

NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 2018

PRESENT: Councillor N Walshaw in the Chair

Councillors B Cleasby, R Grahame,
S Hamilton, M Harland, S McKenna,
E Nash, K Ritchie, P Wadsworth and
G Wilkinson

SITE VISITS

The site visits were attended by Councillors Walshaw, Hamilton, Nash, Ritchie and Wilkinson.

99 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

100 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no exempt items.

101 Late Items

There were no late items.

102 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

103 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

104 Minutes of previous meeting

RESOLVED - The minutes of the previous meeting held on 18th January 2018 be approved as a correct record.

105 16/06951/FU - Demolition of existing buildings and construction of six apartments with associated access, landscaping and car parking at 7 Wakefield Road, Garforth.

The report of the Chief Planning Officer set out an application which proposed the demolition of the existing buildings and the construction of 6 two bedroom

apartments with associated access, car parking and landscaping at 7 Wakefield Road, Garforth.

Members were advised that this application was a resubmission following the refusal of planning permission for a detached house and six self-contained flats with associated gardens and car parking at the site under planning Ref: 14/01717/FU. The applicant appealed against the decision but the decision was dismissed due to design and residential amenity concerns.

This planning application was brought to Plans Panel at the request of Cllr. Mark Dobson who cites reasons of over saturation of vehicles at a pinch point at Town End junction with Wakefield Road and flooding issues. Members were given an update in which Cllr. Dobson reiterated his representations against the application and included the following comments:-

- I am disappointed to read that the development at 7 Wakefield Road, Garforth has been recommended for approval;
- Again Cllr. Field and I feel that the overdevelopment on a busy A road, the increased traffic and flood risk have not been addressed by the applicant and question the officers recommendations;
- Please consider this and, we suggest, panel members look to, again, reject.

Members had attended a site visit earlier in the day, photographs and plans were shown throughout the presentation.

The proposal for the site was set out at point 2.0 of the submitted report. Members were advised that the current reconfiguration with a single access had been submitted after negotiations with officers.

Members were informed of the following points:-

- Concerns raised in relation to on street parking in relation to associated terraces and the doctors surgery nearby.
- Proposal sets out 9 parking spaces which is within parking guidelines.
- The proposed development was adequately positioned away from the bungalow to the rear of the site and was not considered to be unduly dominant.
- It was proposed that there would be replacement planting on the site.
- The six apartments would be over 3 floors with the upper apartments in the roof space.
- All the apartments would be 2 bedrooms.
- Two side windows which would serve stairwells and bathrooms would be obscure glazed.

Issues relating to drainage had been set out at 10.18 and 10.19 of the submitted report.

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

- Assurance that the site would be checked for Japanese Knotwood and eradicated if found.
- Parking was adequate and the layout would be as set out in the submitted plan.
- Parking of construction vehicles to be on site.
- Construction work to be undertaken within standard times with no work on Sunday or Bank holidays.
- Size of the flats as Members had been informed that 4 of the flats were below space standards guidelines. The 4 flats were short by 7.5sq metres. Members were also informed that consultation was still ongoing in relation to the emerging policy of National Space Standards. The Consultation will end on 23rd March and it was hoped that Leeds would adopt the National Space Standards Policy.
- Layout of the development.
- Members were informed that drainage issues had been addressed and would be for the betterment of the area.

RESOLVED – To defer consideration to seek amendments to the layout of the flats so that all accord with the emerging Minimum Space Standards (Policy H9 of the Core Strategy Selective Review, February 2018).

106 17/07407/FU – Installation of outdoor fitness equipment at the Playground, Kirkhills, Thorner, LS14 3JD

The report of the Chief Planning Officer sought planning permission for the installation of outdoor fitness equipment at the Playground, Kirkhills, Thorner, LS14 3JD.

The Playground is situated in Thorner's Conservation Area. Councillor Matthew Robinson had requested that the application be brought to Plans Panel due to concerns raised by residents about the impact of the development upon the broader character and amenity of the area.

The application proposes six pieces of fitness equipment, situated next to the existing playground, in an area of open space within the centre of Thorner.

Members had attended a site visit earlier in the day, photographs and plans were shown throughout the presentation.

Members were advised of the following points:-

- An application to vary condition 2 (approved plans) for Minor Material Amendment to allow for a wooden swing frame which was pending.
- The proposed equipment and the height of each piece of equipment as set out at point 2.2 of the submitted report.
- No lights or benches are proposed in this area.
- The equipment will be beige and green in colour to be in keeping with the character of the area.

- The fitness equipment would be screened from houses on Moat End by trees and shrubs.
- Relevant planning policies were set out at 8.2 of the submitted report.
- The Parish Council had undertaken a consultation survey and this was the preferred site.
- The onus for Health and Safety would be on the Parish Council who own the land.
- There would be an appropriate distance between the fitness equipment and the children's playground, there is currently fencing which would be retained.
- Equipment meets British Standards for safety
- Highways had no objection as they were of the view that users would access the area on foot.
- The Parish Council would be responsible for the maintenance and insurance of the equipment.

Mr Brereton attended the meeting speaking against the recommendations he informed the Panel of the following points:-

- He had been a resident of Thorner for 20 years
- Residents had asked that the application be brought before Plans Panel as the issue was bigger than this planning application
- The area of concern stretched over 100 metres and directly affected 10 houses on Moat End.
- Mr Brereton highlighted a number of points within the submitted report where the officer had referred to the 'existing play area' especially when dealing with an objection.
- Stead Lane, Kirkhills was the most congested road in Thorner
- The existing playground had been there for almost 40 years and the equipment was designed for children up to approximately 8 years of age.
- Moat End was a relatively new development and residents of those houses had a choice of living there close to the existing children's playground.
- Advised Members that the existing playground was due to change with the removal of some equipment to be replaced with a tower that would provide views into nearby bedrooms on Moat End, a zip wire and climbing net.

Mr Brereton was of the view that the whole complex should have been dealt with as one application. He was also of the opinion that this type of development went against the aspirations as set out in the Parish Plan 2006 and the aspirations set out in the Village Design Statement.

In response to Members questions and comments the following was noted:-

- Anti-social behaviour involving youths was not really a problem.
- The Parish Council owned the land and could go ahead with the installing the equipment under Permitted Development even if refused by the Plans Panel.
- The Parish Council were aware of the opinions of residents.

Victoria Goodall, Chair of Thorner Parish Council attended the meeting and provided the Members with the following information:-

- Consultation had taken place with residents which included an article in the Parish council newsletter.
- The Parish Council had voted to come to submit an application rather than go ahead with the installation under Permitted Development.
- Health and Safety assurances had been received from the manufacturer and installer.
- The area proposed for the fitness equipment was a discreet area with borders of shrubs.
- The Parish Council would be liable for the insurance of the equipment and for maintenance.
- The Parish Council were of the view that the equipment would not encourage anti-social behaviour with youths.
- The Parish Council had secured funded for the project under from Lottery Funding 'Wards for All'.
- The children's play area was due to undergo changes for new wooden equipment to be installed to blend in better with the area.

Councillor McKenna informed the meeting that he wished to take no further part in discussions on this item

In response to Members questions and comments the following points were noted:-

- Feedback on consultation had been provided to Parish Councillors at the Annual General Meeting;
- The village had been informed of the project in the Parish newsletter;
- It was hoped that the new pieces at the playground would provide something to do for older children up to age 11 years;
- Manufacturers had confirmed that the fitness equipment conformed to Health and Safety Standards;
- The playground would maintain the same footprint with the addition of new equipment made of wood.

The publicity provided by LCC to be provided to Cllr. Cleasby as requested.

Jonathan Carr, Head of Development provided clarity as to the reason for this application being brought before Plans Panel. He explained the Parish Council wished to legitimise planning permission for the fitness area although they could go ahead with the project under Permitted Development.

Members who had similar fitness equipment in their wards said the equipment was well used and there were no incidents of anti-social behaviour in locations where the equipment was situated.

RESOLVED – To grant planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation.

107 17/06735/FU - Alterations including two storey part single storey front, side and rear extension incorporating a double garage; first floor terrace area with balustrade to rear; inset dormer window to rear and raised roof height at 24 Lakeland Crescent, Alwoodley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer requested Members to consider an application for alterations including two storey part single storey front, side and rear extension incorporating a double garage; first floor terrace area with balustrade to rear; inset dormer window to rear and raised roof height at 24 Lakeland Crescent, Alwoodley, Leeds.

The application had been brought to Plans Panel at the request of Councillor Peter Harrand on the grounds of:

- The proposed height of the proposal;
- Potential overlooking of adjoining properties and lack of privacy;
- Incursion into public footpath.

Members were informed of two further requests for the item to be determined at Plans Panel from Councillor Dan Cohen for the following reasons;

- Front design is inconsistent with the street scene; particularly the height
 - Overbearing impact on adjoining properties; affecting light and privacy;
- and

Councillor Neil Buckley for the following reasons;

- Impact on public right of way
- Overbearing impact; loss of light
- Incongruous design

Members were also informed of follow up comments from original objectors:

- Alwoodley Parish Council cited objections as previously set out in the submitted report;
- 25 Lakeland Crescent unable to access revisions until 7th February;
- 23 Lakeland Crescent no front elevation shown on revised plans, previous comments still stands;
- 26 Lakeland Crescent unable to open plans until 9th February;
- 21 Lakeland Crescent no discernible differences;
- 22 Lakeland Crescent unable to originally access plans privacy screen of concern due to open fields/ high wind, removal of tree at boundary not helped. Previous objection remains;
- 23 Lakeland Crescent publication of officer report, in advance of 22nd February date inability to view plans.

The Panel was advised that once the officer had been made aware that the revised plans could not be accessed the Design and Access statement containing the revisions was uploaded onto Public Access.

Members were advised of an objection by the Ramblers Association set out at 6.3 of the submitted report. Members were further advised that the public right of way was in the ownership of the applicant.

Members had attended a site visit earlier in the day, photographs and plans were shown throughout the presentation.

Members were informed of the following points:-

- Proposed height was consistent with neighbouring properties;
- The integral garage would have space for two cars;
- Houses on Lakeland Crescent were of different designs;
- 10.7 of the submitted report was highlighted especially in regard to special character and the privacy screen which would be condition 7;
- 10.9 of submitted report was highlighted, especially the quote from the NPPF Paragraph 59;
- The parking provided was policy compliant;
- Unprotected trees to be removed fencing and hedging was proposed;
- The proposed alterations would not encroach on the public right of way

Mr Allanson of 23 Lakeland Crescent and on behalf of residents of numbers 21, 22, 25 and 26 attended the meeting to speak against the application.

Mr Allanson said that many of the residents had lived on Lakeland Crescent for a number of years whereas the applicant had lived there only 1 year.

Mr Allanson said that the size, style and character was a complete change to the existing dwelling and should not be called an extension. Mr Allanson highlighted 10.9 of the submitted report and was of the view that BD6 of the Core Strategy had not be strictly adhered to and that the residents would suggest that this was a rebuild.

Members noted that the original building was constructed of stone and brick with grey tiling to the roof. The proposal for split-faced stone, cedar cladding, white render with slate tiling and extensive use of glass to the front elevation not in keeping with area.

Mr Allanson was of the view that the proposal being 50% larger than the current footprint should be considered as a rebuild. He informed Members that the proposal increased the height and depth creating a 7 bedroom 4 bathroom property and would be too large for the area and over dominant to immediate neighbours.

Mr Allanson reminded the Panel of Policies HDG1 in respect of scale, character and appearance and HDG2 in respect of amenity of neighbours.

Mr Allanson was of the opinion that this was the wrong house in the wrong location.

Mr and Mrs Jones the applicants and Paul Carter attended the meeting.

Mrs Jones spoke to the Panel informing the Members of the following points:-

- Amendments have been submitted during the process to address all areas of concern;

- The public rights of way in their ownership would not be affected as the area between the property and the boundary of the footpath would be increased;
- Replanting scheme to be conditioned;
- The property would be 1 metre away from the footpath at its closest point;
- The property on the other side of the footpath over hangs the boundary line and footpath;
- The height of the roof was no higher than other houses on the street;
- The loft space was being better utilised and other houses in the area had also used the loft space;
- Squaring off the bay windows to the front of the property to provide symmetry to the house they will not project out any further than they do currently;
- Front of house would be 29 metres from the house opposite;
- Reducing current depth upstairs removing walls of 3rd bedroom which currently juts out;
- Demolishing 2 storey rear extension and a single storey extension to the side.
- The house already looked different to those houses on Lakeland Crescent;
- There were over 15 different designs of property on Lakeland Crescent
- Obscure glazing to windows to the West;
- Windows to the East to be a double height room so unable to see out.

Mrs Jones explained to the Panel that they wanted to provide a family house which maximised the plot that it sat in and increased light into the house mitigating the need for the light tunnel on the landing. The applicant was of the view that this proposal has the potential to be a beautiful, modern addition to the diverse styles of Lakeland Crescent.

In response to Members questions and comments the Panel were informed of the following points:-

- The footpath was a defined public right of way;
- The footpath would not be suitable for disabled access as there was a stile leading to open fields;
- The cedar cladding will become dated naturally;
- Split-faced stones would be used round the windows;
- There was sufficient parking with a double garage and a driveway large enough for two cars;
- The privacy screen on the balcony would be 1.8 metres high and 1 metre from the public footpath;

Members requested a condition be added for construction traffic to be on site and not parked on the street.

RESOLVED – To grant planning permission in accordance with the officer recommendation and subject to imposition of an additional condition requiring the submission for approval of a construction management plan.

108 Date and Time of Next Meeting

To note the next meeting of the North and East Plans Panel will be held on Thursday 22nd March 2018 at 1:30pm.