

## **PLANS PANEL (WEST)**

**THURSDAY, 21ST JULY, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, B Chastney, G Driver,  
K Groves, J Hardy, T Leadley, J Matthews,  
E Nash, P Wadsworth and R Wood

### **9 Late Items**

No formal late items of business were added to the agenda, however the Panel was in receipt of an additional map relating to Agenda Item 12 Woodhall Croft (minute 14) which had been omitted during the reprographics process, but which had been published to the website.

The Chair additionally dealt with a request from a member of the public to table an additional submission in support of their objection to the scheme at Springhead Mills (minute 19). Members did not accept the additional submission as they felt that neither they nor the agent had sufficient time to address any issues raised.

### **10 Declarations of Interest**

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

Councillor R Wood – Application 11/01843/FU Netherfield Road, Guiseley – declared both personal and prejudicial interests as a member of Leeds & Yorkshire Housing Association. Bellway Homes (the applicant) has an agreement in principle with L&YHA to provide social housing within the affordable units included in the application before Panel (minute 17 refers)

Councillor Chastney - Application 10/03063/FU Richmond House School – declared a personal interest as he stated he had attended drop-in sessions and residents' meetings held in relation to the proposals but that he had not expressed an opinion on them (minute 18 refers)

Councillor Matthews – Application 10/03063/FU Richmond House School – declared a personal interest as he lived nearby (minute 18 refers)

Councillors Akhtar, Chastney and Matthews - Application 11/02021/FU Headingley Stadium – The report referred to comments made by the North West Inner Area Committee planning sub committee which were subsequently discussed at the N W Inner Area Committee. Councillors Akhtar, Chastney and Matthews are members of the NW Inner Area Committee and confirmed that they had not taken part in those discussions and had informed the Area Committee of their likely future involvement in the decision making on proposals for the South Stand as Members of Plans Panel

West and although not strictly a declaration of interest, they wished to make that clear to the Panel. (minute 15 refers)

**11 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Coulson and J Harper. The Chair welcomed Councillors Nash and Driver as their substitutes.

**12 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the last meeting held 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2011 be agreed as a correct record subject to a clarification to minute 157 that, after voting, Members had supported the full demolition of the tannery buildings and not the partial demolition option

**13 Matters Arising**

The Head of Planning Services reported on the following matters:  
Minute 156 (appeals)

- a) Leeds Girls High School – The Inspectors report had now been received on the outcome of the appeals against non determination of the five applications associated with the re-development of the former Leeds Girls High School. The Head of Planning Services briefly outlined the findings for information (3 appeals allowed and 2 dismissed with the application for costs against the Council refused) and reported that a full report on the findings of the Inspector would be presented to the next meeting
- b) Leeds Bradford International Airport – The Chair reported the Panel had received an invitation to visit LBIA. Members were concerned that the visit should be meaningful and relevant and agreed it should be held on a separate day to Panel meetings. Those Councillors who frequently acted as substitute members on Plans Panel West would also be invited

**14 Application 11/00903/FU - 16 Woodhall Croft, Stanningley, LS28**

The Chair reported a late request from local ward Councillor A Carter to defer determination of this application to allow time for Panel Members to undertake a site visit; citing concerns over the dominance of the dormer, overlooking to No.18 and the proximity of the new build to No.14. The Panel considered the request and

**RESOLVED** - To defer determination of the application to the next meeting to allow time for a site visit to be undertaken.

**15 Position Statement for Application 11/02021/FU - Headingley Stadium, LS6**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report setting out the current position with regard to the redevelopment proposals for the South Stand and supporters club at Headingley Carnegie Stadium. Members had previously received a pre-application presentation on early proposals on 18 March 2010. Plans, elevations, 3D graphics and photographs of the site were displayed at the meeting.

Officers reported receipt of 8 further letters of objection, including letters from the Cardigan Triangle Residents Association and Ash Road Residents Association, none of which raised any new issues

Officers clarified that the scheme now before Members differed from the scheme presented to the public during the consultation period, however this scheme had been advertised correctly and the public were aware of the amendments and public representations had been received relating to the current application.

The comments made by the public were outlined at the meeting and officers provided responses on the following matters:

- The design review panel sought additional landscaping and officers now requested inclusion of an additional condition to require detail of the landscaping to ensure trees are planted so that they can grow to their full extent
- The roofline to the concession area had been altered to align the glazing to emphasise the entranceway and the parapet detailing had been enhanced. The triangular glazing panels had been retained to match the panels on the Carnegie stand
- Residents expressed concern about noise being funnelled between the new and existing stands. Members noted there would be an impact on the streetscene if the stands were joined however. The findings of a Noise Report and the Environmental Health Officers comments would be included in the next report

Members discussed the following:

Noise – Members expressed the view that a noise report should have been commissioned some time ago and sought clarification on the role of EPT. Officers explained the usual approach was to ensure the applicant provided the noise report at their own cost, which was then assessed by LCC EPT. In this case EPT had visited the site and talked to residents. The EPT assessment would be reported back and the conditions they required would be included in that report.

Capacity – considered the impact of the increased capacity on the locality and that the existing stand had capacity for 8000 which was currently limited to 6,000 due to health and safety concerns. If appropriate works were done to the stand the 8000 capacity could potentially be re-introduced

Design – Members were not convinced that the amendments to the entrance were sufficient and commented on the appearance of the super-structure. The Panel expressed concern over the height, stating the height between the top tier of the stand and its roof seemed unnecessary although acknowledged this could be due to the location of the TV gantry

Consultation – Members were very concerned about the way public consultation had been undertaken, particularly as the plans shown during the public consultation suggested lower heights and capacity to those now before Members and indeed discussed with Members at the pre-application stage. Officers confirmed that the objections referred to in the report had been received in relation to the version of the scheme Members now had before

them and the Chair confirmed there was no point at present in the applicant re-consulting on the scheme.

Car parking and highways issues – noted the existing difficulties on the local highway network and the impact of the Carnegie Stand development. Members noted no travel plan had yet been submitted and officers response that that the conditions would seek to ensure submission of Match Day Management Plans. The relocation of the turnstiles to a point farther down St Michael's Lane and nearer to the narrow bridge required careful management. The police instigated road closures for short periods on match days and officers commented on the likely routes to be chosen for the redirected traffic. Members supported the idea that the park & ride scheme employed on cricket match days by the stadium should be extended to include rugby match days and run from the nearest rail stations as the new stand had the potential to attract an additional 1000 vehicles. Officers highlighted the work undertaken to educate visitors in terms of upgraded pedestrian signs and website updates

Members were disappointed at the lack of slides showing the development and requested that slides showing views across and to the Stand be produced for the next meeting.

The Panel considered two main issues were the relationship of the new stand to St Michaels Lane and its relationship to the Turnaways. Members noted that they could review the Carnegie stand and its relationship to residents to help inform the Panels view on their forthcoming site visit

Having discussed the key issues, the Panel generally supported the principle of the redevelopment but remained concerned over issues relating to design, scale, layout, landscaping and character; impact on residential amenity and highways matters

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the report and the comments made by Panel be noted

(Councillor Akhtar left the meeting at this point)

- 16 Application 09/04287/RM - Garnetts Paper Mill, Otley, LS21 and Application 10/0395/FU access road at Gallows Hill, Pool Road, Otley**  
Further to minute 147 of the meeting held 25 May 2011 when the applicant had requested the matter be deferred to allow more time to consider access, the Panel considered two applications in respect of the redevelopment of the former Garnetts Mill, Otley. Members had visited the site prior to the meeting.

Officers outlined the planning history of the site and referred to the plans, aerial photographs and artists impressions of the development on display. It was noted that the reserved matters application and the application relating to the eastern access route would be linked together through a Section 106 Agreement.

Officers also reported receipt of one further letter of representation which raised no new issues but continued to object to the proposed eastern access road.

Officers addressed consideration of the eastern access point and slides showing the proposed access route across the flood plain were displayed. It was noted that this route would be constructed prior to works commencing on the Garnetts Mill site and catered for a 1:100 year flooding event, therefore would be the “dry” access point at all times. Officers addressed the western access which would provide access to the commercial units within the development – but which would not provide a “thru-route” through the site. Consideration had been given to the construction of a footpath bridge from the western end of the Garnetts Mill site (in order to ensure dry pedestrian access) but it was felt that, on balance, due to the prohibitive cost to the developer and the requirement of PPS25 to provide only one dry means of access, a bridge was not necessary.

The Panel heard representation from local ward Councillor C Campbell who expressed concern over the reduction of employment use elements originally proposed in the scheme and sought to ensure that the development did not become one large housing estate. He urged the implementation of the Hydro Electric Scheme and Fish Pass and the requirement for a management plan to deal with the waterways and public open space. Councillor Campbell also stated that the access point should not encroach into the green belt.

The Panel then heard from Mr A Flatman, agent for the developer, who confirmed the developers commitment to provide a mixed use site, the HES and Fish Pass. He stated that the preferred eastern access point would have a minimal impact on the Green belt and would provide the safest means of access.

The Highways officer provided clarification on the three access points under discussion. It was confirmed that the developer did not own the land proposed to provide the access point previously agreed at Outline stage. The alternative access point which did lie within the red line development boundary did not meet the Highways Authority’s standards as there was insufficient carriageway to allow two vehicles to pass each other, poor visibility of oncoming traffic and would require traffic lights 50m away from the junction to regulate traffic. The third and safest access point would encroach into the Green Belt and require an embankment.

Members discussed the following matters:

- Retention of the traditional house design and use of natural materials
- The likely take up of the retirement apartments
- Acknowledged that any development on the site would generate more traffic in the area
- The likely bus route
- Impact of the altered access point on existing residents
- Suggestion that the pocket of land at the junction would be suitable for feature artwork
- The proximity of the western end of the site to Otley Town Centre and the pedestrian linkages to be funded by the development to the town and nearby housing estates

- Reiterated the need to protect the mixed use nature of the development and officers suggested that floorspace could be specified under the terms of the S106 agreement to ensure that mix

Members discussions balanced the loss of the small area of Green Belt to facilitate the access point with the gain of managed public open space within the development site and the limited impact on openness or amenity and were minded to support the access proposed in 10/0395 as this would provide the safest access point.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) Application 09/04287/RM Garnetts Paper Mill – That the application be deferred and final approval be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions specified within the report and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement within 3 months of the date of the resolution to include those matters detailed in the report. There is a need to explore how the non residential floorspaces to be provided (including the retirement apartments) can be tied into the S106 Agreement to ensure that these elements of the scheme are delivered as part of the overall scheme
- b) Application 10/03695/FU – Gallows Hill – That the application be deferred and final approval delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions specified within the report and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement within 3 months of the date of the resolution to include those matters detailed in the report.

(Councillor R Wood, having earlier declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item, withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the decision making process)

**17 Application 11/01843/FU - Netherfield Road, Guiseley, LS20**

The Panel considered an application for a residential development of 74 family sized houses within the eastern portion of the Edison Fields residential development site at Netherfield Road, Guiseley. This proposal was designed to complement the completed phases of residential development on Netherfield Road. Plans, elevations, architects drawings and photographs of the site were displayed at the meeting

Officers outlined the planning history of the overall development site and highlighted the following in particular:

Affordable Housing – the applicant had offered 15 two bed units in one apartment block, which equated to 20% provision and was more than that required. It was acknowledged the LPA would not normally accept all AH provision in one location on a site, however there was a mix of AH provision pepper potted throughout the whole Netherfield Road site and it was important to note that the suggestion for the apartment block came from the registered social landlord who managed the AH on site and cited a demand for 2 bed apartments

Residents concerns over proximity – it was noted the scheme had been amended to ensure 21m distance between Greenshaw Terrace and the new properties, with back gardens facing back gardens

Boundary wall – the parcel of land between Greenshaw Terrace and the development site had been signed over to Greenshaw residents. Works to the boundary wall would be undertaken when the new development commenced

Members discussed the following:

- The transport measures and contributions secured in 2006 through the grant of the outline permission, noting there was no scope to seek additional contributions now at the reserved matters stage
- The work undertaken on site by the developer in conjunction with METRO to improve the uptake of residents metrocards
- The difficulties experienced for rail travellers on the Wharfedale line in terms of capacity and rolling stock quality
- Concern that the AH offer associated with this phase would be located within one area on site and would not be a mix of style usually sought by the LPA but that other AH had already been provided in earlier phases

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and final approval be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the completion of a “recession proof” Section 106 Agreement within three months of the date of the approval to ensure contributions for the following:

- Greenspace
- Public transport improvements (£44,400)
- Travel Plan monitoring measures (£2,500)
- Residential Metro card scheme (£35,918)
- Education contribution (£347,757)
- Provision of 15 affordable housing units

And subject to the conditions specified in the report plus additional conditions to cover maximum gradient of driveways and to ensure the treatment to the boundary wall at Greenshaw Terrace

(Councillor Wood resumed his seat in the meeting at this point)

## **18 Application 10/03063/FU - Richmond House School, Otley Road, LS16**

The Panel considered proposals to layout a new car park to the Richmond House School playing fields, off Glen Road, Otley. The application was brought to Panel at the request of Councillor Sue Bentley and due to the high level of local interest in the proposals. It was noted the proposed car park would utilise current playing fields but that these would be re-provided elsewhere in the site through the upgrading of other pitches. The comments of Sport England were reported to the meeting

The Panel heard representation from Mr M Thomas, Chair of Weetwood Residents Association who expressed concern over parking arrangements in the neighbouring streets, drainage and the lack of a traffic study to accompany the application. He made reference to a damaged culvert within the development site which he stated caused flooding and he suggested

Traffic Regulation Orders along the northern side of Glen Road would allow parents to drop-off/pick-up pupils as an alternative to the car park

Members noted that conditions required investigation of the culvert and went onto consider the following:

- The comments of Sports England regarding the extensive reparation works required to bring the pitches intended as a car park back into use and the comment that the new pitches were in a better location
- Balance of whether the current ad-hoc drop-off arrangement which spread school traffic within the locality caused less stress to the highway network than all school traffic entering/exiting the site at peak hours
- Whether there was appropriate enforcement action which could prevent parents using the A660 and the Bus Lane to drop-off/pick-up
- Noted the Bus Lane was not 24 hour and had no CCTV camera. Officers noted the suggestion that the A660 should be double yellow lined
- Discussed the design of the car park and whether there would be sufficient space to cater for the families of the 280 pupils on roll at the school. Officers noted the suggestion that the surface of the proposed car park should be permeable
- Welcomed the attempt by the school to address the problem of cars parking within residential streets but queried whether this solution was the best and whether better management of the existing car park would suffice
- Noted that Highways would support the offer made by the school to fund restrictions on Glen Road in addition to development of the car park however that offer was not within the application

Members noted the officer recommendation to approve the application but did not feel able to at this point, having regard to all the issues raised above therefore

**RESOLVED** – To defer determination of the application to allow time for further consideration of the matters raised above and a report be brought back to the next appropriate meeting

(Councillor Groves left the meeting at this point)

**19 Application 11/01857/OT - Springhead Mills, Guiseley, LS20**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report setting out proposals to replace and refurbish the former Springhead Mills, Guiseley to provide 54 dwellings, car parking, landscaping, public open space and new access road. Site plans, architects drawings and photographs were displayed at the meeting.

Officers outlined the planning history of the site and Members noted an earlier scheme for the same site had been refused in April 2010 and a pre-application presentation on the current proposals had been given in February 2011. The contents of an additional representation received from Aireborough Civic Society were read out with officers addressing each point in turn and highlighting the consideration given to the loss of employment land



The Panel considered a request from Councillor Hardy to defer determination of the application to allow time for a site visit as he felt that this would be beneficial for new Panel Members and stated he did not feel could make a decision without having seen the site. Members were not minded to defer the matter and agreed to proceed.

(Councillor Hardy withdrew from the meeting)

The Panel heard representation from Mr C Woods on behalf of Aireborough Civic Society regarding the extent of the proposed demolition works and impact on the Conservation Area, the loss of employment land and availability of employment land in the locality and the impact of this development when considered in conjunction with other permissions granted for residential development on the A65. Mr P Hall, agent for the applicant then addressed the Panel in response and stated the existing employment uses were unsustainable.

The Panel discussed the following:

- Current employment use on the site and the retention of two buildings for future employment
- Considered the site was unsuited to full employment/commercial use as it lay within the Conservation Area and was surrounded by residential properties. Additionally, the roads would be unsuitable for articulated vehicle access
- Noted the intention to retain the lower scale mill buildings but to move them back from the highway to create better sight lines and public space
- The need to use quality materials and natural stone
- The need to resist any “watering down” of the quality and design detail proposed in the application in the future

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and final approval be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to include contributions of:

- £20,000 for off site highway works
- £59,245 for public transport improvements
- £2,500 for Travel Plan measures
- £37,171.20 for a residential Metro card scheme
- £257,245 for education contribution
- 8 affordable housing units
- £95,297 for the provision of off-site Greenspace enhancements

And subject to the conditions specified in the report

Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16:5 Councillor Wadsworth required it to be recorded that he abstained from voting on this matter

(Councillor Hardy resumed his seat in the meeting)

## **20 Application 11/01290/FU - 194B to 194C New Road Side, Horsforth, LS18**

The Panel considered proposals for the change of use and alterations to an existing retail unit to form two restaurants/take aways. Plans and photographs of the site were displayed at the meeting.

It was noted that the unit had operated as two individual units some time ago but had been vacant for 2 years. Officers addressed the comments of the objectors and reported the findings of a parking survey undertaken by Highways Services. They also highlighted that closing hours of the units had been conditioned to protect the amenity of local residents

**RESOLVED** – that the application be granted subject to the specified conditions contained within the report

**21 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note the date of the next meeting as 18<sup>th</sup> August 2011