

## **NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 28TH MAY, 2015**

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

Councillors R Grahame, M Harland,  
C Macniven, J Procter, G Wilkinson,  
B Cleasby, B Selby, S McKenna and  
A McKenna

### **1 Chair's opening remarks**

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

### **2 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests

### **3 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Wadsworth

### **4 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the North and East Plans Panel meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2015 be approved

### **5 Matters arising from the minutes**

With reference to minute 151 of the North and East Plans Panel meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2015, - Applications 14/06051FU and 14/06052/LI – Crown Hotel 128 High Street Boston Spa Wetherby, the Panel's Lead Officer advised that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant

### **6 Application 14/05078/FU - The Old Forge Cottage Forge Lane Wike LS17 - Appeal summary**

Further to minute 113 of the North and East Plans Panel meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> January 2015, where Panel further considered an application for the demolition of an existing cottage and erection of new dwelling with detached garage and indicated it would have refused the application had an appeal

against non-determination not have been lodged, Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out the Inspector's decision

The Inspector had noted there was a fall-back position in this case which was important, however as the applicant had not proved that the fall-back position could be achieved, less weight was applied to this and the appeal was dismissed

The Panel's Lead Officer stressed the importance of this decision when considering applications where fall-back positions existed, especially where these were evidenced

**RESOLVED** – To note the appeal summary set out in the submitted report

## **7 Application 15/00737/FU - Erection of nine self-contained flats off Sutton Approach LS14**

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

Officers presented the report which related to an application for a residential development comprising nine self-contained flats, in two blocks, off Sutton Approach LS14

The planning history of the site was outlined, with Members being informed that previous concerns about the site being former allotments had been investigated, with Officers now satisfied this was not the case and therefore the principle of development of the site was acceptable

The layout of the development was presented, with concerns being outlined in relation to the tandem arrangement of buildings and the lack of amenity space, with these being cited in the recommendation before Panel to refuse the application

The Panel heard representations from the applicant's agent who provided information to Members which included:

- that the proposals complied with Neighbourhoods for Living and the Street Design Guide
- that the scheme was similar in form and mass to the surrounding properties
- that the scheme could not be considered as backland development
- the size of the amenity space

Members discussed the application and commented on the following matters:

- the shared amenity space and how this would work practically
- that this was brownfield site and was ready for development
- safety in view of the proximity of a former mine. The presenting Officer advised that the Coal Board had not stipulated any special requirements in respect of the proposals
- the proposed layout and the amount of amenity space being provided

The Panel considered how to proceed. The need for the site to be developed was supported however the extent of the proposals were considered to amount to overdevelopment and that a smaller development on

the site might be more suitable. In supporting the Officer's recommendation, Panel hoped the developer would consider a smaller scheme for the site which better respected the character of the area

**RESOLVED** - That the application be refused for the following reason:

The local planning authority considers that the proposed development as evidenced by the tandem arrangement of buildings and extent of hardstanding which when viewed in context with the spatial characteristics of the plot and the relationship to its surroundings, represents an overdevelopment of the site resulting in harm to the visual amenity of the site and character of the area. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed development would by reason of its layout, building footprint and off-street parking requirements, fail to provide the future occupants of the proposed flats with adequate amenity space resulting in an overall sub-standard level of accommodation, prejudicial to the interests of residential amenity. Accordingly, the proposed development is thereby contrary to the City Council's Core Strategy (2014) policy P10, the saved UDP Review (2006) policies GP5 and BD5 and the guidance contained within the Neighbourhoods for Living SPG

Under Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillor R Grahame required it to be recorded that he voted against the matter

**8 Application 15/00203/FU - Part demolition of existing buildings and erection of three terraced houses with parking - 13/15 Parkside Road Meanwood LS6**

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

Officers presented a report which sought approval of the partial demolition of existing buildings and the erection of three terraced houses with parking at 13-15 Parkside Road, Meanwood. The application site incorporated a stone building and associated yard, together with No.17 Parkside Road, with the driveway of this property being incorporated into proposed parking for the new development whilst still providing parking for No. 17 Parkside Road

Members were informed that the site needed developing however Leeds Civic Trust had objected to the application, with concerns being raised about the loss of the stone building which was felt to have some historic value. Members were advised that the site was not within a Conservation Area and the stone building was not Listed

Clarification was sought on the property affected by the proposals for the driveway. The Panel's Lead Officer confirmed this was No.17 Parkside Road and that there had been an error on the drawings which indicated the property affected was No. 14 Parkside Road

Members were also informed that the applicant owned part of the adjoining stone building which was marked on the plan as additional residential accommodation. If this was existing residential use, the LPA would not have control over that refurbishment. It was reported that there

had been anti-social behaviour on the site and that the refurbishment of this additional element might address this problem

The Panel heard from a local resident who was also speaking on behalf of a number of neighbours and who highlighted concerns with the application which included:

- the heritage value of the buildings; that these formed part of the Fosse estate and comprised quality stone and many attractive features
- overdevelopment
- lack of parking for No.13 Parkside Road
- minimum amenity requirements were not being met
- that 4 bed properties were being proposed so families with children could reasonably be expected to occupy these dwellings

The Panel then heard representations from the applicant's agent who provided information to Members, which included:

- the amount of time spent on bringing the scheme forward
- that the heritage argument was not accepted
- that the issue of on-street parking was addressed by the scheme
- confirmation that the property affected by the driveway proposals was No. 17 Parkside Road
- that a garden space would be provided
- that the option existed for the site to be returned to commercial use

Members discussed the application, with the main issues raised relating to:

- restricting the development of the roofspace to Plot 1 as a living space to avoid further intensification of the site. The Panel's Lead Officer advised that a condition could be included to restrict the roofspace of Plot 1 from being used for habitable accommodation
- the nature of the concerns raised by a Ward Member
- issues of overlooking
- concerns the proposals represented overdevelopment and that two dwellings might be considered more appropriate
- the loss of amenity

The Panel considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - To defer determination of the application for one cycle due to concerns regarding overdevelopment and overlooking and to request further negotiations take place to see if a scheme could be put forward with a reduced height, reduced number of dwellings and which addressed the issues of overlooking, and for a further report to be brought back to Panel for determination of the application

## **9 Application 15/01177/FU -Two detached dwellings at 7 Westfield Lane Kippax LS25**

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

Officers presented a report seeking approval of an application for two detached dwellings at 7 Westfield Lane, Kippax, which would be sited on the remnants of a former industrial building. The difference in land levels was brought to Members' attention as were the mix of house types in the immediate area

The planning history of the site was outlined, with Members being informed that a scheme for three detached dwellings had been withdrawn earlier in the year following on from an earlier scheme for three detached houses with integral garages, which had been refused

The proposal before Panel was outlined, which was for two, substantial dwellings, sited with the bulk of the development in a more central location than on previous schemes. Following submission of revised plans one previous representation had been resubmitted and the receipt of an additional objection was reported which had raised the fact that Westfield Lane had been reinstated as part of a bus route

In terms of design, the scheme presented as a typical two storey property but due to the level differences the accommodation was sited over three storeys

If minded to approve the application, an additional condition was proposed relating to implementation of footway widening

The Panel heard representations from an objector who outlined his concerns with the proposals, which included:

- the size of the proposed dwellings and the increase in height
- overshadowing and overmassing
- highway safety issues
- levels of car parking being proposed and the possibility of on-street parking resulting from the development
- land stability issues
- the vagueness of the plans and the impact of the proposals on existing dwellings

The Panel then heard from the applicant's agent who provided information about the application which included:

- the development of the site was much needed; was a brownfield site; would provide family homes and was being developed by a local business man who would employ local people
- that the scheme had been reduced to address the concerns raised on the previous proposals
- that the access was considered to be acceptable
- that the highway proposals were considered to be acceptable

Members discussed the application, with the main issues raised relating to:

- land slippage. The presenting Officer advised that the land fell steeply from the road. However, the fall in gradient was less severe towards the rear of the site where it shared a common boundary with a residential property. Retaining structures were proposed near to the rear of the proposed new dwellings but none were required near to the boundary with the neighbouring

dwellings as existing levels were shown to be maintained in this area

- car parking provision, which would be two on-drive spaces and double garages
- the reinstatement of the bus route. The Panel's Highways Officer advised this was a positive aspect in terms of sustainability
- land ownership in respect of the land to the rear of the site. The applicant indicated the land to the rear of the site was not in his ownership

Members considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report and an additional condition in respect of the implementation of footway widening

**10 Applications 15/00771/FU and 15/00772/LI - Partial demolition, alterations to form ten dwellings, erection of energy centre and stores, new access road and balancing ponds - Ledston Hall Hall Lane Ledston WF10**

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

Officers presented the report which sought planning approval and Listed Building consent for works to the Grade I Listed Ledston Hall, as outlined in the report before Panel

Members were informed that the building was on the buildings at risk register; that the proposals would provide residential accommodation as well as enabling some public use of the building, although due to the limited size of the rooms, these could not cater for large functions.

As part of the proposals, a later inserted brick wall would be removed and replaced by a glazed link across two floors

The proposed energy centre would be sited behind hedging to obscure views of this and would feed into an historic pipework tunnel

The main issues were summarised as relating to:

- highways – concerns about how the public car park would function; that the development was not in a sustainable location and so would be a car borne development and would give rise to the ten residential dwellings taking access from a private drive – in excess of the guidance. Officers considered that in this particular case, the number of dwellings taking access from a private drive would not be detrimental to highway safety or have a detrimental impact on the access or the site
- Green Belt – the works to the Hall were acceptable but the works within the grounds constituted inappropriate development and the new build would cause some slight harm. However Officers were of the view that there were very special circumstances which outweighed the harm, through inappropriateness, in that the proposals would bring back into viable use a Grade I Listed Building

- the Listed Building – that minimal works were proposed to this and that the applicant had worked with English Heritage in drawing up the scheme

Members discussed the applications and commented on the following matters:

- the costs associated with the proposals; the importance of ensuring the Listed Building was dealt with at an early stage to prevent further deterioration and the need for further details on the use of the public space and how the residential accommodation would sit alongside that public use
- car parking; concerns that would not be formally laid out and the need for construction traffic to be catered for. Members were informed that there was sufficient car parking for the residential accommodation and that 45 spaces had been indicated on the plans for public car parking
- the importance of the 17<sup>th</sup> Century building and the need to ensure its retention

The Chair invited a representative of the applicants to address the Panel and provide factual information on issues which had been raised. Members were informed that there was a charitable trust which had assets and resources to fund the works; that English Heritage were pushing for particular works to be undertaken and that applications had been submitted to the Heritage Lottery Fund. In terms of educational use, which was proposed, contacts had been made with the local Universities and that construction training and estate management were being considered through the Council's Employment and Skills initiative. The education facilities would also be tailored for primary school children and space would be available for hire, although this use would be limited by the relatively small sized rooms, with the majority of the income being generated from letting the residential accommodation

The Panel considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - i) That the applications be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report

ii) That Officers be asked to provide help and guidance to the applicants to secure additional funding for works to preserve the Listed Building

## **11 Application 15/00889/FU - Single storey side and rear extension - 8 Kings Mount Moortown LS17**

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

Members were informed that the application had been brought to Panel as the neighbour who had objected to the proposals was an Elected Member

Officers presented the report which sought approval for a single storey side and rear extension at 8 Kings Mount Moortown LS17 and highlighted the elements of the extension which could be built under Permitted Development

Members were informed that part of the extension was sited close to the neighbouring property and to the only window in one particular room of

that property. Officers considered that although the gap between the extension and the neighbouring property was narrow, in terms of what could be built under Permitted Development, it was acceptable

The Panel discussed the application with concerns being raised at the proposed arrangement of the extension; its size; scale and the impact on the boundary wall in terms of its maintenance

The Panel considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** – To defer determination of the application to enable further negotiations to take place to reduce the bulk of the extension, with particular regard to that element which contains the proposed kitchen, so as to reduce the impact on the neighbouring property and for the Chief Planning Officer to submit a further report in due course for determination of the application

## **12 Preapp/15/00260 - Preapplication proposals for a Maggie's Centre on land at St James Hospital Beckett Street LS9**

Photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Members received a presentation from the applicant's representatives who outlined proposals for the development of a 'Maggie's Centre' which would provide practical, emotional and social support to people with cancer, their family and friends, on land at St James Hospital

The following details were provided:

- the design of the building, which would resemble a series of hand crafted ceramic pots
- the amenity spaces which would be created, which would include roof gardens and smaller, private areas
- the room layouts, with the kitchen being the heart of the Centre
- the views afforded from the top level of the building
- the landscaping proposals, with the aim being to provide a changing, seasonal landscape; that site specific species were being proposed and that the aim was to create a well-established woodland at an early point in the development of the scheme

Members were most impressed with the proposals and commented on the following specific issues::

- the involvement of local primary school children in the project and the naming of the site. Members were informed this could be developed in conjunction with St James Hospital. The possibility of displaying local children's artwork around the building was suggested
- the number of community groups in the local area who could help with the project. The importance of embedding the Centre into the local community and for local volunteers to be involved in supporting the Maggie's Centres was stated by one of the applicant's team
- environmental noise issues from the surrounding area. Members were informed that an acoustic expert would be



engaged by the applicant and that the use of rugs, soft furnishings, blinds and possibly baffles would help reduce external noise levels within the Centre

- car parking; that this was a particular issue in the area and needed to be given careful consideration

In response to the specific points raised in the report, Members provided the following comments:

- that the principle of developing this part of the hospital site was supported
- that the architectural quality of the building and its proposed landscaping were excellent
- that if a planning application was submitted, Panel wished to see the scheme again in view of the innovative and fascinating proposals which had been put forward in the presentation

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

### **13 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday 25<sup>th</sup> June 2015 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds