

## PLANS PANEL (WEST)

THURSDAY, 24TH MAY, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Taggart and J Harper in the Chair  
Councillors M Coulson, J Hardy, T Leadley, P Wadsworth, D Congreve, R Wood, M Hamilton and Towler

### 1 **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor J Hardy declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 13, Application 11/03324/FU, Former Cookridge hospital and Grounds, Hospital Lane, Cookridge as a former patient and withdrew from the meeting during the discussion on this item.

### 2 **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors J Akhtar, J Bentley, C Gruen and J Walker.

Councillors D Congreve, N Taggart and M Hamilton were in attendance as substitutes.

### 3 **Minutes - 26 April 2012**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meetings held on 26 April 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

### 4 **Application 12/00979/FU - Land to rear of former Harry Ramsdens, Off Bradford Road, White Cross, Guiseley, LS20**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for the erection of four houses with garages and new access, parking and landscaping at land to the rear of the former Harry Ramsden's restaurant (now Wetherby Whaler) off Bradford Road, White Cross, Guiseley, Leeds.

- The application had been brought to Plans Panel at the request of a local Ward Councillor, the impact on the local area and the planning history of the site.

Members were shown site plans and photographs of the site.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- Planning permission had been granted for a supermarket adjacent to the site.
- A previous application had been submitted for ten houses on the site. Subsequent applications had been made for seven and five properties.
- The proposals included a gated driveway to the site.

- There would be alterations and upgrades to a public right of way that went through the site.
- Diagrams of how shading would affect neighbouring properties were shown.
- Tree Protection Orders.

A local resident addressed the Panel with objections to the proposals. The objections concerned trees and blocking of light to existing properties. It was also felt that the diagrams showing projected shading were not accurate. Local residents were happy to see the site developed but felt that the detached house that was sited away from the others in the proposal was too close and too high.

The applicant's agent addressed the meeting. He reported that this was the final part of the larger site that included the new restaurant and supermarket and made efficient use of what was a brownfield site. There had been no statutory objections to the application, minimum separation distances between the proposed properties and existing properties would be met and close work had taken place with planning and arboriculture officers.

In response to members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Discussions had been held regarding re-positioning the house that had attracted the objections but it had not been found suitable to do so.
- The proposed properties were a minimum of 21 metres away which met minimum requirements.
- The model used for demonstrating the projections of shading was often used for planning applications.

**RESOLVED** – That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as outlined in the report.

Councillor Wadsworth requested that his abstention from the voting on this item be recorded.

## **5 Application 12/01131/FU - Land adjacent to 16 Ash Grove, Headingley, LS6**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced a planning application for a 3 storey rear extension to form 6 flats, associated parking and landscaping at land adjacent to 16 Ash Grove, Headingley.

The application had been brought to Panel at the request of local Ward Councillors on the grounds that it would result in a significant imbalance in the community. There were also concerns that the proposal would exacerbate existing problems regarding noise, litter and parking. Letters of objection had also been received from local residents, the local Member of Parliament and 3 local residents groups.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The upper floors of the building were already used for residential purposes.
- The building was within the Headingley Conservation Area.
- There had been previous applications which had been to appeal. Members were informed of findings of the appeal.
- The proposals would include 6 new flats that were not specifically aimed at students. There would also be enhancements to amenity space and parking, improvements to the front of the building and the removal of an old fire escape.

A representative of the South Headingley Community Association addressed the Panel with objections to the application. The following issues were highlighted:

- It was felt that there were some inaccuracies in the report.
- Reference was made to previous applications and refusals.
- The provision of further flats for students was not a sustainable development and would further upset the demographic balance of the area.
- Reference was made to the proposals falling within the conservation area.

The applicants agent addressed the Panel. The following issues were highlighted:

- The application was for 1 and 2 bedroom flats and did not necessarily lend itself to student accommodation.
- The proposals would enhance the conservation area and there would be improvements to surfacing and landscaping.
- The proposals would include 9 new flats overall.
- The prices of the flats would be above those that would typically be affordable to students.
- The garden area at the rear which was previously used as an external drinking area to the social club would become an amenity area for residents.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- The application was significantly different to a previous one that had been refused within the 2 year time period.
- Car parking was felt to be sufficient and was within requirements.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined in the report.

**6 Application 12/01510/FU - 3 Meadow Garth, Bramhope, LS16**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for a conservatory to the rear at 3 Meadow Garth, Bramhope, Leeds, LS16 9DY.

The application had been brought to Plans Panel as the applicant was a City Councillor.

Members were shown site plans and photographs and were given an overview of the application.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved subject to the conditions as outlined in the report.

**7 Application - 12/01586/FU - Greystones, Kelcliffe Lane, Guiseley, LS20**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for a balcony and new French door to the first floor side at Greystones, Kelcliffe Lane, Guiseley, Leeds.

The application had been brought to Panel as the applicant was a Chief Officer of the Council.

Members were shown site plans and photographs and given an overview of the application.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined in the report.

**8 Application 12/01673/FU - Kirkside House, 1 Spen Lane, West Park, LS5**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced a retrospective application for a polytunnel and shed at Kirkside House, Spen Lane, West Park, Leeds.

The application had been brought to Panel at the request of a local Ward councillor as it was considered to be detrimental to the character of the Conservation Area.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The Polytunnel had been erected for activities to be carried out by patrons of the care home only.
- The polytunnel would be screened by foliage for most of the year.

Members indicated that the use of the polytunnel outweighed the fact that it was in a conservation area.

**RESOLVED** – That approval be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to expiration of the consultation period on 31 May 2012 and to conditions as outlined in the report.

**9 Application 12/00362/FU - 83A Otley Road, Headingley, LS6**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for the change of use of a private car park to a public pay and display car park at 83 A Otley Road, Leeds.

The application had been brought to Panel at the request of a former Ward Councillor and on previous Panel discussions on the grounds that the proposal may result in an unacceptable impact on levels of off-street parking in Headingley Town Centre.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The proposals would regularise the use of the car park.
- Conditions of use – these included segregating spaces for use by nearby residents.
- There were no planning objections to the application.

In response to Members comments and questions, it was confirmed that the car park would be available for use by anyone including adjacent shops and restaurants. Members were also updated on parking matters at the Arndale Centre.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined in the report.

**10 Application 11/03324/FU - Former Cookridge Hospital and Grounds, Hospital Lane, Cookridge, LS16**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer provided the Panel with a position statement on the development taking place at the former Cookridge Hospital and Grounds, Hospital Lane, Cookridge, Leeds.

Members were informed that construction on the first phase of the site had commenced and that a further application that covered the rest of the site would be submitted. Members were asked to consider the revised Section 106 package.

The following issues were highlighted:

- The development would contain 56 extra care apartments – this was broadly supported by Ward Members.
- A contribution from the education element of the Section 106 funding to be used for children's play provision.
- Additional £2,500 funding for Travel Plan.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Affordable housing – the current level of 15 percent had been exceeded with an additional 24 properties.
- Further discussion would be held with Asset Management regarding the current proposals.
- Members indicated that the Panel was generally supportive of the proposals.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

**11 Date and Time of Next Meeting**  
Thursday, 14 June 2012 at 1.30 p.m.