

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 7TH SEPTEMBER, 2017**

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

Councillors B Anderson, S Arif, J Bentley,  
D Congreve, P Davey, D Ragan, C Towler  
and R Wood

### **32 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

No declarations were made.

### **33 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors M Coulson and R Finnigan.

Councillor T Leadley was in attendance as substitute.

### **34 Minutes - 3 August 2017**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 3 August 2017 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **35 Application 17/03186/FU - St Joseph's Catholic Primary School, Mount Pleasant Road, Pudsey, LS28**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a proposed 2.4 metre high perimeter fence at St Joseph's Catholic Primary School, Mount Pleasant Road, Pudsey.

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

It was reported that there had been some late information submitted with regards to the primary school site which could prejudice objections received and also highlighted technical inaccuracies in the report. Due to this the application needed to be re-advertised and the Panel was asked to consider deferring the application.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred.

### **36 Application 16/07784/FU - Land at former St Joseph's Convalescent Home, Outwood Lane. Horsforth, LS18**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the development of 28 apartments and 13 houses including new access on land at the former St Joseph's Convalescent Home, Outwood Lane, Horsforth, Leeds.

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

It was reported that some of the information relating to viability was incorrect and would need to be resubmitted and reassessed. The applicant had asked to withdraw the application. Members were asked to consider deferring the application.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred.

**37 Application 16/06514/FU - Land off Galloway Lane, Stanningley, Pudsey, LS28**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for residential development of 52 dwellings on land off Galloway Lane, Stanningley, Pudsey.

Members visited the site prior to the hearing 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 application was for a PAS site that had been allocated for housing in Phase 1 of the Site Allocation Plan.
- The development would consist of semi-detached and detached dwellings in a linear layout and all would be either two or two and a half storey buildings.
- All properties would meet space standards and house styles were shown.
- There would be affordable housing and greenspace on site.
- Objections had been received from local residents and all Ward Members.
- There was still to be further negotiation with the developer regarding the installation of a zebra crossing.
- The application was recommended for approval.

A local resident addressed the Panel with concerns to the application. There was no objection in principle to the application but further consideration was requested to the following:

- Increased possibility of accidents on Galloway Lane near the pedestrian refuge. It was felt that a pelican crossing should be installed rather than a zebra crossing.

- Plots 9 and 10 – it was felt that these should be bungalows which would create ‘all of life’ dwellings and would not cause loss of views for 8 other properties.

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

- The proposals would assist with the demand to meet housing supply in Leeds.
- The proposals were all policy compliant and would include affordable housing.
- Comments received from Ward Councillors and local residents had been addressed.
- A Section 106 agreement had been drafted which would provide other benefits.
- In response to questions, the following was discussed:
  - There would have to be further discussions with the applicant regarding the possibility of having bungalows on plots 9 and 10.
  - The applicant had not had opportunity to fully consider the costings for a zebra crossing and further discussions would be needed for this or if there should be a pelican crossing.

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

- Concern that a zebra crossing would not be sufficient.
- It was proposed for landscaping and screening to the rear of the site.
- It was suggested that the application be deferred so that further discussions could be held regarding a crossing for Galloway Lane.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred for further discussion with the applicant regarding maintenance of the strip of land to the rear of the site and provision of a suitable crossing on Galloway Lane.

**38 Application 17/00789/FU - Salvation Army Church Hall, Opposite 123 Kirkstall Lane, Kirkstall, LS5 2AB**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for twelve flats with car parking at Salvation Army Church Hall, opposite 123 Kirkstall Lane, Kirkstall, Leeds.

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:

- The application had been brought to Panel following concerns raised regarding public rights of way and highway safety issues.

- The proposals would include 4 one bedroom flats and 8 two bedroom flats.
- The public right of way to the rear of the site was not in the ownership of the applicant and would be left open.
- Room layouts of the proposed flats were shown and these would all meet space standards.
- The application was recommended for approval subject to a Section 106 agreement for a payment for greenspace contribution.

A local Ward Member addressed the Panel with concerns regarding the application. These included the following:

- Representations were being made on behalf of the Kirkstall Neighbourhood Forum. The concerns related to public access and there were no concerns regarding the design for the proposed flats.
- It was requested that the applicant maintained the north to south public access route that was on their land and to work with the Council to clear fly tipping and improve public access.
- It was felt fly tipping was a result of access to the land being closed.
- It was requested that a fence be installed to the rear of Eden Crescent.

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

- This was a smaller application than had previously been submitted and allowed the retention of tress on the site.
- The applicant had addressed concerns with access improvements, bin storage and provision of a bat survey.
- The applicant would be happy to agree for a pathway.

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

- That Planning Officers contact Asset Management and Public Rights of Way officers to determine issues relating to the footpath.
- The applicant would be willing to make land available on the eastern boundary for continuation of the footpath.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to conditions specified in the report and also the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the following obligations:

Offsite greenspace contribution in the sum of £38,172.65

In the circumstances where the Section 106 has not been completed within 3 months of the Panel resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.

Also subject to the provision of a suitable strip of land for continuation of the footpath.

### **39 Application 16/04457/FU - Tower Works, Moorfield Road, Armley, LS12**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the laying out of an access road and construction of twenty five apartments and twenty six houses at former Tower Works, Moorfield Road, Armley, Leeds.

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:

- The site previously housed industrial buildings and was close to local facilities and services.
- Access to the site.
- Site layout and relation to surrounding residential properties.
- Following an assessment by the District Valuer it had been concluded that the proposals would not be viable should there be affordable housing and greenspace contributions.
- The proposed properties all complied with the housing mix, space standards and neighbourhoods for living guidance.
- The application was recommended for approval.

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

- Lack of consultation.
- Lack of understanding regarding access to the site.
- Overshadowing to existing properties and proximity of some of the proposed properties.
- The proposals are over intensive.
- Lack of affordable housing and greenspace contribution.

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

- The site was a vacant brownfield site and had been derelict for many years.
- The site was in a sustainable location with access to local services.
- Although there was no affordable housing contribution, some of the properties would be aimed at the first time buyer market.
- A previous offer to supply changing rooms for the local football club remained.
- The applicant would be happy for further discussion regarding the development of plot 17.
- There had not been consultation with local residents but there had been an offer to attend the Armley Forum.

- Should greater profits be achieved than projected from the development, the applicant would be willing to consider making a contribution for public greenspace.

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

- Concern that there was no affordable housing or greenspace contribution.
- Concern regarding access.
- The impact of the Community Infrastructure Levy on viability.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report and also subject to a Section 106 agreement with an overage clause and further discussion with regard to plot 17.

**40 Application 17/02609/FU - Former HSBC Bank PLC, Charlton House, Oxford Road, Guiseley, LS20 8AA**

To receive and consider the attached report of the Chief Planning Officer regarding an application for the change of use of a former bank to A4 public house use and 2 storey extension rear at the former HSBC Bank, Charlton House, Oxford Road, Guiseley.

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:

- The building was on the edge of Guiseley Town Centre.
- Proximity to residential properties.
- The building had not been in use for over a year and was not suitable for other commercial use including retail use.
- There was car parking for seven vehicles.
- Conditions required the premises to be closed at midnight with outdoor areas closed at 21:00.
- The proposed extension to the rear was considered suitable for the conservation area.
- There had been a number of objections in relation to highways safety, particularly access to the car park. This was an existing access and capacity would not be changed.
- Reference was made to objections and letters of support received.
- Additional conditions following comments from the Environmental Protection Team included hours of construction, noise insulation scheme and details regarding replacement windows and the canopy structure.
- On balance it was felt that the proposals offered an acceptable re-use for the building subject to conditions and the application was recommended for approval.

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

- Local residents had not been informed of the proposals.
- Loss of amenity for residents with increased noise and anti-social behaviour.
- Impact on highways and pedestrian safety.
- Insufficient parking near the premises and lack of dropping off places.
- Concern that some of the conditions would not be enforceable.

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

- The building was located within the town centre boundary.
- The proposals would bring a redundant building back into use and create up to 20 full time and 15 part time jobs.
- Noise impact assessments had been carried out and there would not be any impact on residential amenity.
- The highways issues already existed and would be the same for any re-use of the building.
- Contact had been made to engage local Ward Councillors. There had been significant engagement and more than was required under legislation.
- With regard to concerns regarding parking, it was reported that the majority of staff would live locally and be more likely to use public transport or walk to the premises.

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

- There would be conditions in relation to delivery vehicles visiting the premises.
- Enforcement could be carried out by Planning and Licensing should there be any issues with noise from the open balcony area.
- There were no highways objections as the existing access had previously been in use.
- Some concerns remained with regard to parking, highways and potential noise disturbance.
- There was no capacity to increase car parking at the site.

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