

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 30TH JANUARY, 2014

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, J Bentley, A Castle,
M Coulson, R Finnigan, C Gruen, J Hardy,
C Towler, P Truswell and R Wood

88 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable interest however the following was brought to the Panel's attention:

- Agenda Item 11, St Michael's Lane, Headingley – Councillor J Bentley informed the Panel he was a member of Yorkshire Cricket Club
- Agenda Item 9, 9 Lawns Green, New Farnley, Leeds – Councillor Hardy informed the Panel that although he had been involved in previous discussion regarding the application he would be treating the application with an open mind.

89 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

90 Application 12/02434/FU - Manor Park Surgery, Bellmount Close, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to a high court judgement relating to a judicial review which sought to secure the quashing of a Panel decision to approve an application for a part two storey, part single storey front, side and rear extension and laying out of car park at Manor Pak Surgery, Bellmount Close, Bramley.

It was reported that all the concerns listed in the appeal were rejected by the judge and that there would be no further appeal. Costs would be awarded to the Council and this was a matter for negotiation.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

91 Application 13/03007/FU - Land and premises opposite to 60 to 68 Half Mile Lane, Stanningley, Pudsey

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a residential development for 6 pairs of semi-detached two storey dwellings (12 in total) at land and premises opposite 60 to 68 Half Mile Lane, Stanningley, Pudsey.

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

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

- Access to and from the site – access to 10 properties would be gained via Half Mile Lane, with the others from Half Mile.
- Parking restrictions.
- This was a revised application – the original did not receive highways approval.
- Members were shown photo montages of what the site would look like when developed.
- It was proposed that the perimeter wall be demolished and rebuilt to improve visibility splays. This would be subject to the necessary standards, conditions and a risk assessment.
- Reference to public consultation and meetings with local residents – concern was expressed that local facilities could not sustain further development and an application with fewer units would be preferable.
- Further conditions to the application to include bat mitigation and submission of a risk assessment for the wall on Half Mile Lane.

A local resident addressed the Panel with concerns regarding the application. These included the following:

- The field that was to be used for the proposed development was previously maintained by local residents. Access to do this had now been prevented. It was felt that there would be a loss of amenity to local residents and the land could be used for allotments.
- The land supported wildlife including bats, foxes and squirrels and the application should be deferred until a full conservation study had been carried out.
- The development would be out of character with the area.
- Access arrangements would both be on blind bends where residents parked.
- There had been no traffic survey done on Half Mile – reference was made to a recent traffic accident.
- It was felt if any proposals were to go ahead it should be a maximum of 8 units and that these should be stone built to keep within the character of the area.
- In response to comments from the Panel, the following was discussed:
 - There were difficulties on the road when there was ice and snow and the street was not gritted.
 - The field was previously used to keep horses and poultry and regularly used by local residents.
 - An approach had been made to the Calverly Allotment Society about the potential use of the land for allotments. This would also involve a local school.
 - Resident's access to the land was prevented following an earlier application to develop in 2006.

- The landowner had told a local resident the land was not for sale.

The applicants agent addressed the Panel. The following was raised:

- There had been thorough consultation with planning and highways to get the application to this stage.
- The applicant was comfortable with the two additional conditions to the application and endorsed the officer recommendation.
- Access to the site was safe.
- There was a commitment to rebuild the wall.

In response to comments and questions, the following was discussed:

- There was a public right of way footpath along one side of the site. This was not owned or maintained by the Council. It was not in the ownership of the applicant and would not therefore be reasonable to have conditions applied to it.
- Costs for damage to the wall following the recent accident would be recouped through the motorists insurance.
- There would not be an affordable housing contribution as the proposals did not meet the necessary criteria.
- Concerns regarding Half Mile being used as a rat run – it was reported that the retaining wall would be set back to improve visibility and there were no highways concerns.
- The application would trigger a greenspace contribution that would go into the pot for the area.
- There would be further consultation with Ward Members.
- Since previous refusal for development at the site there had been changes to planning policy and guidance.

RESOLVED – That the application be determined as per the officer recommendation with additional conditions regarding:

- Bat mitigation
- Submission of risk assessment for wall on Half Mile Lane

92 Application 13/05787/FU - 9 Lawns Green, New Farnley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to an application for a part two storey, part single storey extension to rear of detached house at 9 Lawns Green, New Farnley, Leeds.

Members attended a site visit prior to the hearing and site photographs were displayed.

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

- Objections had been received from adjoining neighbours
- Concerns regarded the two storey element of the application.

- Existing policy normally precluded two storey extensions without planning permission – this was for Members' consideration.
- The recommendation was to refuse permission.

The applicant addressed the Panel and raised the following issues:

- The house was on an estate of detached housing, many of which had similar extensions.
- The proposals had been made to accommodate a growing family and other improvements would include a more efficient heating system.
- There were no issues with oversteering windows.
- There would be little impact on the amenity to the garden of neighbours at number 11.
- There would be no overshadowing or loss of light to neighbours gardens.
- It was felt that the planning officer statement was based on subjective opinion and it was asked whether the impact on neighbours outweighed the applicant's right to extend the property.
- In response to questions from the Panel the following was discussed:
 - The application had already been amended to deal with neighbours' concerns.
 - The applicant had lived there since 2006 and similar extensions had been erected since then.

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

- Reference to changes to planning policy and design guidelines since previous extensions were built.
- The proposals would not affect sunlight into neighbouring properties.

A proposal was made to move the officer recommendation to refuse the application. Following a vote, the officer recommendation was overturned and a subsequent proposal was made to approve the application. The Panel was advised of conditions that would need to be attached to the application if approved.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved in principle subject to detailed drafting of conditions related to:

- Standard Time Limit
- Submission and approval of materials
- No addition of side windows
- Direction regarding encroachment

93 Application 13/05106/FU - 74 Weetwood Lane, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to a retrospective application for a detached double garage with storage area above to the rear of 74 Weetwood Lane, Leeds.

Site plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting.

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

- The property at 74 Weetwood Lane was to be divided into two properties.
- The garage had a first floor storage area and was situated in a substantial garden.
- There was a condition that the garage should not be used for living accommodation.

A local resident addressed the panel with concerns regarding the application. These included the following:

- The original application at the address did not include a garage.
- The structure was very large for use as a garage
- The inclusion of roof lights and windows led to suspicion that the building would be used as a dwelling in future.
- It was requested that if the application be granted, that conditions prevented future use as a dwelling and that double garage doors should be fitted.

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

- Concern regarding the design of the garage – it was felt that it wouldn't be possible to manoeuvre two vehicles in and out.
- In relation to questions regarding the design of the garage, it was reported that this was the design that the applicant had chosen.
- The remainder of the space in the garage and on the first floor level would be used for general garden and domestic storage.
- Concern regarding retrospective applications.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred for officers to negotiate further with applicants to seek:

- Reduction in height of roof to ensure as far as possible that roof space cannot be converted to living accommodation.
- Replacement of proposed single garage door with double garage door.
- Removal of access door on front elevation of garage.

Also condition 2 proposed to be amended to read:

- The garage shall not be used other than for storage of private motor vehicles and as ancillary domestic storage and shall not be used as living accommodation and or business accommodation.

94 Application 13/05526/FU - St Michael's Lane, Headingley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer gave a position statement on an application for the installation of four floodlights, substation and associate infrastructure to Headingley cricket ground.

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

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

- The application was for four permanent floodlight columns and a sub station.
- The floodlight columns would be made from galvanised steel and would reach a height of 58 metres.
- Photo montages were displayed from around the area which demonstrated views with and without the proposed floodlights.
- Images were displayed that showed an assessment of light pollution.
- There would be a clear visual impact on the appearance of the conservation area and amenity of residents.
- There was currently an agreement with the England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB) to hold one test match and a one day international match at the ground. Permanent floodlights were required to secure the future of these matches.
- Members were shown examples of permanent floodlights at other grounds which included those on telescopic columns and retractable lighting.
- The lights would only be used during the cricket season and it was expected only for a period of up to 2 hours before 10.00 p.m.
- Representations received had included objections from the North Hyde Park Neighbourhood Association and a local resident. A letter of support had been received from the ECB.

Representatives of Yorkshire Cricket Club were invited to address the Panel. In response to Members comments and questions, the following was discussed:

- The floodlights would be used for a maximum of 15 to 20 times per season and would not be used for anything other than cricket.
- The preferred 6 floodlight solution was not possible due to space constraints and issues with land ownership.
- Proposals for community engagement and consultation with Ward Members.
- Telescopic floodlights would be cost prohibitive and would still only lower to a height of 30 metres and have a visual impact.
- The floodlights would be fitted with anti-glare hoods to minimise light pollution.
- In response to questions outlined in the report, the following was discussed:

- Members all supported the importance of retaining international and test match cricket at Headingley.
- Further information on telescopic and cranked columns would be useful.
- Maximum efforts to reduce light pollution.
- Further detail regarding the concerns of local community and residents.
- Examples and pictures of lighting at other cricket grounds.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

95 **Date and Time of Next meeting**
Thursday, 6 March 2014 at 1.30 p.m.