

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 6TH NOVEMBER, 2014

PRESENT: Councillor M Rafique in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, J Bentley, A Castle,
M Coulson, R Finnigan, K Ritchie,
C Towler, P Truswell, F Venner and
R Wood

45 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

46 Minutes - 2 October 2014

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 2 October 2014 be confirmed as a correct record.

47 Application 14/01004/FU - 23 Bradford Road, Gildersome, Morley

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to an application for the change of use of a former industrial unit to form storage and maintenance of vehicles and plant, offices and associated parking and access at 23 Bradford Road, Gildersome, Morley. The application was previously considered at the October meeting of the Plans Panel where the officer recommendation to approve the application was overturned.

The report detailed the reasons for refusal and it was requested that further information relating to maintenance activity be included in the reasons.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the following reasons:

“The proposed use will generate vehicle movements associated with the comings and goings of Heavy Goods vehicles and maintenance activity associated with the operation in close proximity to existing residential dwellings. It is considered that such movements, maintenance activity and noise and general disturbance would be detrimental to the general amenity of nearby residential occupants. As such the proposal would be contrary to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and to Policy GP5 of the Development Plan (Review) 2006”

48 Application 14/03674/FU - Land at Haigh Moor Road, West Ardsley, Wakefield

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the construction of 10 dwellings and associated car parking and landscaping on land at Haigh Moor Road, West Ardsley.

This item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

49 Application 14/04077/FU - Development Engineering Services, Ilkley Road, Otley

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the demolition of former single storey mill buildings and construction of nine houses and three flats at Development Engineering Services, Ilkley Road, Otley.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this application.

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

- Since the report was produced there had been an alteration to the greenspace contribution.
- The 9 houses would be in two terraces, one group of four and one group of five.
- There would be a parking court to the rear with two spaces for each property and an additional two visitor spaces.
- There would be bicycle and bin storage.
- Reclaimed stone would be used to form part of the boundary wall.
- The gardens would be small and there would be restrictions to extensions and side buildings.
- The site was within flood zone one but there had been no objections from the Environment Agency.
- It was felt that the proposals offered a good re-use of a brownfield site and it was recommended to approve the application.

A local Ward Councillor spoke with concerns regarding the application. These included the following:

- The site had always been used for employment purposes.
- The development was felt to be of a poor design for the gateway to Otley.
- The gardens were sub-standard.
- It was felt the greenspace contribution should be higher.
- It was felt the flats building should be redesigned to reflect its position at the gateway to Otley.
- There was a lack of employment land throughout the North West area of the City.

Further to comments and questions, the following was discussed:

- Planning policy allowed for the loss of some employment land and in this case it was not felt that it would be viable to re-use as an employment site due to the dilapidated condition of the existing buildings.
- The gardens were appropriate as they were in character with others within the area.
- Transport contribution for metrocards – detailed analysis of the success of this had not yet been done due to timescales involved and it may take 3 to 4 years to find out how successful the contributions to offer metrocards was.
- Concerns regarding access to and from the site – it was reported that all visibility splays would meet standard requirements.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report. Also to include additional Greenspace payment before decision issued (approx. £5,000).

50 Application 14/01785/FU - Overhouse, Over Lane, Rawdon, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for two storey extensions to front, side and rear with balcony to front at Overhouse, Over Lane, Rawdon, Leeds.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this application.

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

- The application had been referred to Panel by a local Ward Councillor following concerns regarding loss of privacy to neighbours and the designs being out of character for the area. Main concerns relating to neighbouring properties at either side.
- It was reported that the distances between the proposed extensions and neighbouring properties were of a sufficient distance and that the application should be approved. It was further reported that although elevated views would be given from the balcony that the distances were also sufficient.

A neighbouring resident address the Panel and raised the following concerns:

- The proposals to extend would cause overlooking of neighbouring properties.
- There would be excessive removal of trees to accommodate the extension.
- The size of the extension would dominate the space of others and the surrounding area.
- There would be loss of privacy to large parts of neighbouring gardens.
- There had been no attempt to protect the privacy of others.

- One of the properties affected was a Grade II listed building and should be protected.
- The extension would be out of character with the immediate locality.

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

- The proposals met planning guidelines and policy.
- There had been further negotiation on the design following objections and neighbours objections had been considered.
- There was planning permission to build a large house on the site – the proposed extension offered an improved alternative and was more in keeping with the area.
- The applicant had not removed any trees, only bushes.

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

- The distances between the proposed extension and neighbouring properties were in excess of guidelines.
- The overlooking nature of the proposals was not enough to justify refusal of the application.
- One of the conditions of the application would be to include replacement tree planting.

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

51 Application 14/04740/FU - 28 Whack House Lane, Yeadon, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for part two storey part first floor front and side extension; single storey rear extension at 28 Whack House Lane, Yeadon, Leeds.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this application.

It was reported that it had been recommended to refuse the application. There had been difficulties in identifying how to appropriately extend the property due to its position and current design. The property was on a prominent corner plot and it was felt that the proposed extension would be harmful to the street scene.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel. Issues raised included the following:

- The applicants wanted to remain in the area but could not find a suitable larger property.

- There was a mix of architectural styles in the area and the current area was not of any architectural importance.
- There were no issues of breaching others privacy or overshadowing with the proposals.
- There would not be sufficient headroom in a dormer extension.

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

- Scope for extending at ground floor level.
- The lack of objections to the proposals and support from neighbours and local Ward Councillors.

Members were broadly supportive of the proposals and following further discussion a vote to overturn the officer recommendation was proposed and agreed. A recommendation was then proposed to approve the application and delegate and defer to the Chief Planning Officer.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved in principle and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer and be subject to usual conditions relating to time limit for implementation, submission of materials etc.

52 Application 14/04182/FU - 10 Hillcrest Rise, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for part two storey part first floor front and side extension; single storey rear extension at 10 Hillcrest Rise, Leeds.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this application.

It was recommended that the application be refused due to concerns regarding the prominence of the extension and the threat it would cause to trees that were covered by a tree preservation order (TPO). There was also concern regarding the dominant appearance of the proposed extension should trees be lost which was expected if the extension was built.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel. Issues highlighted included the following:

- Permission had been granted for a similar extension at a nearby property.
- There was not a uniform street scene and the extension would not be out of keeping with the area.
- A tree report had highlighted that some of the TPO trees were of a poor condition and the better quality trees would not be affected by the extension.

- The extension would be less than a quarter of the footprint of the building.
- The extension would not cause any shadowing to or overlook any other properties; there would be no highways implications and there had only been supportive representations and no objections.
- In response to questions, the following was discussed:
 - There would be minimal interference with the trees during erection of the extension and there would be minimal intrusion into the trees root structure. The trees would be maintained.
 - The occupants did not want to extend to the rear of the property as significant time and resources had been used landscaping and planting to the rear. An extension to the rear would also have an impact on existing trees and would be nearer to neighbouring properties.

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

- Potential for liability if the proposals were to go ahead and the trees became a danger to the surrounding area
- Ownership of the strip of land that contained the trees was unknown.
- Depth of the foundations would damage the tree roots.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused as per the reason outlined in the report.

53 Application 14/04075/RM - Haworth Court, Chapel Lane, Yeadon

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a reserved matters application for residential development at Haworth Court, Chapel Lane, Yeadon. The Panel had received a position statement on this application at the previous meeting.

Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this item.

Further issues highlighted included the following:

- The proposals would see the development of 45 self contained flats.
- The site was within the Yeadon Conservation area.
- Since the last meeting the following changes had been proposed:
 - A reduction in the scale and massing
 - It would now be a 3 storey development with accommodation in the roof space as opposed to 4 storeys.
 - The overall height would be reduced by 2.5 metres.
- There was still concern from Ward Members regarding the scale and massing of the proposed building.

A local Ward Councillor addressed the Panel. Issues raised included the following:

- The principle of the proposal was supported but there were concerns over the prominence and size of the building.
- There had not been any pre-application discussion with Ward Members.
- The quality of the drawings displayed did not give a good enough impression of what the actual proposals would look like.
- There had not been further consultation with the Airebrough Civic Society.
- It was felt there was pressure to make a decision due to the time limited funding available.
- It was felt that other options could have been explored other than amendments to what had initially being proposed as it was a considerably sized site.

A representative of the applicant addressed the Panel and reported that the scheme came under the Council Housing Growth Programme. Funding had been secured from the Department of Health and there had been a stipulation that work commenced on the site before the end of 2014. There had been further discussion with the Homes and Communities Agency regarding the possibility of extending this date but there were still very tight timescales for the procurement process. Further explanation was also given on Extra Care Housing and work with Adult Social Care. The Panel was informed of consultation with Ward Members and that comments regarding the external appearance of the building would be considered.

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

- It was felt that due to the size of the building, the proposed design looked bland. It was reported that vertical elements would be added to the design and there would also be bay windows.
- Using more of the land available at the site would reduce the facility for car parking and also mean less communal garden areas. The crescent shape proposed fitted in with the topography of the site.
- The site was located close to mixed residential developments and there had been no objections from near neighbours.
- There would be a mixture of one and two bedroom apartments within the development.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved in principle and deferred to the Chief Planning Office but to include re-advertisement for a minimum of two weeks and further discussion with applicants to secure:

- Bay windows – A better relationship between these elements and the dormers above is needed (alignments and widths), and the designs

themselves need refining in order to avoid comparison with outdated developments of the 1960s & 70s.

- Eaves details – ensure drawings are accurate (see relationship of eaves at gable ends to tops of bay windows)
 - Dormers – break up mass of dormers with a vertical recess.
 - Greater detail needed for curtain walling
 - Window details – heads and sills need to be re-considered
 - Window openings – more careful treatment of glazing arrangements needed (proportions & positions of transoms and glazing bars) to ensure a more consistent visual approach
 - Architectural detail – string courses which introduce a hierarchy to elevations to be considered
 - Entrance details needed
- Ward Members to be fully consulted on any revisions

54 Application 14/03387/FU - Airport West Business Park, Warren House Lane, Yeadon, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the development of a detached restaurant with associated access and landscaping at Airport West Business Park, Warren House Lane, Yeadon.

Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this application.

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

- The site had consent for the development of office accommodation.
- Objections had been received from local Ward Members.
- Supporting representations had been made by nearby business premises.
- With relation to the use of the site for employment land it was reported that there was sufficient employment land nearby. The proposal for a restaurant would create more jobs than if it was to be office accommodation.
- Conditions relating to landscaping.
- It was recommended that the application be approved.

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

- There would be a public transport contribution which would not be used specifically towards this site.
- Public transport links to the site.
- It was envisaged that the proposed restaurant would be used by local residents, the nearby office park and users of the airport.

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

55 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday, 4 December 2014 at 1.30 p.m.