus failing again to meet the panels requirements.

Conclusion

This is a site where the Planning Balance was used to overcome some serious sustainability problems such as failing 4 of 6 of your accessibility standards. The Chief Planner and the Applicant now wish you to 'Balance' even more unfavourable conditions by abandoning clear requirements of the SAP and your panels directions on what the applicant must undertake before permission could be positively considered.

If this application is approved as it now stands your SAP and even panel directions will be seen as optional at best and your Local Plan will be seriously undermined.

Clive Smithson

22/07/2020