

## **Plans Panel (East)**

**Thursday, 13th May, 2010**

**PRESENT:** Councillor G Latty in the Chair

Councillors D Congreve, R Finnigan,  
P Gruen, M Lyons, J Marjoram, K Parker,  
A Taylor, G Wilkinson and D Wilson

### **224 Chair's opening remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

Members were informed that Councillor Wilkinson had been appointed to the Panel in place of former Councillor Paul Wadsworth

The Panel paid tribute to the work Paul Wadsworth had undertaken whilst being a member of the Panel

### **225 Late Items**

The Chair referred to a request made on behalf of an applicant to table additional information for an item being considered at the meeting

The Chair stated that he had declined to accept this information as it was not appropriate to present Members with additional information when other parties, including Officers, had not had a chance to fully consider the new material

### **226 Declarations of Interest**

The following Members declared personal/prejudicial interests for the purposes of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct

Application 10/00412/OT – Former Greyhound Stadium Elland Road – Councillors Congreve and Lyons declared personal interests as members of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as Metro had commented on the proposals (minute 233 refers)

Application 09/01584/OT – Land near Crank Cottage Station Road Morley – Councillor Finnigan declared a personal interest as a member of Morley Town Council which had commented on the proposals (minute 234 refers)

Application 08/00298/OT – Optare site Manston Lane LS15 – Councillors Congreve and Lyons declared personal interests as members of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as Metro had previously commented on the proposals (minute 235 refers)

Application 08/00298/OT – Optare site Manston Lane LS15 – Councillor Gruen declared a personal interest through being a Roman Catholic as the report related to the method of assessment for the education contribution as part of the S106 agreement and that the initial assessment had not included children attending Catholic primary schools (minute 235 refers)

Application 08/03378/OT – Knowsthorpe Crescent Cross Green LS9 – Councillors Congreve and Lyons declared personal interests through being members of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as Metro had previously commented on the proposals (minute 237 refers)

Application 10/01347/FU – Old Golden Fleece Elland Road LS27 – Councillor Finnigan declared a personal interest as a member of Morley Town Council which had commented on the proposals (minute 238 refers)

## **227 Minutes of the last meeting**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> April 2010 be approved subject to an amendment to the resolution of minute 220 – Application 10/00773/FU – White Rose Shopping Centre – as follows:

‘an additional condition requiring the submission of a work programme and timetable for the recommencement of works to the Trinity Quarter’ to be amended to read ‘ an additional condition requiring the submission of a work programme and timetable for the recommencement and completion of works to the Trinity Quarter’

## **228 Matters arising from the minutes**

Councillor Gruen referred to situations where the Panel had not accepted an Officer’s recommendation to approve an application and before the Panel had met again to consider the detailed reasons for refusal an appeal against non-determination had been lodged. A report on this had been requested and the Head of Planning Services stated this would be brought to the next meeting

## **229 Request to withdraw a report from the agenda**

Members were informed of a request by Councillor Iqbal for the withdrawal of the report on application 10/00944/FU – change of condition relating to opening hours of a hot food take away at 250 Easterly Road LS8, as further information was to be submitted

**RESOLVED** - That the report be withdrawn from the agenda

## **230 Application 08/04259/FU - Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of Four 4 bedroom detached Chalet Bungalows with attached garage, Lingwell Rise, Gypsy Lane, Beeston LS11**

Further to minute 253 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> May 2009 where the application was withdrawn from the agenda in order to resolve issues which had arisen on the Members’ site visit earlier that day, the Panel considered a revised report

Photographs and plans of the current and previous proposals were displayed at the meeting

The Panel’s Lead Officer presented the report which sought permission for the demolition of the existing bungalow on the site and the erection of 4 detached chalet bungalows with garages on Lingwell Rise Gypsy Lane LS11

Members were informed that the previous proposals had been for four 2 storey houses with a significant amount of hardstanding. The revised proposals were for the same number of properties but these would now be dormer bungalows

with attached garages and less hardstanding on the site. Block A had been set back further within the site which Officers considered to be an improvement

The Panel was informed of a correction to the report at paragraph 1.3 and were informed of representations received from the local Residents' Association which had raised concerns particularly in respect of the highway implications of the scheme

Members commented on the following matters:

- the arrangements for refuse collection
- the longstanding highway problems from Gipsy Lane to Ring Road Beeston Park leading to the backing up of traffic from the junction at Dewsbury Road
- that residents' concerns about the scale of the proposals had not been taken on board and the view that a smaller scheme would be more suitable
- acknowledgement of the work undertaken by Officers to obtain a more acceptable scheme than that previously proposed but that concerns remained with the revised scheme

The Head of Highways Development Services who attended the meeting stated that whilst there had been complaints received on the level of traffic in this area, this related to the dropping off/picking up of pupils from the nearby Cockburn College of Arts and that the accident records indicated that the road was not dangerous

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report

### **231 Application 09/05463/FU - 5 Bedroom Detached House with integral double garage to existing residential site, 1 New Farmers Hill, Woodlesford LS26**

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought permission for a five bedroom detached house and garage at 1 New Farmers Hill LS26

Members were informed there was an extant permission on the site for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the subdivision of the plot to form two houses. The applicant had begun to implement that permission but had now submitted a revised scheme

The footprint of the revised proposals was similar to the approved scheme but one metre had been added to the single storey element. The ridge heights had increased by 0.5m and 0.7m and roof lights had been included

The Panel's Lead Officer updated the report in respect of the number of trees previously and currently on the site; that the application for listing of the house had taken place in 2007, not 2009 as stated; that the representations from Oulton Society constituted an objection to the application and minor amendments to paragraphs 10.3 and 10.6

The Panel heard representations from the applicant's architect and an objector who attended the meeting

Members discussed the following matters:

- permitted development rights; whether these had been removed on the extant permission and whether condition 5 could be amended to remove permitted development rights, if approved

- the information provided by the applicant's architect in response to concerns raised about the possibility of a third level being added to the property
- concerns at the removal of the existing laurel hedge and that this should be replaced

Members discussed the removal of permitted development rights with concerns being raised that the removal of these would be unfair to the applicant

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report and that the condition requiring the submission of a landscaping scheme for approval should include the replacement of the laurel hedge

**232 Application 06/06118/FU - Two Linked towers (Part 12 storey raising to 19 and part 24 Storey raising to 26) block comprising 357 Crash Pads, 63 Studio Flats, 16 one bedroom Flats and 4 two bedroom flats, with Launderette, residents gym and 85 car parking spaces at Cromwell Mount, Burmantofts**

Plans, photographs, drawings and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers presented the report which sought permission for a major residential development on a brownfield site at Cromwell Mount LS9 comprising two linked towers, part 12 storey raising to 19 and part 24 storey raising to 26 containing 357 crash pads, 63 studio flats, 16 one bed and 4 two bed flats together with a residents' gym, laundrette and 85 parking spaces

Members were informed that the area was characterised by multi-storey buildings and that the site was in close proximity to St James' Hospital in the heart of Burmantofts

Images of the previous designs of the buildings were shown for comparative purposes with Officers stating that the revised scheme resulted in a more slender building and featured a glazed corridor to link the two blocks. To address issues of overlooking, fins would be incorporated to obscure the views on floors 3 – 7

A copy of a plan showing the sun path analysis was circulated at the meeting

The Panel was informed that concerns had been raised in respect of car parking in the area with Officers stating that there were existing problems due to the location of St James' Hospital and the proximity of the city centre, although there were residents' parking schemes in the area

In respect of S106 contributions, the equivalent of the market value of 66 units (ie 15%) was being provided as an off-site affordable housing contribution and a significant contribution - £687,513 – towards greenspace was being proposed together with highways contributions and travel plan monitoring fee

The Panel heard representations from the applicant's agent and an objector who attended the meeting

The Panel commented on the following matters:

- the need for further information on what constituted a crash pad
- the lack of public consultation on the proposals
- who the scheme would be marketed to and concerns that the impression was being given that the accommodation would be taken up largely by medical staff from the nearby hospital
- the level of car parking being provided and concerns this was insufficient

- the adopted Tall Buildings SPD; whether the requirements for the siting of tall buildings applied to out of city centre sites and the need for more information on how the scheme related to the SPD
- that the building was incongruous in size and shape and that the type of accommodation it would provide could add to problems in the area
- the need for evidence of the demand for this type of accommodation in this area
- that the scheme should be welcomed; that it could provide community benefits and was an adventurous and exciting building in an area which had suffered from deprivation for many years
- that the accommodation should be thought of as studios rather than crash pads and that the growth in the population in Leeds was increasingly young, single people who were being attracted into professions in the city and that this development catered for them
- that the revisions had merit compared to the bulk of the previous scheme but that a city centre location was more suitable to a such a building

Concerns were expressed that a position statement had not been presented to Members to enable early sight of the proposals

Members considered how to proceed

The Panel's Lead Officer stated that if minded to refuse the application then an appeal against non-determination could be lodged which the Planning Inspectorate might accept. In order to ensure that the Council was in a position to identify reasons for refusal which could be relied on at appeal without delay, the Lead Officer requested that Members should defer and delegate the refusal to the Chief Planning Officer

**RESOLVED –**

- i) That the refusal of the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer based upon the concerns raised by Members in relation to:
  - the scale and height of the development in relation to the size of the plot and that the resultant development would be inappropriate in its context causing harm to the character of the area
  - inadequate car parking provision causing harm to highways safety
  - lack of public consultation if a reason for refusal on this ground could be sustained on appeal following legal advice

**233 Application 10/00412/OT - Outline application to erect new Divisional Police Headquarters comprising offices & storage areas, custody suite, multi level car park and secure yard area, former Greyhound Stadium, Elland Road, Holbeck**

Further to minute 207 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> March 2010 where Panel considered a position statement for a divisional police headquarters together with multi-level car parking, offices, storage areas and custody suite on the former greyhound stadium on Elland Road LS11, Panel considered the outline application

Plans, drawings, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and outlined the main issues raised by Panel at the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> March 2010 which were:

- car parking proposals
- the travel plan
- match day parking
- scale

The Panel was informed that the original proposal included 500 car parking spaces which was a significant overprovision on UDP standards and Highways Officers had raised concerns at this. The revised proposals included 315 spaces in the multi-storey car park and surface parking for operational vehicles. Within the multi-storey car park space had been set aside to be available at all times to relocate operational vehicles during massing of police vehicles for large events

A travel plan had now been submitted and agreed

Regarding match day car parking, that the proposals would result in the loss of approximately 350 spaces but that the applicant had agreed to fund Traffic Regulation Orders in the order of £250,000 which was equivalent to providing parking permits for 69 streets around the football stadium. Officers were of the view that this was considered to be reasonable and proportionate to the loss of match day parking; a plan of the area which would be considered for parking permits was displayed and Ward Members would be included in the negotiations to identify the streets in the area to be designated

In respect of the scale of the proposals there was a 10.6 metre difference in height between the residential property at 277 Elland Road and the four storey building. Graphics showing the lower scale of building at this point were displayed but Members were informed that the applicants were seeking to create a civic building on the site and were of the view that a lower scale detracted from the prominence the building was seeking to achieve

Officers provided the following updates:

- condition 21 within the report was no longer required
- in respect of condition 18, - design of the site access junction – a revised junction arrangement had been submitted which would be considered, with the original proposal being a suitable fall back position if needed
- page 47, the reference to 400 cars in the multi-storey car park should read 315
- that refuse vehicles would not use Heath Road

Members discussed the following matters:

- a possible reduction in scale of the building on Elland Road adjacent to the Heath Road junction and where larger building could be sited. Officers stated that it might be possible to re-site the larger building in a less sensitive area but that detailed discussions on this had not taken place
- the possibility of stepping back the building adjacent to 277 Elland Road whilst retaining the presence of the building
- that the building should not be perceived as imposing
- concerns at the reduction of match day parking and that this was something which Ward Members had never agreed to
- acknowledgement of the implementation of TROs but concern at the relatively small area which had been identified for these; that parts of Cottingley and Holbeck suffered from match day parking as much as streets within the Cross Flatts area and that it was necessary to ensure

that sufficient money was being provided for TROs in all of the affected areas

- the need for meaningful consultation with Ward Members on this issue

The Head of Highways Development Services stated that discussions with the developer had led to an area larger than the 350 spaces which would be displaced being agreed on for the implementation of TROs and this had been costed. Whilst Officers were happy to discuss where the money could best be spent, Members were informed that further money to cover a larger area could not be requested. However, another development in the area was to be put forward and it was likely that as part of any approval, contributions for a permit scheme would be requested on that scheme

Regarding the scale of the building it was agreed that this matter be left to Officers to negotiate through the discussion of the Reserved Matters application

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions specified (and any others which he might consider appropriate); the deletion of condition 21 and rewording of condition 18 and following completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following matters:

- travel plan monitoring evaluation fee £4545
- public transport improvements contribution of £101,814
- Metro contributions of £20,000 for real time information at bus stop numbers 10104 and 12116
- £250,000 contribution towards traffic regulation orders to surrounding residential streets as considered necessary by the Council to mitigate the loss of match day parking at the site
- car parking levy charge if peak time vehicle trip rate targets within the travel plan are not met and/or provision of free bus metro cards to 9-5 staff

In the circumstances where the Section 106 Agreement has not been Completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application to be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer

### **234 Application 09/01584/OT - Outline application to erect Four 5 Bedroom Detached Houses on land near Crank Cottage, Station Road, Morley**

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers presented the report which sought outline approval for the erection of four 5 bedroom detached houses on land near Crank Cottage, Station Road Morley LS27

Members were informed that the site is not currently within a Conservation Area but did sit within the revised draft Morley Conservation Area Appraisal. As the revised Conservation Area had not been adopted, only limited weight could be attached to that document

The Panel was informed that the design of the properties was a reserved matter but they would be three storeys in height. Landscaping was also a reserved matter but it was proposed to reduce the height of the Leylandii hedge at the rear of the site by 3 metres

Members discussed the following matters:

- highways and concerns that there should be yellow lines to provide better visibility for traffic exiting on to Station Road
- that if road markings were to be included as part of an approval that further consultation should be carried out with Morley South Members as this was a complex area
- the arrangements for refuse collection
- that the hedge should be reduced by a lesser amount

Officers provided the following responses

- that it would be possible to include road markings but that 19 Albert Road would then have a parking space whereas the other terraced properties would not which would impact on their amenity, also there was doubt that the inclusion of road markings would achieve the full visibility splay. As a private road the geometry was acceptable but that it would not be so if it was an adopted road
- that refuse collection was from the end of the access drive and that currently residents did wheel their bins to this point for collection

**RESOLVED** - That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, an additional condition requiring any reduction in the height of the existing conifer hedge to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, a Traffic Order to be drafted in consultation with Ward Members and further consideration of the siting of the bin store and to have regard to its visual impact including its supporting structure and following completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following matter:

- the provision of a contribution (£200 per unit) for drainage improvements at Cotton Mill Beck
- the expiry of the further advertisement period and no adverse representations being received that raise new issues

In the circumstances where the Section 106 Agreement has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application to be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer

### **235 Application 08/00298/OT - Outline application to layout access and erect residential development at the Optare site, Manston Lane, Crossgates LS15**

Further to minute 110 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2008 where Members approved in principle an application for a residential development on the Optare site at Manston Lane LS15, Members considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer requesting consideration of revisions to the Section 106 Agreement in respect of education contributions. Members were also informed of a request by the applicant for an increase to the standard time limit for the outline application from three years to five years for the submission of reserved matters

Officers stated that new tests relating to the legality of planning obligations had recently been introduced and that it was necessary to consider each of the proposed planning obligations on this application in the light of the new tests

Additionally, the applicant had questioned the methodology used by Education Leeds to determine local capacity as this related to the level of contributions required and had subsequently challenged the methodology

Members were informed that in respect of primary school provision an allowance for the intake of children at a local faith school (a RC Primary School) had



not been included in the calculation. Having made an allowance for Catholic children attending a Catholic primary school, the trigger threshold before education contributions would be required would increase from 200 to 223 which equated to a sizeable drop in the amount of primary school contributions

In respect of secondary school provision Panel was informed that the original assessment had been based on the capacity of John Smeaton Community College which had been challenged by the applicant on the basis that there was spare capacity at Parklands Girls' High School. The applicant was therefore suggesting a reduction in the level of contributions for secondary school provision of 25%

Members were informed that it would be necessary to be equitable to the adjacent Threadneedle development in this matter if they were minded to accept the revised education contribution and a request was made by Threadneedle for an equivalent adjustment and that any contribution had to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development applied for

Members commented on the following matters:

- that the financial contribution for secondary school provision should take into account the fact that parents who wish their children to attend RC secondary schools may well have a preferred school which is some distance from the development site. The Panel's legal representative advised that the legal tests relating to planning obligations require that contributions must be directly related to development. In the context of education contributions this means that there should be a geographical link between the development site and the educational provision that is being funded
- the time taken from September 2008 for the application to come back to Panel
- concern that other faith schools were not being given consideration in assessing the level of education contributions
- the need for a representative from Education Leeds to provide further information
- agreement that the Threadneedle site should be considered in the same way
- the likely start date of the Manston Lane Link Road
- concern at the request for an extension to the time limit on the outline application

Members considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - That the application be deferred for one cycle to enable clarification to be sought on the issues which had been raised and that the Chief Planning Officer request that a representative from Education Leeds attends the meeting to respond to questions from the Panel

(Following consideration of this matter, Councillor Gruen left the meeting)

**236 Application 10/00758/FU - Variation of Condition 12 of Application No. 07/04625/FU to allow 24 hour delivery, Moortown Service Station, 401 Harrogate Road, Moortown Leeds**

Further to minute 47 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> July 2009, where Panel granted permission for the redevelopment of an existing petrol filling station at 401 Harrogate Road LS17, the Panel considered a report seeking approval

minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 10th June, 2010

for the variation of condition 12 of application 07/04625/FU to allow 24 hour delivery of fuel

Officers presented the report and stated that Environmental Health Officers had raised no objections to the proposal and that this 24 hour use had occurred in the past with no complaints from neighbours

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report

### **237 Application 08/03378/OT - Outline application for residential development comprising 86 flats and car parking at Knowsthorpe Crescent/Cross Green Lane LS9**

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers presented the report which sought permission for a residential development comprising 86 flats and car parking at Knowsthorpe Crescent/Cross Green Lane LS9. Members were informed that the boundary plan attached to the submitted report had been amended and that Members should have regard to the plan displayed at the meeting

A further correction to the report was made in relation to paragraph 10.1 with Officers stating that a previous permission (21/188/04/FU) was extant due to some preliminary works which had been carried out as part of that permission

The Panel was informed that the development had been revised from the original scheme which comprised 128 flats in five blocks

A total of 61 car parking spaces would be provided; 41 of these being within the development with 20 perpendicular car spaces off Knowsthorpe Crescent, for public use

The proposed materials would include brick, render with dark grey roofing membrane

The height of the proposals was considered to be acceptable and to relate well to the height of the nearby St Hilda's Church

Whilst the scheme would require affordable housing provision of 12 units, a financial viability statement had been submitted. This had been assessed independently with the view being reached that the scheme could not support any affordable units. In respect of a greenspace contribution, an amount had been submitted although this was below the required level

Members discussed the following matters:

- whether the properties would be rented or sold by the developer
- that no affordable housing was being provided and that developers should not submit applications which did not meet the required level of affordable housing provision
- that previous schemes had sought a reduction in the level of affordable housing but not a complete absence of provision
- the make up of the units
- concern at the location of the car parking spaces; that the boundary treatment obscured the parking spaces and that these should be sited within view of the flats for greater security
- the location of the bin stores

Officers provided the following responses:

- that the flats would be sold as low cost housing

- that the apartments would be a mix of two and one bed flats with some studio apartments
- that 61 car parking spaces were considered to be sufficient for the development
- that further discussions in respect of the proposed boundary treatment could take place
- that a communal bin store was sited in the courtyard and that a condition requiring written details of this had been included

Members considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - That the application be deferred to enable further negotiations with the applicant on the provision of affordable housing and re-consideration of the car parking on Knowsthorpe Crescent by opening up the boundary treatment at this point

**238 Application 10/01347/FU - Amendment to previous approval 09/02973/FU (Demolition of existing public house and replace with single storey A1 retail unit) for repositioning of building and relocation of service area from front to rear, Old Golden Fleece, Elland Road, Churwell, Morley LS27**

Further to minute 92 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2010 where Panel approved in principle an application for the demolition of the Old Golden Fleece Public House at Elland Road Churwell and the erection of a single storey A1 retail unit, Members considered a further report seeking the repositioning of the building and relocation of the service area from the front to the rear of the site

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting

Officers advised that concerns at the proposals had been received from Environmental Health Officer regarding possible noise nuisance but that conditions 5, 10 and 19 in the submitted report required the provision of noise mitigation measures

Whilst Morley Town Council supported the scheme, concerns remained in respect of highways issues and delivery hours

Members were informed that the information provided on traffic management as set out in paragraph 7.3 of the Officer's report was incorrect and should be disregarded

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report including a revision to condition 10 to require the provision of noise attenuation surfacing to the service area

**239 Application 10/00711/FU - Position Statement - Laying out of access road and erection of 4 buildings comprising of 1 single block of 12 Start Up Units with 2 Seminar Rooms and 6 Workshop Units in 3 blocks (all class B1(b) and B1(c)) with car parking at Holmecroft, York Road, LS15**

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers presented a report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out a position statement in respect of an application for laying out of access and the erection of start up units, workshop units, two seminar areas and car parking at Holmecroft, York Road LS15

Members were informed that the site was situated within the Green Belt and by definition would be inappropriate development requiring the applicant to demonstrate that very special circumstances applied to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt

The following information was provided:

- design details of the units
- that the proposals would lead to a clearance of the existing buildings on the site and a net reduction of 34% in the overall floor areas of the buildings
- that the proposals provided the opportunity for further planting to enhance the area
- that approximately 80 permanent jobs would be created by the proposals
- that the scheme would provide 10% renewable energy

Members were informed of comments from the Parish Council and local Ward Members

The Panel was informed that Environmental Health Officers were satisfied with the proposals subject to conditions and Officers confirmed that the proposals did not include office use

Members responded to the specific points raised in the report as follows:

- that the principle of development was acceptable as very special circumstances existed to justify developing in the Green Belt
- that the proposals were a sustainable form of development
- that the proposal was justified in the context of the advice set out in PPS4
- that the design of the buildings required improvement
- that parking provision was acceptable
- that the scheme had adequate regard to the amenities of local residents
- that the proposed landscaping was satisfactory
- that the proposed Section 106 Agreement covered all necessary matters

**RESOLVED** - To note the report and the comments now made

(Councillor Wilkinson left the meeting at this point)

#### **240 Consultation by Wakefield Council on Planning Application 10/00225/OUT - Outline Application for Mixed Use Development including 12000 seat community stadium, Newmarket Lane, Wakefield**

Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer seeking comments from the Panel on proposals submitted to Wakefield Council on a mixed-use development at Newmarket Lane Wakefield which abutted the Leeds boundary

Officers presented the report and outlined the main issues which they considered to be highways and the significant intrusion into the Green Belt

Whilst the scheme contained a 12000 seat community stadium for Wakefield Trinity Wildcats Rugby League club, this constituted 5% of the site

Members provided the following comments:

- that the proposals were intrusive and unwelcome

- that this represented inappropriate development in the Green Belt
- that recently the site had been a breeding ground for the little ringed plover
- that local Ward Members had been invited to a meeting about the proposals although the presence of a distribution centre on the site had not been raised
- that alternative proposals in respect of a shared stadium with Castleford Tigers Rugby League club might be more appropriate
- that the new Secretary of State should be made aware of the proposals

**RESOLVED** - To note the comments made by Members and that Leeds City Council wished to make the following comments in respect of the proposal:

Whilst Leeds City Council does not wish to frustrate regeneration and provision of important community facilities in Wakefield District and there are no concerns in principle over the stadium itself, there are objections over the scale and impact of the wider development on the Green Belt and transport network in Leeds District

(During consideration of this matter, Councillor Marjoram left the meeting)

**241 Date and time of next meeting**

Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> June 2010 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds