

**Planning Committee Meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> January 2022 9.45am at Bramhope Village Hall, Old Lane, Bramhope, LS16 9AZ**

**Present: Diane Fox (Chair), Alan Anslow, Campbell Cowan, John Howard, Ian Robinson, Billy Flynn, Marion Rider**

**1. To receive apologies**

There were no apologies received. Cllr Rider arrived at 9.58am.

**2. To disclose or draw attention to any disclosable pecuniary interests.**

There were no interests declared.

**3. Public Participation**

There were no members of the public present.

**4. To comment on planning applications sent by Leeds City Council**

<b>App No</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>21/09777</b>	Hillside 38 Hall Drive Bramhope	Two storey front extension; Outbuilding to front; Single storey rear extension with basement extension below; Terrace and balcony to rear and side; Dormer windows to rear; New windows and doors	The parish council objects. The proposed remodelling and the additional large garage would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the essential character of the house would be lost. Details such as the drip/label moulds, especially from the western/front and southern elevations and the chimney pots are lost. The proposed changes, because of the orientation of the house to the street, would have considerable visual impact on Hall Drive e.g., the large glass fronted gables on the front/western elevation. Although the roof ridge is now slightly subservient to the northern part of the dwelling (nearest to Hall Drive) and the single long dormer has been removed, the proposed dormers still dominate the appearance of the roof and are alien in both in design and materials to the original character of the house and the Conservation Area. As such the dormers do not comply with the guidance given in the HDG. The garage in its design and materials (timber cladding) still presents an incongruous addition to the Conservations Area. The Bramhope Conservation Areas Appraisal and Management Plan p.17, states that a key way to retain character (in Character Area 4 Hall Drive) is to keep coursed sandstone and render as a remaining predominant finish.
<b>21/09857</b>	11 Moorland Road Bramhope	Part single part two storey rear extension	The parish council objects, unless the proposal complies with Policy HDG3.
<b>21/10002</b>	11 Old Lane Bramhope	Single storey side and rear extension, alterations to roof including new dormer to front, with alterations to existing dormer, and alterations to rear windows	No comment.

<b>21/09731</b>	Land Adjacent to Stone Top Farm Moorland Road Bramhope	Conversion of water tank to form dwelling with associated amenity area and parking; provision of a pond, natural landscaped area, wildflower mound and native species hedgerow; removal of existing brick-built pump house, concrete slab hardstanding area and stone wall	The Parish council does not object but wishes to make the following comments. The parking and bin storage area should be effectively landscaped to prevent any visual intrusion towards Moorland Road. Some additional planting of trees adjacent to the hedging on the eastern boundary would add variation in height and further interest. All boundaries should comply with saved UDP Policy N24 to give an appropriate transition into the surrounding open fields of the Green Belt. Permitted development rights should be removed.
<b>21/09552</b>	10 Kings Drive Bramhope	Removal of existing outbuilding to rear and construction of new outbuilding to rear	No comment.
<b>21/10059</b>	Old Lane Bramhope	Determination of telecommunications equipment for 16.0m phase 8 monopole c/w wraparound cabinet at base and associated ancillary works	The parish council objects. The proposed equipment, due to its prominent position in the landscape at the top of Pool Bank introduces an incongruous feature within the Green Belt. A less conspicuous site should be found. The siting of this monopole should also comply with NPPF (2021) Para 115 in that "Where new sites are required (such as for new 5G networks, or for connected transport and smart city applications), equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriately.
<b>21/10128/</b>	51 Breary Lane East Bramhope	Variation of condition 2No. (Approved Plans) to previously approved planning application 20/04735/FU for alterations to the approved plans	The parish council objects. The introduction of a steep pitched roof to a large triple garage located in the front garden is inappropriate (HDG p.35). It would form a dominant feature and have considerable negative impact in the vicinity of the Conservation Area and the character of this semi-rural lane.
<b>21/10168</b>	4 Wyncroft Grove Bramhope	Part two storey; part single storey front extension; single storey side extension; part two storey; part single rear extension	The parish council objects. The introduction of the single storey side extension results in the full width of the site being occupied by this positive building in the Conservation Area. This does not comply with the Bramhope Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan. This states that a key way to retain character, in Character Area 5, is to retain spaces between dwellings (p.18).
<b>21/10138</b>	Existing Base Station Land Off Whitehouse Lane Leeds Bradford Industrial Estate	The proposed upgrade of an existing base station consisting of the replacement of a 1 no 25m lattice tower for 1 no 30m lattice tower supporting 12 no antennas, 2 no dishes together with internal works to the existing cabin and ancillary development there to.	No comment

**21/09894 - Bramhope Primary School Tredgold Crescent Bramhope**

**Alterations and extension to existing school including new landscaping and reconfiguration of site access and car parking**

**The Parish Council objects.**

Bramhope & Carlton Parish Council is conscious that the expansion of Bramhope Primary School will have an impact on road traffic and congestion far beyond the immediate vicinity of the school. There are already recognised problems with congestion and parking at morning and afternoon peak times. The eventual Doubling in size of the school will have the potential to double the problems and raises safety concerns. The Parish Council will support initiatives that aim to reduce the number of car journeys made to the school and the promotion of sustainable travel. The Parish Council will not support initiatives which transfer the parking problems and traffic issues associated with the school to other roads or areas within the village.

The **Parish Council comments are as follows:**

### **1. Car park in the Green Belt**

The new car park in the Green Belt needs to demonstrate very special circumstances to outweigh any harm done to the openness of the Green Belt.

By virtue of the carpark's possible impact on the GB, and by the likelihood of it undermining any encouragement towards sustainable forms of travel, it is possible that the proposal could not be considered sustainable development and as such there would be no very special circumstances. It should be demonstrated that the car park cannot be accommodated elsewhere on the site and that the size of the car park will be kept to a minimum number of spaces. There is no reference to car sharing in the school travel plan and this should be a factor in reducing the required number of spaces.

Has sufficient consideration been given to expanding the existing parking at the Tredgold entrance to the school?

### **2. Boundary fencing**

Very special circumstances have not been demonstrated to outweigh the harm done to the openness of the Green Belt by the erection of the 2.4m mesh fence on the southern boundary of the playing field which is adjacent to open fields. A fence at a lower height would have lesser impact on the openness of the Green Belt and still serve to effectively deter any potential intruders who may be considered approaching the school from the open fields.

Additionally, a fence of 2.4m in height on other lengths of the boundary e.g., to the rear of the gardens of some of the dwellings on Parklands Gate could also be regarded as excessive in response to safeguarding issues.

### **3. Landscaping and planting**

Replanting should be at 3:1 ratio, whatever the value of the trees to be removed.

The existing vegetation along the length of the southern boundary of the playing field is not adequate enough to mitigate any negative impacts on the openness of the Green Belt, whatever the height of the fence. The opportunity should be taken for further planting in the 'buffer' area between the new fence and the outer boundary of the playing field to assist with the requirements of saved UDP Policy N24.

The proposed new car park in Green Belt (23 spaces) has five trees, with a hedge below, between it and the turning circle and the caretaker's bungalow. Proposed grass seeding on the north western and south eastern boundaries adjacent to the school field should be replaced by further trees and hedging. Despite the presence of a group of trees to the south on the playing field, there should also be approx. five new trees on the south eastern boundary and three to the north western boundary, plus a hedge below. This would serve to mitigate the appearance of parked cars which serve to introduce an urbanising element and a loss of openness into the Green Belt.

All new areas of planting should be introduced in the first season after the commencement of the scheme, with replacements for any plants/trees which die. The planting should be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

#### **4. TRANSPORT STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDED MEASURES**

##### **4.1. Transport Statement**

The Transport Statement may only serve to displace the traffic problems and not serve to reduce the number of car journeys made to the school. Constant work needs to be done on behaviour modification (via the School Travel Plan) to get parents and children out of their cars. Traffic measures alone will not mitigate the problems.

##### **4.2 Enforcement**

The measures proposed in the Transport Statement to reduce congestion and minimise the associated safety hazards– the School Street, and yellow lines –will not have any significant impact unless they are enforced. A proposal for enforcement is required with appropriate funding.

##### **4.3 Monitoring the success of the recommended measures**

During the site visits by the Transport Officer, he suggested that the effectiveness of the proposed yellow lines should be monitored to by video cameras mounted on street lamp columns. The Parish Council requests that budget be allocated for such monitoring.

##### **4.4 Provision of public transport**

The Transport Statement and various other documents state that the X84 bus service runs every 15 minutes. This is no longer the case, provision is now every 30 minutes and the service continues to be very unreliable. Therefore, the statement on page 20 of the Transport Statement that “The site is adequately served by public transport which provides a suitable option for both staff and pupils to access the school,” cannot be claimed to be relevant. The frequency and reliability public transport does not provide an adequate or suitable option for access to the school.

##### **4.5. Park and Stride**

The Parish Council is not convinced, given the very limited public car parking in Bramhope, that Park & Stride schemes, wherever they are located, will make a meaningful impact on volumes of car parking near the school

##### **4.6 School Street – Breary Rise**

The Parish Council accepts the principal of the ‘school street’ providing that it doesn’t displace the parking issue elsewhere.

##### **4.7 Yellow lines**

The double yellow line outside Nos 19 and 21 Tredgold Crescent should be single rather than double so that residents can park out of school hours on the road.

##### **4.8. Ginnel at Wynmore Avenue**

Parish Council request a single yellow line be introduced where the ginnel emerges from Meadow End onto Wynmore Avenue, with a dropped kerb installed (we understood that this recommendation had already been accepted but does not appear on the plan).

#### **4.9. White T-Bars**

The Parish Council suggests that consideration be given in the traffic plan for white T-bars on Tredgold Crescent and other locations to improve access to driveways. Though not a statutory mechanism that can be enforced by fines, they do have an impact on parking behaviours, as evidenced by their use on Church Hill and Breary Lane. even though they are not enforceable.

#### **5. THE SCHOOL TRAVEL PLAN.**

##### **5.1 Measurable and monitored Targets to support the goals**

The Travel Plan does not include measurable targets to assess whether the plan is having the desired impact on modifying parent behaviour and in reducing the number of car journeys. Nor is there a mechanism for monitoring progress towards those goals. Without targets and measurements, the Travel Plan will be ineffective. The Parish Council asks that measurable targets on usage of transport modes be put in place and measurements regularly taken. The Parish Council requests that the targets be reviewed at least annually, reported to Leeds City Council Highways and the Parish Council, and corrective action taken as appropriate to meet the goals.

##### **5.2. Sustainable travel for staff**

The Parish Council does not think that only one shower is an adequate provision to support and encourage staff to cycle to work.

It is noted that many organisations have introduced cycling schemes to enable staff to obtain bikes, including electric bikes, at reduced cost, encouraging cycling to work.

##### **5.3. Travel Plan for Staff**

The Parish Council request that a sustainable travel plan for staff members be produced.

#### **6. Proposed pupil number projections.**

The parish council is concerned about proposed increase in pupil numbers far exceeds the demand required to accommodate pupils from within the Bramhope 'catchment' area. *The Leeds City Councils SAP Remittal – Schools Background Paper, July 2021* estimates that the Spring Wood development will generate an additional twelve pupils per year group (a total of eighty-four pupils).

This gives a total of 364 pupils which is a projected shortfall of fifty-six pupils on the 420 places that the school will provide in future. However, we believe that this figure is overstated. There are around 1610 residential properties within Bramhope with the existing 280 place pupil provision – this equates to 0.174 pupils per property. On that basis the 330 houses on Spring Wood would generate an additional fifty-eight pupils leaving a shortfall of eighty-two pupils. Whilst we accept that the types of houses within the development may attract a greater number of families with children of primary school age, but this will be offset to some degree by the fact there are quite a few places currently filled by pupils from outside of Bramhope on the 'sibling' rule. We do acknowledge that there are constraints on school numbers by the entry levels (single form, one and a half form, two form, etc.).

We are concerned that this is going to generate a significant increase in traffic for pupils from outside of the area travelling by motor vehicle. The travel plan does not really offer any solution – merely outlining several scenarios which could be considered and little that could be enforced. Parking around the school has been a problem for years and the additional traffic generated by the proposed increase in school numbers is going to exacerbate the problem and impact upon the safety of pupils as well as residents.

This is also in total conflict with the *Leeds Local Plan Update Topic 4 – Placemaking* which talks about the proposed concept of '20-minute neighbourhood' which states: *The purpose of the concept is to ensure that residents have quick access to essential facilities and services via walking, cycling or public transport. This, in turn helps support strong communities and local economies, recognising that easy and safe walking and cycle access to services/facilities is good for health, and that physical activity and less reliance on the private car reduces air pollution and carbon emissions. This approach to local growth and place making around service centres and hubs is gathering support across the world and is an easily understood way of planning for the way places change.*

We do not believe that pupils from outside of Bramhope will be able to access the school by sustainable means within the twenty-minute parameter set down. The published transport plan is inaccurate in that the X84 bus service is not every fifteen minutes as stated, it is every thirty minutes and the service has become increasingly unreliable.

Cllr Cowan left the meeting at 11.00am

5. To review current enforcement cases and decide further action

No new enforcement cases.

6. Any items for discussion at a future meeting.

7. Spring Wood Park – coop have put in for a license for 6am to 11pm on licensing. Delegated comment to chair and vice chair.

8. Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting is to be confirmed

The meeting closed at 11.10am

Minutes by Nicola Woodward

Published 14/01/2022