

Planning Committee - Wakefield - 16/7/20.

Sandra Pickin - Chair

John Holmes - presentation

- removal of some T16 trees !
- access from Wakefield Rd
- views of site from road
- even showing lots of trees !
- 2 more objections since the first stage site within GB
- grant of H is 2:1 - lapsed implies trees within the site or T16 ?
- full conference - unreasonable to refuse a App
- all councillors - no objection
- scheme avoided - eva assessment - off mitigation - no adverse effect
- 2:1 replacement -
- scheme avoided - mix of credits - acceptance impact - off recommended

Chair - 2 Councillors speaking - 20 sec

Mr Loughran (Cllr) - concerned re highways + green wedge loss - attention to local heritage + ecology - kept a lot of trees - changes to landscaping - let go - must be taken into consideration - off no of trees chopped down - loss of amenity + ecology + air quality

Mr Jones (Cllr) - impact on highways + the surveys don't take speed into account

- path too narrow on the side
- fed into of sight interrupted
- obstacles to line of sight
- road too narrow to turn = heavy congestion
- does lists other lines - which have express access, not of local access

Members Questions? -

Mr Kathryn Scott - if access taken up? would it still be an issue

Jones - yes it would - due to other roads highly covered by org access points

Mr Samantha Harvey - traffic increased over area why?

Jones - increased traffic to the park = approach increase in traffic

Mr Scott - to Loughran - how long for replacement trees to grow? + impact on wildlife

Loughran - replace doesn't go to trees! or grass - a lot of native ones!

2018 ecology report - is strip for conservation - some of them are good quality = impact on the birds here tree officer - loss of trees - would take 10/15 years to replace

2 there is a need to increase diversity *

Clv Jones - fear - removing trees will
make air quality worse

Z:1 is blackmail - let's do it with
them executive

Clv Maurice Tenant King - or the trees next
to the tennis court removed

Clv Langham - there's a lot of trees
sprinkled all over - 30 of a decent
size
2 could preserve spaces & trees

Clv Swift - G to L2

Celia - no tree work - regardless of replanting
is the only prospect of restoring wooded
appearance

Langham - it will be good trees going
+ work on the roads - so extra trees
will be lost

Dana - is the proposed garden within the
area where the problem is existing?

Jones - yes it is - see pictures in

Clv Scott - Q to Jones - visited the area -
caused congestion - so I parked in the
park - what effect would this have on
the one way parking - it took me 6
minutes to get out. - uh

Clv Jones - agree would be difficult to get
out

Mr. Swift - what impact on the 1 vs

area - is used by residents + delivery vehicles. - angle facing to the right will have to view. - use pads

Any pads - you can't see out so would have to edge out = a pretty dangerous junction. = very dangerous

ed of Questions e 10.36 am

Q's to Officers

Mr. Harry Ellis - don't remember last off the site tree removal?

J. Holmes - re permits approval - access + layout similar - essentially if they retained is the same as permits approval.

Mr. Taylor - worried about Japanese Knotweed from exposure = dead

J. Holmes - have checked the area + identified where there is Knotweed - don't expect to remove it (he hasn't said there is one!)

as it covered by other legislation

Mr. Tyler - how will you deal this year can you be thorough?

J. Holmes - what they do - will have to control themselves - spread legislation - is not a planning issue.

On Scott - if can't check its ~~be~~ answer
how will students know its answer

Thomson - it's a legal matter - experts
would have to satisfy themselves - good
legal advice since law + rights
- put it to everyone.

Ch Scott - how many trees will be felled?

Tholmes - acts out whole trees in the
space 22 individuals
26 groups

slowly people - can't go/for it
the tree are being removed

Ch. Scott - bats - how do we know they will be ok

Thomson - phing ordering for nitrogen -
we explicitly state
+ needed to other retained.
Impact of 2 off to the lowest level

OK Harvey - ok G - let listen to Aranz -
+ no response for consultation

- Q - how can Council respond when in formal assessment of AQ

T-Twoes - as we like Acute cut
- cut for A. Asymptotic - a rounded
O to give a triangle. = ultimately -
have admitted acceptance level of life

Cliff Scott - G - advice on highways - what have you done? when assessed - how long does the

2 Adrian Pigott - highways

carriageway work is done - parking in the bays wouldn't impede access

- AP - I don't want to proxy cross

- work of highway issues raised - a thought + what assessment has been made

- can - is of advice impact

AP - what are the additional speed limit work to the east

- auto survey data was provided - data for Oct 2018 - after completion of the junction speed survey - demonstrate 35/1 - is below 30 mph

- submitted plans had omitted crossings on the other side of the road - but an effort has been - officers did register existing drug access + took these into account

- width of footways - is below 1.2/1.5m

but there is some settlement here of the veg (which was fed to the car/b) - as

emitted by the soil + veg will improve the

footways - so footways will be wider + veg maintained by planting

- right lines - or - wouldn't advise peds as obstruction to a V.O. display

- confident a driver turning right will be able to see 43m

- traffic turning right into the scheme - can't remove a filter - natural breaks in the traffic caused by red crossing lights - as does the roundabout

- Anna Riggott - the site plan of traffic will continue

Concerns - volume of traffic @ 22 units - morning peak - 16 2-way trips - approx 1 vehicle every 2/3 minutes will drop feed into the street

Clv Scott - really concerned about turning right
- traffic down hill will be fast - can't see how this will be safe

AP → based agreement on who will be
concerned the access is safe
will see a R5 street - by conditions
don't believe the access presents a problem

~~Clv~~ No future for - 11.03

Clv More to be voted?

Officers recommended to approve

Ans

Members - against

Kenn White - need a motion first before the vote
(excuse)

Members - for
Hepburn - against
Snodgrass - for
Scott - against
Taylor - against
Tennant - for
Woolhouse -

Whitman - against
Williams - against
Mason Skill - for
Pickin - for

4 in favor } - Richmond failed.
3 against }

2nd motion - move to refuse - but haven't discussed

Etting - for
Haley - against
Hepburn - for
Gardner - against
Scott - for
Tappin - for
Trenton - for
Walker - for
Whitman - for
Williams - for
Hutchinson - against
Pickin - against

App refused - 8 to 3

Ans. App refused - now need reasons:

Scott - look at a few cases
- Japanese interested
- 70% of trees being destroyed
- waste access

J. Holmes - can't use J.K. as a reason to refuse
- loss of trees + highway safety could be put forth

Prober - loss of trees + energy
- high safety

Terrace-King - add wildlife - clear - no

Thomson - combine loss of trees to loss of
habitat + impact on biodiversity.

Kern White - is it straight refusal - or
needed to refuse or allow options to test
the reasons.

2 reasons w/ 214 - there was a 11 - + Open
and there was a lot of different
members have taken a diff view - set options
what need an opp to review

Chair - members have said they want to share

Clv Taylor - worked about Japanese knowled -
should be a reason

Chair - matter for the developer

~~Smitha~~ ^{Chair} ~~Richard~~ - condition was already there re
area of trees.

Kern White - enhanced the reasons for refusal:

Judy Jones - impact a loss of protected trees,
amenity + impact on ecology
- impact is high
- needed to refuse - so will look
at the point in detail for further work with Chair.