

LNP Drafting Committee (DC)

Minutes of Second Landowners Meeting Held on 20 February 2013 at 3.00 p.m.

DC Members Present: Jill Bolton, Irving Weaver, Ken Morton, Roger Limbert.

Apologies: None – these attendees were the agreed representatives of the DC

Landowners' Representative Present:

Andy Bateson (AB) – on behalf of Peter Salmon & Gillian Hackney

Site: Land to east of Linton Village Memorial Hall & Linton Tennis Club, comprising Linton Livery Stables & adjoining field – to be now known as 'The Green Lane (GL) Site'

SHLAA Number: None

1. Jill opened the meeting by welcoming AB & explaining that Leeds City Council Planning (LCCP) has, again, changed its timetable for putting to the Development Plans Panel the LCCP initial site assessment (SA) for Outer NE Leeds. The current proposed date for this is 9 April 2013 but there is still no certainty that this date will be met. The LCCPSA will then go to the Executive Board. Jill stated that the Steering Group for Linton (SG) has agreed that the outcome of the SA should be awaited & the next SG meeting is planned to take place on Wednesday 17 April 2013 at 7.30 p.m. when it is hoped the SA will be available for discussion. In the meantime the DC has been preparing for its own SA & for this purpose is gathering further information in relation to a number of Linton sites. This meeting has been called as part of that process.
2. Jill then moved to the agenda items as follows:
 - 2.1 The Proposed Development of 8 Houses on the GL Site.
 - Irving referred to the village survey returns, which suggested that smaller houses for down-sizing were needed & asked AB if it would be practicable to reduce the house sizes on the GL site & increase the density of houses, if the SG wanted this. AB stated that there would be no problem per se but if the wish was for all houses to be of three bedrooms instead of four each, of three & four bedrooms, as currently proposed, then ten houses would be required to maintain the same land value and maintain viability such that it could still provide all the requisite community infrastructure benefits being sought.
 - AB stated that there would be two additional problems created by more houses. The current plans aim to address the floodplain issue ~~is to~~ by replacing ~~remove~~ surface water storage volume on a 3 to 1 basis ~~volume~~, which is much higher than required. ~~and~~ To maintain this ratio, more flood attenuation work would be needed. Also, there would be more water run-off from the additional houses, which would, again, need to be addressed.

- The proposed drainage ~~water~~ scheme incorporates ponds to collect excess water from Northgate Beck, the development and, exceptionally, flood water from the Wharf and release it slowly thus avoiding any flooding. For the 100 year flood risk then a floodplain remains in the area surrounding the development, which would not put the houses or village at risk. Ken suggested this scheme should be put to the Environment Agency for comment but AB pointed out there are substantial cost implications in preparing a full Level 3 Flood Risk Assessment that could be discussed with the EA, which his clients are unwilling to incur until they have more surety ~~know~~ that there is a prospect of this scheme receiving support from the SG/village.
- 2.2 The proposal for an additional tennis court as part of the proposed development is considered by the DC as not being needed, due to limited demand for the existing 2 courts. From preliminary discussions, this is also ~~the~~ likely to be the formal view of the Tennis Club.
- 2.3 AB pointed out that additional car parking is provided for in the proposals. There will be a loss of 6 current spaces but the new layout proposes a net gain of 12 spaces.
- 2.4 AB stated he is aware that the Montessori School needs to have at least the same outside play area & would like more. 50%+ additional playing space would be ~~is~~ provided for under the proposed scheme by moving the southern part round to the north of the hall.
- 2.5 The proposed new access road was discussed, with Ken pointing out that the Highways Authority may well want the junction of Main Street & Northgate Lane squared off into a proper staggered junction as part of the creation of a new entrance into GL. This is because the current layout of the Northgate Lane junction has been identified as being hazardous. AB stated that there is less of a financial cost to his clients in making an approach to the Highways Authority on the proposed new GL access. He also stated that his clients believe that they have the legal right to re-route the GL access as that will not be detrimental to the other households that will continue to use GL.
- 2.6 Roger explained that there may be the possibility that the currently proposed amenity land may possibly be expanded but this would need to be explored further with the Tennis Club & Village Hall Trustees. With their agreement then the amenity land could comprise that to the NW & N of the tennis courts, which is currently an eyesore.
- 2.7 The consideration to be paid to the Village Hall & Tennis Club to create the proposed access road was discussed. It was agreed that given the uncertainties of certain aspects of the development AB will have to make certain assumptions as to infrastructure costs but he will undertake viability calculations as soon as possible & submit those to the DC so that these can be used in discussions with the Village Hall & Tennis Club Trustees.

- 2.8 Jill asked AB to at least start looking in greater detail at the drainage issue and the suggested highway improvements. This will necessitate a wider detailed survey being undertaken and the preparation of plan designs for the new highway junctions. Jill also asked AB to provide a summary of all the community benefits that would arise from development of the site.
3. There being no other business, the meeting was closed with Jill thanking AB for attending.

RL 22.2