

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 6TH MARCH, 2014

PRESENT: Councillor D Congreve in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, J Bentley, A Castle,
M Coulson, J Hardy, T Leadley, E Nash,
C Towler, P Truswell and R Wood

97 Election of Chair

Due to the absence of the Chair, a nomination was sought for a Chair of the meeting. Councillor D Congreve was nominated.

RESOLVED – That Councillor D Congreve be elected as Chair for the meeting.

98 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

99 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors J McKenna, C Gruen and R Finnigan.

Councillors D Congreve, E Nash and T Leadley were in attendance as substitutes.

100 Minutes - 30 January 2014

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 January 2014 be confirmed as a correct record.

101 Application 13/05573/FU - 9 Coach Road, Guiseley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for a detached house to the garden at 9 Coach Road, Guiseley, Leeds.

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

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

- The application had been brought to Panel at the request of a Ward Member.
- Members' attention was brought to the poor condition of the unadopted road, poor lighting and lack of a footway.

- The site was immediately opposite the Guiseley Conservation Area.
- The site was allocated as allotment land in the UDP – although as there was already a house and garden on the site it was unlikely to be used for allotments.
- The proposal was contrary to the street design guide.
- The application was recommended for refusal.

A Ward Councillor addressed the Panel in support of the application. The following issues were highlighted:

- It was not felt that there would be a problem due to the road – vehicles could not travel at speed due to the poor condition of the surface.
- The road narrowed due to a hedge along the side of the site. The applicant would remove this to create extra width.
- The site was accessed by others and there were alternative routes.
- Only a small part of the road was unmade.
- There was some street lighting.
- The site had not been used for an allotment for over forty years.

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

- The owner of the allotment land was hoping to sell it for development.
- Concern regarding the consistency of allowing development on unadopted roads.
- Use of the road by works/commercial traffic.

Members voted against the officer recommendation to refuse the application and further motion was moved to recommend the application for approval.

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
- Boundary treatment
- Levels
- Drainage
- Site lines of 2.4 x

102 Application 13/05700/FU - 56 Eden Crescent, Kirkstall. Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to an application for a first floor side extension at 56 Eden Crescent, Kirkstall, Leeds.

Site plans and photographs were displayed.

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

- The application had been referred to Panel by local Ward Councillors with regard to potential impact on the streetscene.
- A previous application had been approved and was not built in accordance with the approved plans. The first floor had subsequently been demolished.
- Rear windows to the extension would be obscurely glazed.
- Proposed materials for the extension.
- A further representation had been received that had concern regarding the scale of the development and potential use as a HMO.

A local resident spoke with objections to the application. These included the following:

- The proposed extension would amount to over development.
- The proposals would not provide any improvement to the area.
- Loss of light to neighbouring property.
- Occupants of the property could see straight into the neighbouring property.

Members requested that this item be deferred to allow for a site visit.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred to allow Panel Members to visit the site.

103 Application 13/05581/FU - St Michael's Court, Shire Oak Street, Headingley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application seeking the variation of conditions to a previous application for the change of use of part of ground floor and extension to side of medical centre to form a restaurant at St Michaels Court, Shire Oak Street, Headingley. The changes to the conditions were to allow increase in servicing vehicles to 10 metres from 7.5 metres and to increase the number of covers for the site to 88 inside and 20 outside from 60 inside and 26 outside.

Members were reminded of the previous application that had been approved by the Panel and it was reported that Highways had no concerns regarding the increase in space for servicing vehicles.

Further issues discussed regarding the application and in response to Members comments and questions included the following:

- Proximity of the proposed New Generation Transport scheme.
- Changes to internal and external floor plans.
- Previous concern regarding car parking and the effect of having extra covers – it was reported that since the original application, the Arndale Centre had changed ownership and the new operator was aware of parking needs. There was cycle parking provided and it was anticipated that many users of the premises would use public transport.

RESOLVED – That the application be granted as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report.

104 Application 13/05106/FU - 74 Weetwood Lane Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer brought back a retrospective application for a detached double garage with storage area above to the rear of 74 Weetwood Lane, Leeds. The application had been considered at the previous Panel meeting when it had been deferred for further negotiation with the applicant due to concerns regarding potential future use.

It was reported that the applicant had agreed to reduce the height, have fewer window and install a double garage door to the building.

In response to Members questions, it was reported that the building would have a rendered finish and that the driveway was sufficient for vehicular access.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved as per the office recommendation and conditions outlined in the report.

105 Application 13/05685/FU - Otley Road, Guiseley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a first floor and single storey front extension to a warehouse at Otley Road, Guiseley.

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

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

- The building was within the Guiseley conservation area.
- Concern due to limited space for parking.
- It was recommended to refuse the application on the grounds that it was not compatible within the conservation area and would restrict views.

An objector to the application addressed the panel. Concerns raised included the following:

- The proposals would be domineering and have a negative impact on views.
- The proposals would obscure historic parts of the conservation area.
- The increase in size on a small site was of concern and would amount to over development.
- Issues relating to car parking.

The applicant addressed the panel and raised the following:

- The property was used for a small family business that employed local people. Turnover of the business had increased and there was a need to be able to store more stock.
- The proposals would update an old and tired looking building.
- It was not felt that the proposals would cause harm to the conservation area.
- The design had been made following discussions with planning officers and a Ward Councillor.
- In response to Members questions, car parking and service vehicle arrangements were explained.

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

- It was accepted that the applicant required more space for storage and it was reported that the proposed height of the extension was necessary for this purpose.
- The applicant reported that he would be open to suggestions to modify the proposals.
- Concern regarding the materials to be used.
- Members broadly showed support for the application.

Members voted against the officer recommendation to refuse and a further motion was made to defer and delegate the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred and delegated to officers subject to the use of natural stone to external elevations and slate to roof and to explore detailed alterations to the design with particular regard to dual roof pitch to remove if possible the ‘cat slide’ effect.

106 POSITION STATEMENT - Application 13/02604/FU - St Bernard's Mills, Gelderd Road, Gildersome, Morley, Leeds

97 POSITION STATEMENT - Application 13/02604/FU - St Bernard's Mills, Gelderd Road, Gildersome, Morley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a position statement for changes to an existing materials recycling facility, extension to waste transfer building (no increase in annual waste throughput), two storey extension to offices and amended site layout with additional landscaping at St Bernard’s Mill, Gildersome.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting and photographs and site plans were displayed and referred to throughout consideration of this item.

Issues highlighted from the report included the following:

- The site was currently operating as materials recycling facility (MRF) and had been since 2011.
- The site was within a greenbelt area and was a safeguarded waste management site within the adopted development plan.
- Members were shown proposals for an extension to the office block. This would replace portakabin accommodation currently on site.
- Storage facility – waste bales were currently stored within the ‘lean-to’ section of building nearest the access and were loaded outside – it was proposed to move this storage and loading indoors within the proposed extension.
- Proposed design of the extensions and materials to be used were shown.
- Views of the site from the nearest residential properties were shown.
- Reference to Environment Agency requirements.

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

- Concern regarding odour from the site – it was reported that following a problem with this last summer and subsequent notices issued by the Environment Agency, new units had been installed to reduce this and that there had been no further permit breaches. The operator had an obligation to provide reports to the Environment Agency.
- There had been public consultation but none aimed specifically at the nearby travellers site. This could be arranged if Members required.

Members were asked a series of questions outlined in the report and gave the following views:

- The principle of the development and whether the proposals were regarded as appropriate – Members supported this.
- There were no concerns regarding the impact of the proposals on the greenbelt.
- It was agreed that the proposals would make an improvement to the site but it was requested that further information and attendance from the Environment Agency be available when the application came back to Panel.
- Members felt that the proposals would assist in mitigating noise from the site.
- There were no concerns raised regarding the visual impact of the proposals.
- There were no concerns regarding the regularisation of the ‘as built’ scheme.

RESOLVED – That the report and Members views and comments be noted.

98 PRE-APPLICATION - Preapp/13/01022 - Former Green Lane Dyeworks, Green Lane, Yeadon, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a pre-application for partial demolition of the former dyeworks buildings and conversion and new build residential development of 171 dwellings at Green Lane, Yeadon.

Site plans and photographs were displayed.

Members were reminded of the previous report that was considered by the Panel and issues raised regarding the retention of historic buildings and access to the site. The site fell entirely within a conservation area.

The applicant's representatives were invited to address the Panel and the following issues were highlighted:

- There were still viability issues to be resolved.
- Consultation regarding design and conservation issues with Ward Councillors.
- Details of design and materials to be used had not yet been decided.
- The dwellings would consist of approximately 100 new builds and 70 conversions.
- There was an intention to keep the earlier built stone chimney on the site.
- Reference to the historical development of the site including the reservoirs.
- Access to Green Lane.
- Since the last presentation to panel there was now a greater emphasis on the retention of original buildings on the site and this was highlighted on one of the site plans.

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

- The mill ponds would not be retained.
- There could be some kind of presentation board to recognise the historical and industrial heritage of the site.
- Re-use of materials and use of natural stone.
- Retention of the water tower.
- There would be further public consultation prior to the submission of an application.

Objectors to the proposal addressed the Panel. The following issues were raised:

- The amendments since the last presentation were welcomed.
- Consultation with the Aireborough Civic Society and Aireborough Neighbourhood Forum was requested. It was felt that the local knowledge would be valuable

- Retention of both chimneys on the site and the water tower would be preferred.
- There was a preference if possible to still keep some kind of employment at this site. Concern was expressed regarding the lack of employment sites in Outer North West Leeds
- Importance of access to Green Lane and Focus Way.
- Community infrastructure – provision of walkways and cycle routes.
- Concern regarding surface water and the need to ensure that the site would not be susceptible to flooding.

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

- The proposals were an improvement on the previous presented and the re-use of existing buildings was welcomed.
- Provision of affordable housing – it was preferred if this was situated throughout the site.
- Retention of the water tower.
- Concern regarding the impact on the local road network

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

99 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday, 3 April 2014 at 1.30 p.m.