

Minutes of a meeting of the Regulatory and Appeals Committee held on Thursday, 25 May 2017 at Committee Room 1 - City Hall, Bradford

Commenced 10.05 am
Concluded 11.50 am

Present – Councillors

CONSERVATIVE	LABOUR	LIBERAL DEMOCRAT AND INDEPENDENT
Brown Rickard	Amran Lal Wainwright Warburton	Griffiths

Observers: Councillor Ferriby

Apologies: Councillor Watson

Councillor Warburton in the Chair

1. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Councillor Warburton disclosed, in relation to the item concerning Land at the Playing Fields, Huddersfield Road, Bradford (Minute 97), that he had been involved with the scheme to replace the Richard Dunn Sports Centre since its inception a number of years previously. He therefore withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of this item in accordance with the requirements of the Members' Code of Conduct (Part 4A of the Constitution) and the Members' Planning Code of Conduct (Part 4B of the Constitution).

2. INSPECTION OF REPORTS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

There were no appeals submitted by the public to review decisions to restrict documents.

3. APPOINTMENT OF SUB-COMMITTEES

Resolved -

- (1) That the Panels set out in Document “A” be appointed with memberships as shown and with the role and functions as contained in the Articles of the Council’s Constitution and subject to the Rules of Procedure contained in Part 3 of the Constitution.**
- (2) That the Chairs and Deputy Chairs be appointed to the Panels as indicated in Document “A”.**

ACTION: *City Solicitor*

Councillor Wainwright in the Chair

4. LAND AT THE PLAYING FIELDS, HUDDERSFIELD ROAD, BRADFORD

The Assistant Director - Planning, Transportation and Highways presented a report (**Document “B”**) in respect of a full planning application for the development of an aquatic, sport and leisure facility on the playing fields, Huddersfield Road, Bradford – 17/00352/MAF. He recommended that, if Members were minded to approve the application, an additional condition should be included in respect of the permitted hours of use.

The Assistant Director responded to questions from Members, as set out below:

- There were no serious safety concerns in terms of the flow of traffic; the model indicated approximately 59 related total movements in the a.m. peak hour and 129 in the p.m. peak.
- Parking would be restricted along the same side of Cleckheaton Road as the development and officers would consider the provision of resident’s permit parking on the opposite side of the carriageway.
- Two traffic islands would be provided on Cleckheaton Road with a ‘PUFFIN’ crossing halfway along the site frontage.
- In assessing the adequacy of the proposed parking provision, recorded data in respect use of such facilities and the demographic of potential users had been considered. Usage of the parking spaces at Richard Dunn Sports Centre had also been monitored. 165 spaces was lower than would normally be required but the standards set out in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan were intended to be maximum figures. In accepting this provision, account had been taken of: the available public transport links, the likelihood that children would be dropped off/collected and that, given its location in a residential area, there would be a number of visitors who would travel on foot. Overall he was satisfied that the provision would be adequate, however, the situation in terms of the impact on on-street parking would be reviewed six months after the facility opened and the potential for extending the proposed permit parking scheme would be considered if necessary.
- There would also be 30 spaces for cycle parking and 7 for motorcycles.



A Ward Councillor was in attendance at the meeting and made the following comments in support of the development:

- This was a much needed facility to replace the outdated Richard Dunn Sports Centre.
- The development would provide updated and upgraded playing pitches and modern aquatic and sports facilities.
- The existing pitches were very well used by local sports clubs and the local rugby club had welcomed the proposed investment.
- The site was also well used by the local community.
- Although it was appreciated that there had been some objections to the proposals, most residents were supportive of the scheme.
- The layout had been designed so that the new playing pitches were located as far away from existing residential properties as possible.
- A consultation event had been held.
- Additional crossing facilities would be provided in conjunction with a well designed access and egress.
- The site was well provided for by public transport, it was also accessible by walking and cycling and included parking provision.
- These facilities would enable more local people to use up to date facilities thus encouraging physical activity and participation in sport. The facilities would be suitable for a wide range of ages and abilities.

Objectors to the proposals addressed the Committee:

- 357 people had agreed with the scheme going ahead but thousands had not and wished to see the existing facilities at Richard Dunn Sports Centre refurbished.
- It was understood that the proposals would cost 17.5 million.
- It was believed that numerous accidents had been omitted from the statistics, there had been 7 accidents near to the bus stop on Cleckheaton Road.
- Differing figures had been quoted in respect of the distance from existing dwellings. Residents had also been told that the development would be higher than the houses.
- Lots of the houses were not included on the plans.
- She lived in a small house whose living room would be facing a wall and sunlight to the property would be blocked.
- The site was currently a green space that was used by a local rugby club. The facilities were free at the present time but the rugby club had said that people would have to pay to use the new facilities.
- There were concerns about security and nuisance; it was proposed to allow use up to 23.00. Appleton Academy had experienced problems with the use of its pitches due to complaints about noise.
- An alleyway would be created between the existing housing and the new building.
- The junction of Netherlands Avenue had been altered and the traffic situation was now even worse; the amount of traffic using Cleckheaton Road had



increased.

- There had already been complaints from residents of McMillan Gardens in respect of noise and foul language from people using the site.
- It was considered that insufficient electric vehicle (EV) charging points were to be provided and there was also no provision for electric cycles or for vehicles for people with impaired mobility.
- Security outside the operational hours was a concern.
- Richard Dunn Sports Centre should remain open until the development was completed.

The Assistant Director explained that:

- The accident database had been checked; the last accident recorded as being significant had been in 2010.
- There were no causes for concern on Cleckheaton Road where the access and egress would be located.
- No information had been forthcoming that would give rise to any concerns about the operation of the highway network.
- Work around Netherlands Avenue was still ongoing; the new layout would remove the need for right hand turning at this junction.
- The distance between the new building and the dwellings had been calculated from the plans. If the distance was 22 metres this was in excess of what would normally be required.
- The development would have to be built in accordance with the approved plans.
- The site was currently an open field with no controls or restrictions on its use or any security measures.
- No floodlights were proposed to be provided as part of this application.
- The Council's Air Quality Officer required a minimum of two EV charging points. The necessary infrastructure would be in place if the demand increased in the future.
- No electric cycle points were proposed but this could be considered in the future subject to there being a demand.

In response to further questions from Members, he also clarified that it was proposed to relocate the bus stop and to incorporate a 'build-out' into the road; this would help to slow the flow of traffic but drivers would be able to pass if it was safe to do so.

The applicant responded to questions from Members:

- The facility had been designed to meet the necessary standards for both rugby and football. Both the Rugby Football League and the Football Association had been consulted.
- The rugby club that currently used the site would use the new facilities.
- There was a standard charge for the use of such Council facilities.
- There was a latent demand for playing pitches but the existing pitches were not of a good quality.



- Richard Dunn Sports Centre would not close until this development was completed. Once the new facilities were open Estate Management would work towards disposal of that site.
- The existing sports centre had been built in the 1970s and it had very high running costs and a significant maintenance backlog. The Executive and relevant Overview & Scrutiny Committee had considered the business cases for a new build replacement and refurbishment of the existing facility and it had been established that there was a financial benefit associated with the development of a new facility.

In response to a question from a Member of the Committee, the City Solicitor confirmed that Members' views in respect of the refurbishment/replacement of the Richard Dunn Sports Centre were not relevant to this decision; their concern was to consider the proposal in the light of planning policy and whether this was an acceptable use for the site.

Resolved –

That the application be approved for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Assistant Director - Planning, Transportation and Highways' technical report together with an additional condition in respect of:

Hours of operation to be restricted to 06.00 to 23.00 Monday to Friday and 07.00 to 21.00 on Saturday, Sunday and Bank Holidays.

ACTION: Assistant Director - Planning, Transportation and Highways

Chair

Note: These minutes are subject to approval as a correct record at the next meeting of the Regulatory and Appeals Committee.

THESE MINUTES HAVE BEEN PRODUCED, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ON RECYCLED PAPER

