

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 19TH MARCH, 2015

PRESENT: Councillor M Rafique in the Chair

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

87 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

Members were advised that there was an exempt appendix to Agenda Item 9 – Green Lane Dyeworks, Green Lane, Yeadon and that members of the public and press should be excluded from the meeting should the content of this appendix be discussed.

88 Minutes - 19 February 2015

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 19 February 2015 be confirmed as a correct record.

89 Matters arising from the Minutes

With reference to Minute No 85, erection of a fence/structure on land at College Hill House, Burras Lane, Otley, concern was expressed as to why this was referred to the Plans Panel and that all information had not been submitted prior to the meeting. It was reported that it was an unusual case that had seen a dispute between two parties and was still the subject of consideration through the customer complaints procedure.

Members were also informed that the appeal in relation to the Kirklees Knows site had been dismissed. The Inspector and Secretary of State had concurred that the Council did have a 5 year supply of housing land and that loss of this site would be harmful.

90 Application 14/00905/FU - 29-31 Moor Road, Headingley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the change of use, extensions, part demolition and alterations to form 32 extra care apartments and ancillary facilities for older people at 29-31 Moor Road, Headingley, Leeds. The application had previously been considered by the Panel when it was deferred to allow negotiations for amendments to the proposals.

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

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

- Members were shown a photo montage of how the proposed application would look from neighbouring properties.
- Members' attention was brought to key changes following the previous report which was considered in February. These included obscure glazing to windows that overlooked neighbouring properties, reconfiguration of the parking area with an additional space and revised floor plans.
- It was reported that the distance between the proposals and neighbouring properties were within acceptable guidelines.
- Reference was made to objections from local Ward Members and local residents.
- The scheme needed a minimum of 32 units to be viable.
- It was felt that with the changes made to the application that it should be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval.

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

- Concern regarding the close proximity of the proposals to neighbouring properties.
- The photographic images of how the proposals would look did not give a true reflection of the height of the development.
- Local residents had not had any further communication with the developer.
- The only real concession seemed to be the provision of obscured glass.
- Concern regarding the proposals overlooking existing properties.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel, the following issues were raised:

- The Panel was given an overview of the site's previous use and the need for extra care provision in the area.
- The garden frontage to the site would remain the same and trees would be retained.
- Residents' concerns had been taken into account, the designs had been reconfigured to reduce the impact on neighbouring properties.
- Residents concerns had first been known during the public consultation period and there had been work to address these ever since.

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

- The car parking was felt to be adequate in comparison to other similar schemes.
- Changes to first floor accommodation to be used as a corridor.
- Concern that the changes had not fully addressed the objections from neighbouring residents.

91 RESOLVED – That the application be deferred
Application 14/06380/FU - Land adjacent to the former Swan with Two Necks, Raglan Road, Woodhouse

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a residential development, block of 6 flats at land adjacent to the former Swan with Two Necks, Raglan Road, Woodhouse, Leeds.

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 fell within a predominantly residential area.
- The proposals were for three one bedroom flats and three two bedroom flats with four off road parking spaces and cycle and bin storage.
- There were a number of concerns in relation to the application:
 - The size and scale of the building
 - It was out of character with neighbouring buildings
 - Insufficient parking and a potential increase in on street parking
 - Poor vehicular access
 - Close proximity to other properties
- It was not felt that the proposals outweighed the re-use of a vacant site in consideration of the concerns and it was recommended that the application be refused.

The applicant's representative addressed the meeting. The following issues were highlighted:

- The pictures displayed did not show similar properties opposite the site.
- The applicant had developed one of the neighbouring properties.
- The site was in a sustainable location with access to amenities and public transport.
- In response to Members' questions, the following was discussed:
 - Bulk and scale of the proposals – it was reported that this was the same as neighbouring properties.
 - Problems with parking in the area – there were traffic regulation orders in place and existing residents had permits. The properties would be marketed to people who wouldn't want to use cars.

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

- Concerns regarding the size of the footprint of the proposed development.
- It was felt there were already enough flats in the area.
- More family housing in the area would be welcomed.

RESOLVED - That the application be refused as per the officer recommendation outlined in the report.

92 Application 14/05524/FU - Green Lane Dyeworks, Green Lane, Yeadon

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a residential development comprising 93 new build units and conversion of existing mill to create 46 units, 64 bed care home, new access from Focus Way, provision of public open space, realignment of existing watercourse and demolition of redundant industrial buildings at Green Lane Dyeworks, Green Lane, Yeadon Leeds.

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

Issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The site fell within a conservation area.
- The mill ponds would not be retained.
- The water tower would be demolished and re-erected within the site.
- The older stone chimney would be retained.
- Members were shown the previous proposals for the site – main changes included a different range of property types and sizes along with much more retention of original buildings.
- The larger brick chimney which is a prominent landmark feature would restrict views for properties on the site and the view of planning and conservation officers was that this could be demolished.
- There would be at least 2 parking spaces for each house, 1 for each flat and generous visitor parking.
- There would be 10 affordable housing units – this figure had been advised by the District Valuer.
- Reference was made to representations from a local Ward Member. These included the retention of all the original buildings and the brick chimney.
- It was recommended that the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval.

A member of the Aireborough Civic Society addressed the Panel. Issues raised included the following:

- It was felt that the scheme was much improved but there were still a number of concerns.
- The loss of the landmark brick chimney would be controversial and there were other schemes where similar features had been retained.
- The site had become derelict and it was important that the existing buildings be brought back to uses as soon as possible.
- Stone from demolished properties should be used in new buildings on the site.

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

- The proposals had been revised along with planning officers and Elected Members.
- The proposals offered a residential development that would bring a brownfield site back into use.
- A number of flagship buildings would be retained on the site.
- Retention of the brick chimney would have an impact on amenity and would affect the opportunity to deliver the proposals as outlined.
- The provider of the care home was a joint applicant and the care element of the scheme would definitely go ahead.

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

- Timing for construction of the care home and phasing of affordable housing and re-use of existing buildings – this would all be detailed in conditions to the application.
- Retention of the gateway to the site.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval as per the recommendation outlined in the report.

(Members of the public and press left the meeting during the discussion of information detailed in the exempt appendix for this item).

93 Application 14/07276/FU - Leeds Trinity University College, Brownberrie Lane, Horsforth

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to an application for erection of student accommodation (up to 7 storeys) comprising 29 cluster flats providing 228 rooms with associated communal space, landscaping and parking at Leeds Trinity University College, Brownberrie Lane, Horsforth, Leeds.

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

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

- The University was looking to expand and additional accommodation was key to attracting students.
- Reference to Ward Member and residents' complaints – that the building was too close to existing properties and could lead to problems with noise disturbance and litter.

- Members were shown details of arrangements for a replacement car parking on the site.
- The proposed building would be at least 100 metres from the nearest residential property.
- The University had a green travel plan.
- Residents would have permits to park on the site and there would be funding for any necessary traffic regulation orders and payments towards public transport facilities.
- There had not been any complaints about noise from the existing halls of residence on the site.
- It was recommended that the application be deferred to the Chief Planning Officer for approval.

Local residents addressed the Panel. Issues raised included the following:

- The proposals were not sympathetic to the site and area.
- There had been over 50 complaints including Horsforth Town Council and the local MP.
- The height, massing and location should all be reconsidered.
- The proposals would cause noise and light pollution to local residents.
- Concerns regarding car parking in the area – many students used off site parking on local streets which caused problems for residents.
- Problems with litter.
- Concerns regarding the consultation process.

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

- There had been three consultation events during the development of the proposals.
- The University carried out annual parking surveys in relation to the travel plan and the numbers of students parking had reduced.
- There had not been any problems with litter or noise and the University had a robust noise mitigation plan.
- Traffic regulation orders could be used to prevent students parking on local streets and provide permits for local residents.
- There were reciprocal parking arrangements with the local rugby club.
- There was a community forum and meetings took place with local residents.

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

- Further concern regarding car parking and the impact of having additional students and staff at the site. It was felt that the proposals would be sufficient for extra parking and it was suggested that an extra condition be attached to the application to monitor this position.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred to the Chief Planning Officer for approval as per the officer recommendation outlined in the report and that

condition 17 be altered to include surveys and monitoring and review of car parking provision to inform possible further mitigation if required.

Application 14/06917/OT - Nethertown, Old Lane, Drighlington

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to an outline application for residential development and means of access at Nethertown Farm, Old Lane, Drighlington.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting. Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to during the discussion of this application.

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

- Current uses of the site included caravan and container storage, stables, and outdoor and indoor horse arenas.
- A previous application for residential development had been felt inappropriate for the site.
- The site had now been assessed as brownfield.
- The proposals would include the installation footpaths and an agreement for off site highways works.
- Reference was made to letters of objection from local residents.
- Reference was made to conditions to site management and construction and also that moving the use of the current site to other land could lead to enforcement legislation.

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

- Concern that the existing materials at the site would be transferred to adjacent land and further greenbelt would be lost.
- That the road was not suitable for construction vehicles.
- Concerns regarding the extra traffic that would be generated.
- The current use of the site did not have a detrimental impact on the village.
- Concern that new properties would overlook the village.

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

- This was a reduced application from what was initially proposed.
- Greenbelt could be developed in certain circumstances.
- Only the stables and menagerie were to be relocated.
- There would only be limited access for construction vehicles for such a small scale development.
- The applicant would be willing to sign a legal agreement regarding use of the adjacent land.

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

- Concern that the Council should be more committed to building on brownfield sites.
- It was suggested that additional conditions be included for a management plan for construction traffic and to ensure that materials at the site are not moved to additional land.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval as per the officer recommendation outlined in the report and in addition to the Section 106 to identify adjacent areas of land to village site where any similar development to that being displaced by the approval of this application could be restricted. Also to ensure that condition 19 was robust enough to properly manage construction traffic.

95 Application 14/06211/FU - Former Denso Marston Premises, Armley Road, Armley

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to an application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of non-food retail unit (Class A1) with garden centre, two retail food stores (Class A1), provision of associated access, customer car parking, landscaping and associated works at former Denston Marston Premises, 45-49 Armley Road, Armley, Leeds.

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

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

- The site was located at a key gateway to Armley.
- There was a mix of uses proposed for the site.
- Reference was made to representations from local residents.
- Members were shown a photographic montage of how the development would look.
- It was recommended that the application be deferred to the Chief Planning Officer for approval.

Further discussion referred to employment at the site and obligations to employ local people. This would include both the construction of the site and the retail element once completed.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer as per the officer recommendation outlined in the report.

96 Application 14/05882/FU - Former Railway Public House, Moor Knoll Lane, East Ardsley

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to an application for the development of 12 houses with associated access road, parking and landscaping on land at the former Railway Public House, Moor Knoll Lane, East Ardsley.

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

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

- There had previously been outline permission for 8 houses at the site.
- Concerns of local residents and Ward Members including highways, loss of greenfield, lack of services and the loss of an asset with the Public House.
- The Public House was not a listed building and neither did it fall in a conservation area.
- The applicant had considered conversion of the public house.
- It was felt that the loss of the public house building was not enough to merit refusal.

In response to a question, the applicant's agent confirmed that there had not been a survey of the public house building but that it had been agreed that the scheme would only be viable with a minimum of 12 units. Members had attended the site and felt that it would be a shame to lose the building from the street scene. It was suggested that the application be deferred to allow the applicant to give further consideration to conversion of the public house building.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred for further discussions with the applicant to explore full possibility of retaining Public House and converting it into flats.

97 Application 15/00585/FU - Robin Lane Filling Station, Robin Lane, Pudsey

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to an application for the change of use of a petrol filling station to a car wash at Robin Lane Filling Station, Pudsey.

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

Further issues highlighted included the following:

- Previous applications had been refused due to residential amenity and highway safety.
- Pictures showed the close proximity of the site to other properties.
- There was potential for an impact on the highway due to queuing vehicles.
- The site was in the Pudsey Conservation Area.
- There was no drainage plan for the collection of effluence.
- It was recommended that the application be refused.

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