

## **SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**FRIDAY 8 JULY 2011 AT 10.00 AM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mrs Parsons (Chairman), Councillors Bloxham, Cape, M Clarke, Craig, Mrs Farmer, McDevitt, Nedved (as substitute for Councillor Morton), Mrs Riddle, Mrs Rutherford, Scarborough and Whalen (as substitute for Mrs Warwick)

**ALSO**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Bainbridge attended the meeting as Ward Councillor in respect of application 09/0617 (Crindledyke, Carlisle, Cumbria)  
Councillor Bowman attended the meeting as an observer  
Councillor Mrs Bowman attended the meeting as an observer  
Councillor Hendry attended part of the meeting as an observer  
Councillor Graham attended part of the meeting as an observer

### **DC.42/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors Morton and Mrs Warwick.

### **DC.43/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- Councillor McDevitt declared a personal interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct in respect of Application 09/0617 – Crindledyke, Carlisle, Cumbria. The interest related to the fact that he was Councillor for Cumbria County Council.

### **DC.44/11 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the site visit meeting held on 6 July 2011 were noted.

### **DC.45/11 PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS IN RESPECT OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Legal Services Manager outlined, for the benefit of those members of the public present at the meeting, the procedure to be followed in dealing with rights to speak.

### **DC.46/11 CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT AND ADVERTISING**

**RESOLVED** – That the applications referred to in the Schedule of Applications under A, B, C and D be approved/refused/deferred, subject to the conditions as set out in the Schedule of Decisions attached to these Minutes.

**(1) Proposed residential development and ancillary local community facilities and open space, Crindledyke, Carlisle, Cumbria (Application 09/0617)**

The Chairman introduced Mr Ottewell and Mr Stephenson from Urban Vision.

Mr Ottewell introduced himself and explained his background and that he had been employed to provide independent planning advice on the application. He submitted the report on the application, which was the subject of a site visit on 6 July 2011, and outlined the background to the application and described the design and site of the proposal.

Slides of the site were presented showing the site from various points around the site and indicated the changes in differences in levels across the site. One slide gave an aerial image of the site that highlighted the position of the site in relation to the West Coast mainline railway, the urban boundary, the site of the Carlisle Northern Development Route (CNDR) and the proposed development at Brunthill.

Mr Ottewell explained the proposed access to the development and advised that Crindledyke Lane would be diverted and a transport route around the village provided. He advised that with regard to the junction the road would be widened and improved and would include a cycleway/footpath and speed would be restricted to 20mph. At the junction with Parkhouse Road it was suggested that the speed limit would be reduced to 40mph and traffic signals installed.

With regard to the design, Mr Ottewell explained the proposed 5 character zones which would include a central area with a village green and shops with apartments above. There would be improved boundary treatment including hedgerows and trees. In the areas close to the railway line and the Brunthill development, there would be less residential development and the boundary would include acoustic fencing and trespass proof fencing. Two SUDS ponds would also be provided as well as a foraging area.

Mr Ottewell reminded Members that the application was an outline application with all matters reserved and that consideration should be given only to whether such a scheme could be delivered.

Mr Ottewell explained that Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 required that an application for planning permission was determined in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. He explained the make-up of the Development Plan and advised that the Plan sought to regulate the amount and location of development required within the District to meet the community's need for housing, employment, social and community facilities, transport, leisure and recreation, retail and other land uses. It sought to balance such requirements against (and/or reconcile them with) economic objectives, infrastructure capacities and environmental considerations.

Although the site was not allocated for residential development under the Local Plan, the Local Plan requirement was set at a lower level than the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). The 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act provided that if there was a conflict between policies in an RSS or in a Development Plan Document (DPD) the most recent policy would take precedence. Therefore the housing target in the RSS would take precedence and the lack of allocation under H16 must be considered in the overall context of the ability of allocations and permissions to deliver the supply of housing contained in the RSS. Mr Ottewell explained that the allocated sites had not all come forward to a construction stage, nor had the Local Development Framework (LDF) work progressed to a stage that additional land allocations were confirmed. Therefore the RSS continued to be afforded full weight following recent consideration by the Council's Executive Committee.

Mr Ottewell further advised that PPS3 indicated that Local Authorities were required to ensure that there was sufficient, suitable housing land available to achieve housing land delivery targets through identification of a 5 year supply. A comprehensive assessment of the Council's housing land supply had been undertaken and the Council were not able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing sites to meet targets.

Paragraph 71 of PPS3 advised on the options available if an up to date 5 year supply of deliverable sites could not be demonstrated. The Council had accepted that there was a shortfall in the 5 year housing supply and that the requirement for a favourable consideration of the proposal was a significant material consideration. The phased release of the application site would contribute towards achieving the desired delivery of dwellings over the plan period. The site would fit in well with the economic strategy for the Carlisle City Region as the site offered a clear opportunity to locate substantial housing development adjacent to Kingmoor Park and would support the creation of a sustainable live-work area to the north of the City. The site, in a sustainable and accessible urban location, would be further supported by the development at Brunthill and the potential to grow public transport infrastructure within the site with the cooperation of bus operators.

Mr Ottewell further advised that the need for affordable housing in the area was substantial and the offer of 171 units to be available for affordable housing gave weight to the application. As part of the application a primary school would also be provided on site along with a range of community facilities necessary to serve the needs of those who would live within the development.

There were some significant factors that weighted against the application including the loss of agricultural land, landscape impact and ecology. However, the spatial distribution of the land, across 6 fields meant that the potential to farm the higher grade agricultural land was limited and the retention of the land would be impractical should the application be allowed.

With regard to landscape impact, Mr Ottewell advised that while the development would have an impact on the visual amenity of the area the site was located within the urban area of Carlisle and the proposals did not seek to extend the boundary of the urban area and as a consequence a clear defensible boundary would remain. Also the land had been identified white land with no pertinent designations such as

for any intrinsic landscape quality. Detailed landscape measures could be achieved through any reserved matters approval.

With regard to ecology, Mr Ottewell advised that Natural England were satisfied that the proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on the Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation.

Mr Ottewell explained that regard had been given to the issue of prematurity and the impact of permitting development on the progression of the Local Development Framework (LDF) and added that while the LDF was the most appropriate forum for taking forward new housing allocations that would not be substantially progressed until 2015. Given that the City Council had recently reaffirmed the housing targets in the Regional Spatial Strategy as the basis upon which to manage delivery of housing land it was concluded that the current shortfall of housing land must be given significant weight. That could not be addressed through existing permissions and Local Plan allocations alone and the shortage of suitable brownfield land had been acknowledged by the Annual Monitoring Report and the Local Plan Inspectors Report. Therefore consideration would have to be given to greenfield sites. In line with the broad development strategy supported by the Local Plan particular weight had been given to the location of the site within the existing urban area boundary.

Mr Ottewell stated that with regard to the accessibility of the proposed development, while concerns about the highway remained and issues regarding 3<sup>rd</sup> party land had not been secured there were no sustainable objections and the Officers had considered the impact on and safety of residents on an assumption that the CNDR would be completed. He added that provision would be made to improve the rights of way and cycleways.

Therefore on balance, and having regard to the Development Plan and all other material planning considerations, Mr Ottewell recommended that the application be approved subject to legal agreement.

The Planning Manager advised that since the report had been published there were 3 issues to be considered. Firstly, Councillor Bainbridge had written with concerns that Members had not had sufficient time to read the reports and consider the information contained. The Planning Manager confirmed that the papers had been circulated according to the normal timescales and therefore there had been sufficient time.

The report summarised the representations received and it had been stated that the summary had not given the complete picture. However, the Planning Manager believed that all the issues had been dealt with and confirmed that Kingmoor Park continued to object to the proposals on the grounds that it was the largest employment site in the area and it was important that the proposed development did not impact on that site.

Finally, the Planning Manager advised that there had been a lot of coverage of the issues and that the Government Office North West and the Secretary of States office had asked for information. The information had been sent to the National Planning Casework Unit and they would consider whether any decision made by the

Committee would be called in. That would take approximately 3-5 weeks. The Planning Manager confirmed that if Members granted authority to issue approval subject to a Section 106 Agreement the Council would be notified whether the decision had been called in during that period.

Mr Ruddick (Objector) presented photographs of the site and stated that he believed the proposal would destroy quality land and countryside. He explained that he and his family had moved to the area 6 years ago to be in a rural area and had set up a business growing trees. He was concerned about the amount of traffic that would be passing his house and onto the main road as access at the junction was difficult due to the number of wagons using the road. He was also concerned that with the increase in traffic he would be unable to park on the road outside his home. Mr Ruddick advised that as part of his business he had premises on Kingmoor Park next to the proposed site and that his business often operated during unsocial hours and that as his business grew he would have the potential to extend and install small windmills, solar panels and a composter. That would involve deliveries and possibly vehicles from Kingmoor Park.

Mr Ruddick advised that he had often seen deer, foxes, bats and owls and lots of butterflies and wild birds. He did not understand why there had to be only one access to the site. He did not believe that the road was wide enough for HGVs and to widen it would damage trees along the fence line. He believed that there were many inconsistencies in the report and queried whether every consultee and Member had walked the site as he believed that if they had the application would not be approved.

Mr Kirkwood (Objector) believed that Crindledyke was a small village and that would be ruined if the development went ahead and that it would be more ecologically sound to leave the area as it was. He stated that there would be an unsustainable amount of traffic and that if an additional access point could not be installed as part of the Brunthill development there would be only one point of access.

Mr Kirkwood stated that as the indications were that there would be 30-50 houses built per year the development would take 17-19 years to complete and that would mean 17-19 years of construction traffic. He did not believe that the area was suitable for housing and that it should remain as a greenfield site as it was remote from the urban area with facilities such as schools and transport services. In conclusion Mr Kirkwood pointed out that most of the objections were from local residents while many of the letters in support of the proposals were from as far away as London and he urged Members to refuse the application.

Mr Sander (Objector) reminded Members that the site was not in the Local Plan and that no material considerations had been given to the application. He believed that significant areas of the application were not compliant with the Local Plan policies and that the report had been misrepresented and was misleading. The report stated that Kingmoor Park had no objections to the application but Mr Sander believed that they objected in the strongest terms and that the report had left many of the objections unanswered. He believed that the figures relating to housing targets and building rates were questionable.

Mr Sander added that there were other locations more suitable to such a development and that the Local Development Framework should determine the scale and location of the development.

Mr Tucker (Objector) explained that he was a Director of DTA who had been employed by Kingmoor Park for a number of years. He stated that Kingmoor Park had objected to the application in September 2009 and again in 2010. He did not believe that information was reflected fully in the report. He stated that Kingmoor Park played an important role in the employment market and that it created substantial noise and lighting.

Mr Tucker was concerned about the single point of access to the site and stated that he agreed with the County Council's proposal for 3 points of access. He stated that Government guidance recommended a risk assessment should be carried out but Mr Tucker believed that neither the fire nor ambulance service had been consulted on the proposals. He believed that further points of access could not be delivered as they would be on land outside the applicant's control.

With regard to the deliverability of the scheme Mr Tucker did not believe that the 5 year housing supply could be used as an argument in favour of the proposal. He believed that the proposed footpath would be inadequate and represented a serious highway safety issue. Mr Tucker did not believe that the highways issues raised by the County Council had been fully addressed and therefore that the proposal scheme was not deliverable.

Mr Taylor (Objector) stated that he believed that the report was flawed and that some of the content of the report was the reverse of the original report. Mr Taylor also believed that the deliverable housing land supply of 3.9 years was incorrect. He advised that although he had met with the officer with regard to that figure he was still of the opinion that the figure was incorrect. He believed that there was a 4.98 years supply in the urban area – a shortfall of 8 units against a target of 1800.

Mr Taylor also stated that PPS3 allowed for an acceptable range below the set target of 10-20%. He advised that the officer had accepted that the Urban and District wide figures fell within that range.

Mr Taylor requested Members to take into account the revocation of the RSS and reminded Members that the emerging LDF would set the new targets. He therefore requested that Members recognised that the recent report to the Executive about the revocation of the RSS adopted the target of 450 with no backlog which was contrary to the report presented. Mr Taylor stated that the report sought to exceed that limit.

Mr Taylor added that he was concerned that the concerns of Cumbria County Council in relation to highways, transport and education remained. He stated that the Secretary of State had dismissed appeals where proposals conflicted with the current policy and which would restrict opportunities for identifying other greenfield development as part of the LDF when housing supply had been as little as 1.5 years.

Mr Taylor believed that approval of the of the development would pre-empt debate about the future Development Strategy for the Urban Area when various options for

growth were part of the Core Strategy Issues and Options which the Council would be consulting on in September.

Mr Taylor advised that advice in PPS3 indicated that where there was not a 5 year supply appropriate initiatives should be looked at. There was no evidence of such discussions in the report. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) had indicated several other suitable sites but Crindledyke was not included.

Mr Taylor concluded by stating that there was conflict with the Development Plan policies and that the application should be refused.

Councillor Bainbridge (Ward Councillor) stated that much of the report was based on targets and he believed that in the current economic climate the City Council would have difficulties reaching those targets. The SHLAA indicated an abundance of alternative sites. Councillor Bainbridge was concerned that Officers and Members by fixing a solution on one area the Council could be legally challenged if it appeared that the Council were advancing one development over the potential of other sites.

Councillor Bainbridge advised that his main concern was in relation to the highway issues. He believed that the houses would be disjointed from the CNDR and the access would be along the stretch of road from the site to Parkhouse Road on which the County Council had commented. Councillor Bainbridge stated that he was disappointed with regard to the comments from the County Council. The data that the report drew information from was based on a recording taken at a point just past the entrance to Kingmoor Park. He presented photographs that he had taken from the same spot after rush hour and saw several delivery vehicles using the junction. Councillor Bainbridge reminded Members that most settlements of a similar size had two points of exit and while Garlands only had one point of exit it was not shared with a rapidly expanding industrial park.

Councillor Bainbridge requested that if traffic lights were installed as mentioned in the report that would lead to standing traffic on a road that saw an increasing amount of accidents. If the application was approved there would be an increase in construction traffic, residential traffic and staff from the expanded Kingmoor Park development on that same road.

Councillor Bainbridge added that he was also concerned about the length of time that it would take for completion of the proposed development. He believed that it would take up to 14 years of construction in an area close to existing properties and it would be difficult for children from those properties to access the grassed areas. He did not believe those issues had been addressed in the report.

With regard to the primary school, Councillor Bainbridge was concerned that it could be up to 5 years before the school was constructed and that there could be up to 74 pupils needing education during that time. He was aware that schools to the north of the City were full and while rejections were fairly low that could not be maintained if the proposed development were approved.

Councillor Bainbridge acknowledged that there had been a lot of work in developing the report but that it was too focussed on the short term of planning policy and dealt

less with the infrastructure and impact on existing residents. He urged Members and Officers to look at the issues that had been raised before a final decision was made.

Mrs Tarbitt (Objector) advised that she was a County Councillor for Longtown and Bewcastle whose ward covered Rockcliffe and Kingmoor. She believed that the development would change the area and that the residents' quality of life during construction would be destroyed. Once completed the area would be an urban area rather than rural as at present.

Mrs Tarbitt requested Members to consider the impact on roads on Crindledyke during construction of the proposed development and stated that Parkhouse Road was used by HGVs and speeding cars. The impact of the CNDR was as yet unknown.

Mrs Tarbitt stated that the recent move by the County Council to premises at Kingmoor Park had resulted in an additional 200 cars using that road and that while houses were needed requested Members to look at other pockets of available land first and then reassess the situation.

Ms Jackson (Arup – Agent) explained that work had started on the development 3 years ago and had been submitted to the Council 2 years ago and that there had been extensive work done on the scheme. She believed it was a great opportunity to see new high quality accommodation delivered to meet the need for housing.

Mr Dolby (Pod Urban Design – Agent) explained that the development would not exceed the urban area and that the boundary would remain post development. The proposed development was adjacent to land that was under industrial use and the West Coast main railway line and was therefore could not be classed solely as countryside.

Mr Dolby stated that even at the strategic stage the application indicated a village green and open spaces. With regard to the Masterplan and Urban Design he advised that the Urban Design Officer had made no objections and acknowledged that efficiencies had been made. Mr Dolby believed there had been a good relationship between housing and open spaces.

Mr Dolby advised that with regard to the boundary Crindledyke Lane was part of the Masterplan and that there would be a higher density of housing at the centre of the development and that it would be less at the edges. He explained that there would be 3 transitional zones similar to developments in other areas of the City and he believed that the density was appropriate to the design. Zone 1 would have the highest density with town houses and apartments above shops and a village green. Zone 4 would have the lowest density with the largest houses set back from Crindledyke Lane. Landscaping would maintain a rural feel and effective use had been made of the playing fields and open spaces. Mr Dolby advised that the Open Spaces Society had given their approval of the proposals and that the public right of way would be retained and improved. There would also be a foraging area.

With regard to the location of the school, Mr Dolby advised that it had been decided to place the school towards the edge of the development to keep it away from the



residential area which was not uncommon. There would be landscaping and bunding along the boundary with the railway that would make it difficult to access and the applicant had worked with Network Rail on that area.

Mr Dolby informed Members that the community facilities would be at the centre of the scheme and would be accessible to all. The report acknowledged that facilities would meet the day to day needs of residents and that would reduce the need for residents to travel to major supermarkets. The main bus stops would be at the centre of the development and at the school.

Mr Dolby believed that the scheme now made good planning reasoning and the proposed development was of sound design, would be a quality product that would always be attractive and therefore the houses would sell.

Ms Jackson advised that the applicants had researched alternative sites and had provided no evidence to conclude that other sites were available and that they were therefore limited to that site.

Ms Jackson explained that the timescale for the delivery of the LDF was considerable and would have an adverse impact on affordability. Approval of the application would bring forward the amount of available affordable housing. Consultation had taken place over the last 3 years and the amendments to the application had resulted in there now being no objections from national or local consultees.

Ms Jackson advised that there had been £11m invested in affordable housing and that the proposals had been amended to include a primary school. That type of investment was supported by key organisations such as Cumbria Vision, NWDA and Carlisle College.

Ms Jackson acknowledged the local concerns of the construction phase and beyond and advised that the applicants were a member of the Considerate Constructors scheme.

With regard to transport there had been consultation with both the City and County Council and advised that the access to Kingmoor Park would be relocated as a result of the CNDR. Bus services would be improved and the highway agency had no objections to the revised proposals.

With regard to jobs Ms Jackson believed that the proposed development would bring high quality jobs to the area. She informed Members that the Planning Inspector had welcomed and encouraged the housing development adjacent to the proposed Brunthill development. Both applications were for outline planning permission and Ms Jackson confirmed that there would be a considerable buffer between the two developments. Ms Jackson believed that there was no technical reason to support refusal of the application and that the proposed development would help to rebalance the structure of the city and provide accessibility to jobs.

Mr Ottewell advised Members that one of the images presented by Mr Ruddick was a band of grade 3A land to the west of the site and that there would be further analysis of the land.

With regard to prematurity and the LDF that issue had been addressed in the report.

Mr Ottewell advised that the report made reference to extant comments from the County Council with regard to the development of the LDF. Since then progress had been made with the objectives emerging and Officers were now working on the Core Strategy.

With regard to housing land supply, Mr Ottewell advised that the County Council views presumed a 5 year housing land supply when in fact there was a 3.9 year supply.

The Planning Manager explained that with regard to the supply issues the Officers were working on the figure of 450 houses per year which had been in place since 2003. Those figures had not been achieved and that should be taken into account. He believed it would be unreasonable to discount the application on that basis.

The Committee then gave detailed consideration to the application.

A Member stated that there were many good things about the application but they were overshadowed by the road safety aspect. He was concerned about the single point of access from Crindledyke Lane. The plans indicated that the junction would be configured to encourage residents to turn left onto the lane. However, the Member believed that residents would turn right if they wished.

The Member was also concerned that it was intended that the school would be constructed when the 300<sup>th</sup> house had been occupied. He queried what would happen if 285 houses were occupied then no more. He was also concerned about what would happen to the children who occupied the houses prior to the school being constructed. He believed they would probably be accepted at Rockcliffe School and therefore parents would turn left from the development. The Member was also concerned about the width of the road and asked for clarification. Mr Ottewell advised that the road would be widened to 6.5m but added that there would be additional footpaths and cycleway of 2.5m. The Member stated that he was still concerned and would not be happy to support approval of the application.

A Member stated that he did not agree with the layout but reminded Members that the application was an outline application with other matters being reserved and therefore being discussed at various meetings in future.

The Member believed that the County Council were remiss in not providing information and he did not know how the children from the first houses to be occupied to the 300<sup>th</sup> would be accommodated and indicated that he was aware that Rockcliffe School already was already at capacity. He also believed that the school was not in the correct location and that residents would prefer to have the school in the centre of the development rather than the playing field.

With regard to infrastructure – including highways – the Member was disappointed with the County Council highways department. He believed Officers should try to work with stakeholders to agree an alternative access and exit. He also believed that if traffic lights were installed traffic would back up.

The Member also queried how emergency service vehicles would enter and exit the proposed development. He was also of the opinion that if the school remained where it was currently located residents would travel through the estate. If the school was located in the centre of the development there would be less need for residents to drive to the school.

The Member added that he would also wish to see more information about the ecological issues. The report stated that there was the opportunity to upgrade to level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The Member queried what that entailed.

With regard to parking arrangements the Member was concerned that residents would park on the green areas. He believed that matters could change over the 10-14 year construction period and the use of roads may change. He urged the applicants and Officers to look at the issue as the accommodation situation changed.

The Member stated that if the application was approved there should be some legal agreement to ensure there was not just one point of access. He added that a development plan was needed that could be adjusted as the development progressed and properties were occupied.

The Member also appealed to the County Council to work with the developers and Officers to ensure there were no further problems with regard to highways as he believed that if the issues were not addressed at the present stage there would be problems in the future.

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) reminded Members that the application was an outline application with reserved matters. The issues with regard to parking could be resolved under reserved matters and future applications and the issues regarding the school could be discussed again with the developers.

With regard to the highways the Assistant Director (Economic Development) advised that there had been no objections from the highways agency and it would be difficult to impose a condition that would satisfy the issues that had been raised. However, Officers could request that the developers look again at the site.

A Member acknowledged that it may be difficult to resolve the highway issues. He requested that the County Council look at the issues around the point of access and the travel plan within the proposed development.

A Member stated that he was pleased that affordable housing had been included in the proposal but added that he too had concerns about the highway and the school and queried when work on the school would be completed. The Member also believed that the school could be better located and requested that the issue be looked at again.

A Member believed that there would be more progress when residents started moving into the properties. With regard to the school the Member queried whether the school could be built when the 200<sup>th</sup> property was occupied rather than the 300<sup>th</sup>. He believed there should be further discussion regarding the location. The Member also queried whether the sports field would be all-weather. The Member requested that the highway works and improvements be carried out in line with the development and that any underground services be placed below pavements rather than roads.

The Planning Manager explained that negotiations with the Education Authority had been around the school being operational when the 300<sup>th</sup> house was occupied. He advised that the matter could be included as part of the legal agreement.

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) advised that with regard to adoption of the highways that would be done as each phase was completed.

Mr Ottewell stated that Conditions 8 and 14 related to the delivery of the highways.

A Member stated that he shared the views expressed regarding the school and the highways. He was concerned about secondary education for the children as the proposed development was in the catchment area for Trinity School which was already at capacity and was also concerned that the report did not address that issue. He believed there would be risks of residents travelling through the site to access the school. The Member was also concerned about the proximity of the school to the railway line and believed that serious consideration should be given to the matter.

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) informed that Members' views would be taken into account and that the issues would be considered under the Section 106 Agreement and through reserved matters.

A Member stated that he would have preferred to see 3 points of access and hoped that Officers could work with the developers to find a suitable and safe solution. There would be an impact on the traffic from the adjacent industrial estate and also from parents taking children to schools outside the development. He believed that the school should be operational when the 200<sup>th</sup> house was occupied and that the school should be located in the centre of the development. The Member added that there should be fewer properties adjacent to the railway line.

With regard to the adoption of the roads he did not believe Condition 8 fully covered the matter and was concerned that even if an agreement was in place the roads, grass maintenance and street lighting may not be adopted and that it should be part of the legal process. The Assistant Director (Economic Development) advised that officers would investigate how the legal agreement could be tightened up to cover those areas.

A Member reminded the Committee that consideration should only be given to the principle of a residential development under the current application. He stated that with regard to the school the Committee could specify when the school should be constructed but it was the Education Authority's decision when to staff it.

A Member requested clarification over the prematurity issue. As the Core Strategy would not be completed until 2013 the Member queried whether the development could be put on hold until that time. The Planning Manager advised that Officers were looking at a 15-20 year plan under the Core Strategy. The policy currently specified 450 units but that was based on a 2 year housing supply. Consultation would be required and responses to the consultation considered before the Core Strategy could be adopted. That left a gap in provision but the Planning Manager advised that if there was a gap in provision then it was appropriate to bring applications forward.

The Planning Manager explained that as the City Council was in the process of developing the LDF it was inappropriate to wait until January 2013 when it was anticipated it would be completed.

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) advised that the City Council was some way from issuing site allocation documents and with regard to housing numbers Officers had to make decisions or defer consideration on the grounds of prematurity.

A Member stated that she was also concerned about the issues raised regarding the access, highways and school and added that it was unclear what form of Education Authority may be in place in the future due to proposed changes to the education system. She was concerned that the school may be built and not used or possibly not built at all.

The Member reminded Members that the report referred to a mixture of on and off street parking but from the plans there did not appear to be a lot of off street parking or garages and no lay-by provision. She was concerned that residents would therefore park on the street. The Member was happy with the site in principle and believed that the whole matter revolved around the supply of housing land.

The Member queried the deliverability of the targets set and believed that if land was identified but builders did not wish to build on it the targets would not be reached. The Member queried whether the developers could look at building the same number of properties across a number of smaller sites. That would possibly allow children to be accommodated at other schools and would provide the same number of affordable housing.

Mr Ottewell advised that Members were limited in what they could do to ensure deliverability and in supporting the targets Members were supporting the key objectives. He reminded Members that the Executive had supported the target at their meeting in April 2011.

The Assistant Director (Economic Development) advised that the application had to be considered as it stood under the current economic climate and Government guidance.

A Member believed that the Committee were addressing issues too quickly and stated that there was nowhere else in the City that could accommodate a

development similar to the proposed site. While there may be concerns regarding highways, he believed there may also be issues elsewhere but the application was an outline application and should be considered as such.

A Member stated that when the Morton development was under consideration a report was referred to regarding car journeys. The situation would be similar with the Crindledyke proposal and she believed that the amount of traffic would increase over the 10-15 year construction period.

A Member moved that the application be approved with the condition that Officers consider the issues regarding the highway and look for a solution to the problems and whether the school would be staffed on completion. That would ensure that when each section was referred to the Committee for consideration those issues had been addressed. The Member added that one of the objectors had raised the issue of potential problems around amending the point of access as the land in question was not owned by the developer. The Assistant Director (Economic Development) advised that that issue was a matter for the developer.

A Member seconded the proposal to approve the application provided the amendments suggested were made.

A Member asked for more information about the eco-village. Mr Ottewell advised that there was a sustainability checklist with regard to drainage, renewable energy and sustainability of design. He advised that the conditions made reference to those matters in line with Code level 4. Mr Ottewell confirmed that it would be difficult to discuss sustainable energy and energy sources as there were still a number of reserved matters to be achieved.

Following a vote it was:

RESOLVED – That approval of the application be granted subject to legal agreement, that the school be delivered prior to the occupation of the 200<sup>th</sup> house, further consideration being given to the wording of the highway conditions to ensure that the highway is adopted in line with the phasing of the scheme and condition 38 is modified to refer to achieving a minimum of Code for Sustainable Housing Level 4 rating or equivalent.

[The meeting ended at 12:25pm]