

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 3RD AUGUST, 2017**

**PRESENT:** Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, S Arif, B Cleasby,  
D Congreve, M Coulson, P Davey,  
R Finnigan, D Ragan and C Towler

The following Members attended site visits prior to the meeting: Councillors B Anderson, M Coulson, D Congreve, R Finnigan, C Gruen, D Ragan and C Towler.

### **24 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations.

### **25 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors J Bentley and R Wood.

Councillors B Cleasby and B Flynn were in attendance as substitutes.

### **26 Minutes - 6 July 2017**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2017 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **27 Application 17/01174/FU - The Omnibus, Throstle Road North, Middleton, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented reasons for refusal to an application for the change of use and alterations of a former public house to form a house in multiple occupation at the Omnibus, Throstle Road North, Middleton, Leeds.

The application had been considered at the previous Panel meeting when it had been resolved to overturn the officer recommendation to approve the application.

### **28 RESOLVED – That the reasons for refusal and report be noted. Application 16/07987/OT - Pitty Close Farm, Wakefield Road, Drighlington, BD11 1DH**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an outline planning application (all matters reserved except for means of access to, but not within the site) for the residential development of up to 208 dwellings and associated works on land at Pitty Close Farm, Wakefield Road, Drighlington.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

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

- Members were asked to consider the principle of development and means of access.
- There would be a singular access to the site via King Street.
- Objections had been received from local residents, Ward Councillors and the local MP. There had also been a petition against the proposed development. Objections included impact on infrastructure, loss of greenbelt land and highways impacts.
- The site had been identified as a Phase 3 housing site in the Site Allocation Plan.
- A pedestrian crossing would be funded by the applicant for access to the site.
- There was not capacity in local Primary Schools but could be in the wider area. CIL requirements may be need for the necessary provision.
- The application was supported by a flood risk assessment. Flood risk would be managed on site with a detention basin.
- Public rights of way affected by the proposals would be considered at the reserved matters stage.
- It was considered that any adverse impacts caused by the proposals were not of enough significance to prevent bringing the site forward for housing. There would be provision for affordable housing and a full CIL contribution.
- It was recommended that the application be approved.

A local Parish Councillor addressed the Panel with concerns and objections to the application. These included the following:

- The proposals would have an enormous impact on amenity and existing services,
- There were not enough school places.
- There was not enough capacity in local GP surgeries and dentists.
- Drainage could not cope at present and local water courses had been contaminated with sewage.
- The village became gridlocked with traffic whenever there were problems on the local motorway network.
- Drighlington should remain a village and not be joined up to Gildersome. These proposals would account for a 10% increase in the size of the village.
- The site was currently used by local people for walking and horse riding.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel and answered questions from Members. The following was discussed:

- The site had been safeguarded for development since 2001.
- The applicant was willing to make CIL contributions in respect of school places.
- A building rates of 40 houses per year was hoped to be achieved although this could be affected by market forces.

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

- It was recognised that the existing sewers could not cope with heavy rainfall and this had been reported to Yorkshire Water. This site would not use the same sewerage system and would not exacerbate existing problems.
- The Environment Agency had been contacted regarding the existing flooding/sewerage problems. Concern was expressed that further action had not been taken.
- School places – options that could be considered included temporary expansion for bulge cohorts. There were currently no plans to expand the nearby schools. There was a responsibility of the Council to ensure that reasonable school places could be offered.
- There would be opportunity for community involvement at the Reserved Matters stage.
- Concerns regarding to the overall sustainability when proposals for the adjoining site were also taken into consideration.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to conditions to cover those matters outlined below (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a S106 agreement to secure the following:

- i. Affordable Housing – 15% (with a 60% social rent and 40% submarket split)
- ii. A contribution of £100,000 to Flood Risk Management to construct an outlet from Lumb Wood Pond.
- iii. Public open space on site of the site to comply with Core Strategy Policy G4
- iv. Provision of a Sustainable Travel Fund of £88,407
- v. £40,000 for two new bus stops with Real Live Information.
- vi. Travel Plan Review fee of £2,650.

In the circumstances where the S106 has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.

In addition condition 37 (coal workings) to be amended to include details of scheme of remedial works and implementation of those works.

Additional conditions in respect of:

- The establishment of a community liaison group.
- Details of rights of way across the site to be submitted.

Officers in conjunction with the Chair to write Yorkshire Water/Environment Agency to draw attention to the Panel concerns about issues reported by local residents concerning surcharging of, and flooding of local properties by, foul sewerage.

## **29 Application 16/07731/FU - 23 Bradford Road, Gildersome, LS27 7HW**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the demolition of an office building and part demolition of HGV workshop, erection of two storey office building, alterations to the façade and openings on the HGV workshop, new ramped link to the applicant's neighbouring property and landscaping works.

Members attended the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

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

- The site was situated behind residential properties off Bradford Road.
- The site was previously used for manufacturing and was in the ownership of the operator of the adjacent site who wished to extend operations across both sites.
- It was proposed to install an access ramp between the sites.
- Siting of the proposed office block.
- Details of landscaping including the provision of acoustic fencing.
- It was recommended that parts of the office building would have angled/obscured glazing to prevent overlooking of residential properties.
- Objections to the application included noise, light and air pollution. There were also concerns regarding the use of a proposed courtyard area.
- The applicant was recommended for approval.

A local resident addressed the Panel with concerns and objections to the application. These included the following:

- There should be restrictions on the hours of operation and the types of vehicle using the site.
- Concern regarding pollution from vehicles using the site and impacts on health.
- Noise and vibration from vehicle using the site with up to 40 HGV vehicles using the site on a daily basis.

- Concern that the proposals would mean the operator surrounded the objector's property effectively making it a compound.
- The area was now mainly residential.
- The proposals prevented the objector from developing the rear of their property for outdoor use.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel. The following was discussed:

- The site had extant planning permission and the operator had been present at the adjacent site for over 100 years.
- The proposals would not mean an increase in staff members at the site.
- The existing buildings were no longer fit for purpose.
- The ramp would enable movement within the site and prevent vehicles using the highway in front of the neighbouring residential property.
- The proposed office building was of modern design and would replace a dilapidated building.
- Use of the courtyard would be strictly controlled by the operator.
- Due to the nature of the business at certain times of year, a 24 hour operation would be necessary.
- Outdoor smoking areas would be at the rear of the office block away from residential properties.
- The proposed office block was further away from the objector's property than the current building. It would not be feasible to move it any further back as it would affect movement of vehicles within the site.

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

- It was suggested that there should be conditions to the use of the courtyard area.
- There was a 20 metre gap from the rear of the residential property to the proposed office block which was considered to be acceptable.
- There would be difficulties in making conditions that restricted the movements of HGV vehicles to and from the site.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation with an additional condition to restrict the use of the external breakout area to daylight hours

**30 Application 17/03519/FU - 20 Conference Road, Armley, Leeds, LS12 3DX**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the change of use of a dwelling house (C3 use class) to a 4 bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (C4 use class) at 20 Conference Road, Armley, Leeds, LS12 3DX.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting and photographs and plans of the property were shown and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

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

- There were no planned external or internal changes to the property. Internal layout plans were displayed.
- Objections had been received from local residents and Ward Members due to the impact of HMOs in the area.
- Armley did have a high concentration of HMOs but this location was considered to be less concentrated with 4 registered HMOs on Conference Road.
- The application was recognised for approval. Internally the property met all specifications and it was anticipated that use as a HMO would only have the same impact as that of a family dwelling.
- It was proposed that there would be conditions in respect of waste collection and cycle storage.

Local residents addressed the Panel with concerns and objections to the application. These included the following:

- Although there were only 4 registered HMOs on Conference Road, another 5 properties had been converted to bedsits. This application would take the number of HMOs/bedsits on Conference Road to be a total of 25% of properties and would further affect the balance of the local community.
- The area which had a higher concentration of HMOs in Armley was only 500 metres away.
- Conversion to a HMO would cause further problems with parking in the area.
- Noise disturbance from existing HMOs.
- Concern that there had been an increase in anti-social behaviour and crime in the area following the conversion of such properties.

The applicant addressed the Panel. The following issues were highlighted:

- The applicant was a member of the Residential Landlords Association and managed six other HMOs.
- This application would provide affordable housing.
- Issues of parking were recognised but the tenants in these kinds of properties tended not to have vehicles.
- The applicant had not had complaints from other properties with regard to noise. The applicant had a strict vetting process and did not rent rooms to students.
- It was felt that the number of waste bins at the property would be in line with that of a family dwelling.
- All tenants would have individual tenancy agreements.

- Partners of tenants would be limited to staying three nights per week. Permission was required for extended stays.

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

- There was only limited on street parking on Conference Road. Occupants of HMOs were less likely to be vehicle owners.
- Concern regarding the number of HMOs and converted bedsit properties on Conference Road,
- Concern regarding crime levels in the area.
- Concern regarding the loss of community cohesion where there was a concentration of HMOs.
- A proposal was made to refuse the application following concerns that had been raised by the Panel.

**RESOLVED** – That the officer recommendation to grant the application be refused and refusal of the application be delegated to officers for reasons relating to (in summary):

The proposals will result in a concentration of HMOs within the street and adjacent streets causing harm to the character of the area; the loss of community cohesion; the loss of a family house; and an increase in the demand for on street parking contrary to Policy H6 of the Core Strategy, Policy GP5 of the UDP and paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

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

Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> September 2017 at 1.30 p.m.