

## **Plans Panel (East)**

**Thursday, 11th March, 2010**

**PRESENT:** Councillor P Wadsworth in the Chair

Councillors D Congreve, T Leadley,  
M Lyons, J Matthews, K Parker, N Taggart,  
G Wilkinson and D Wilson

### **189 Election of Chair**

As Councillor Latty was unable to attend the meeting, the Clerk sought nominations for a Chair

Councillor Wadsworth was proposed, seconded and elected to chair the meeting

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

### **190 Late Items**

The Chair admitted one late to the agenda (minute 193 (b) refers). This item was not available when the agenda was despatched and required urgent consideration to enable the Panel to consider the minutes from the additional Plans Panel East meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010 at its next meeting. A copy of the minutes had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting

Members were also in receipt of the following additional information on applications to be considered at the meeting:

Applications 09/05215/FU and 09/05216/CA – plans and a written submission from an objector

Applications 08/06412/FU – Plots 145 and 146 off Station Road Allerton Bywater – photographs submitted by an objector

### **191 Declarations of Interest**

The following Members declared personal/prejudicial interests for the purposes of Section 81 (3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct:

Application 06/06983/FU – Appeal decision at Rein Road Tingley – Councillor Leadley declared a personal interest as a member of Morley Town Council which had been consulted on the application (minute 195 refers)

Applications 09/01970/FU and 09/04179/FU – Parkfield Mills Queens Road Morley – Councillor Leadley declared a personal and prejudicial interest through being the chair of the Morley Town Council Planning Committee which had been involved in discussions on the applications (minute 202 refers)

Application 09/01417/FU – New Horizon Girls School Newton Hill Road LS7 – Councillor Congreve declared a personal interest through knowing the school

representative who was speaking on the application through the community work he undertook in Councillor Congreve's Ward (minute 201 refers)

Applications 08/06741/FU and 08/06742/FU – Leeds United FC Ltd Elland Road LS11 – Councillors Congreve, Leadley, Lyons and Wadsworth declared personal interests through being members of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as Metro had commented on the proposals (minute 206 refers)

Application 10/00412/FU – Position statement on former Greyhound Stadium – Elland Road LS11 – Councillors Congreve, Leadley, Lyons and Wadsworth declared personal interests through being members of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as Metro had commented on the proposals (minute 207 refers)

Application 09/03138/FU – 10 Elmete Avenue LS15 – Councillor Wilkinson declared a personal interest as one of the objectors to the proposals was a personal friend (minute 199 refers)

## **192 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Latty, Councillor Marjoram, who was substituted for by Councillor Wilkinson, Councillor Finnigan, who was substituted for by Councillor Leadley, Councillor Gruen, who was substituted for by Councillor Taggart and Councillor Taylor, who was substituted for by Councillor Matthews

The Head of Planning Services informed the Panel that as Mr Newbury was absent due to illness, he would be the Lead Officer for the meeting

As some of the items on the agenda had been discussed at previous meetings, the Head of Planning Services advised those Members who were substituting that they might wish to consider abstaining from voting on applications where they felt they did not have enough information on which to reach a decision, as set out in paragraph 15.7 of the Code of Practice for the Determination of Planning Matters

## **193 Minutes**

### **RESOLVED -**

- i) That the minutes of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010 be approved
- ii) That the minutes of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2010 and circulated as a late item, be approved

## **194 Application 08/03405/FU, 08/03398/LI, 08/03418/FU and 08/03415/LI- Royds Green Farm, Royds Green Oulton LS26 - Appeal decision**

Further to minute 149 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> November 2008 where Panel resolved not to accept the Officer's recommendation to approve the applications for a residential development, Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out the Inspector's decisions on appeals lodged by the applicant

The appeals were dismissed although the Inspector was supportive of the principle of residential development at the farm and cottage buildings

Members were informed that pre-application discussions had been requested by the applicant on a revised scheme

**RESOLVED** - To note the report

**195 Application 08/06983/FU - 30 - 36 Rein Road Tingley LS27 - Appeal decision**

Further to minute 239 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2009 where Panel resolved not to accept the Officer's recommendation to approve an application for 11 dwellings and access at 30-36 Rein Road Tingley, Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out the Inspector's decision on an appeal lodged by the applicant

It was the decision of the Inspector to allow the appeal in a letter dated 1<sup>st</sup> February 2010

Members were informed that the Inspector decided not to impose a condition requiring a greenspace contribution which had resulted in a loss of a £25,000 contribution and that in future, where relevant, including a reason for refusal relating to greenspace should be considered

**196 Application 09/04871/FU - Three bedroom detached house with detached double garage - 36 West Park Avenue Roundhay LS8**

Plans, drawings and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers presented the report which sought permission for a three bedroom detached house at 36 West Park Avenue Roundhay LS8, with consideration of this being deferred from the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010 for a site visit

The Panel was informed that the applicant had submitted an appeal against non-determination. As Members could no longer consider the matter, an indication was required on what the Panel's decision would have been had it been in a position to determine the application

The Panel heard representations from an objector who attended the meeting. Whilst the applicant's agent had registered to speak he was not in attendance

Members discussed the highway issues relating to the proposals

**RESOLVED** - That had the Panel been in a position to determine the application, that it would have been approved subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report

**197 Application 09/04018/FU - Engineering works to form flood storage area Land off First Avenue Bardsey LS17**

Further to minute 172 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010 where Panel deferred consideration of the application to enable a site visit to be undertaken and for representatives of the Environment Agency to attend and respond to questions. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended. Members considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer

Officers presented the report which sought permission for engineering works to form a flood storage area on land at First Avenue Bardsey LS17 for a residential development initially approved in 1997

Representatives from the Environment Agency responded to questions from Members regarding the proposals; their impact on existing residents and the frequency of flooding

The Panel heard representations arising from the points made by the Environment Agency representatives from the applicant's agent and an objector who attended the meeting

Members considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** – That determination of the application be deferred to enable further discussions between Officers, the Environment Agency and local residents on the proposals and the impact of these on local flooding and that a further report be brought back to Panel in due course

### **198 Applications 09/05215/FU and 09/05216/CA - Erection of 3 detached houses to site of existing house and Conservation Area consent to demolish house - 2 North Lane Oulton LS26**

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers presented the report which sought permission for the demolition of an existing property and the erection of three detached houses at 2 North Lane Oulton LS26 which was situated in the Oulton Conservation Area

The Panel was informed that the application was the resubmission of a previous scheme which had been refused under delegated powers and subsequently dismissed on appeal. Amendments had been made to the proposals having considered the Inspector's comments on design, scale and siting

If minded to approve the application additional conditions were proposed in respect of window treatment, together with the deletion of conditions 3 and 4 of the submitted report

Officers reported the receipt of an objection from Councillor Golton on the grounds of over development and adverse impact on character and an additional objection relating to the Conservation Area application although this had not raised any new issues. The Victorian Society had objected on the loss of the garden, over development and design grounds

The Panel heard representations from an objector and the applicant's agent who attended the meeting

Members discussed the following matters:

- the impact of the proposals on the Conservation Area
- that the proposals were overintensive and did not provide sufficient garden and space for landscaping
- the siting of plots 2 and 3 with concerns that these were too close to Calverley Road
- the impact of plot 1 on the neighbouring property at 4 North Lane
- disappointment at the Inspector's disregard of the view of the chapel along Calverley Road
- that the proposals could be considered to be garden grabbing
- that two properties sited further back might be more appropriate

**RESOLVED -**

Application 09/0521/FU

That the Officer's recommendation to approve the application be not approved and to defer and delegate reasons for refusal to the Chief Planning Officer based upon the Panel's concerns regarding the adverse impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; the intensity of the building design and the balance between the built form and the space around it for gardens and landscaping

Application 09/0521/CA

That the Officer's recommendation for conservation area consent for demolition be refused on the grounds of the adverse impact on the appearance of the Conservation Area if demolition went ahead without an acceptable replacement scheme on the site

**199 Application 09/03138/FU - Three 4 bedroom detached houses with integral garage to rear garden and replacement detached double garage to existing dwelling - 10 Elmete Avenue Scholes LS15**

Further to minute 173 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010 where Panel deferred determination of the application for a small residential development at the rear of 10 Elmete Avenue Scholes LS15 to enable a site visit to take place, Members considered a further report

Plans were displayed at the meeting and a site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers stated that the applicant had lodged an appeal against non-determination. As Members could no longer consider the matter, an indication was required on what the Panel's decision would have been, had it been in a position to determine the application

**RESOLVED** - That had the Panel been in a position to determine the application it would have been refused for the following reasons:

- 1 The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed dwellings will be out of keeping with the spatial character of the area due to their location within an area of rear gardens. As a consequence the development is considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the locality and the overall design is inappropriate in its context and fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. The proposal, if allowed, would also create a precedent for similar development on neighbouring garden areas to the further detriment of the spatial character of the area. The application is therefore contrary to policies H4, N12 and N13 of the Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) and guidance contained within SPG13 Neighbourhoods for Living and the guidance set out within Planning Policy Statement 1 Delivering Sustainable Development and PPS3 Housing
- 2 The proposed residential development due to the site layout, disposition of houses and relationship to adjacent dwellings results in harm to residential amenity as a result of dominance, overlooking, noise and disturbance from vehicles, inadequate waste disposal

provision and poor space about dwellings. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to guidance in Neighbourhoods for Living and Policies GP5 and H4 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) and to guidance contained in PPS3 Housing

**200 Applications 09/005500/FU and 09/00501/CA - Erection of two 4 bedroom dwelling houses and three 3 bedroom houses and change of use of building, including extensions, to form one 4 bedroom house and Conservation Area application for demolition of workshops and storage buildings at rear of 134 - 140 High Street Boston Spa LS23**

Further to minute 174 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010 where Panel resolved not to accept the Officer's decision to grant planning permission and Conservation Area consent for the demolition of buildings and erection of a small residential development at 134-140 High Street Boston Spa LS23, Members considered a further report setting out possible reasons for refusal of the applications

**RESOLVED** – That the applications be refused for the following reasons:

Application 09/005500/FU

- 1 The proposed development, by virtue of the substandard width of the access drive from High Street, which would not allow for the two-way passing of vehicles and poor visibility at the junction with High Street, would result in hazardous vehicle movement to the detriment of highway safety in this locality, contrary to policies GP5 and T2 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review) 2006
- 2 The proposals makes inadequate provision for refuse storage and collection by reason of the substandard access width, which is likely to preclude access by refuse vehicles and the distance along which residents would have to transport bins from the proposed bin store on High Street. The development is therefore likely to lead to bins being left on High Street between collections, which would appear unsightly and further restrict visibility at the site access, to the significant detriment of the character and appearance of the streetscene and the Boston Spa conservation area and to highway safety in the locality. The proposals are therefore contrary to policies GP5, N19 and T2 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review) 2006 and the guidance in Leeds City Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Street Design Guide and Planning Policy Guidance 15: Planning and the Historic Environment

Application 09/00501/CA

In the absence of an acceptable scheme for the redevelopment of the site, the demolition of the existing buildings would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Boston Spa conservation area contrary to policy N18B of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan

**201 Application 09/01417/FU - Retention of use of building as a school and two storey extension at New Horizon Girls School Newton Hill Road Potternewton LS7**

Further to minute 108 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2009 where Panel deferred determination of the application for a two storey extension and retention of use of the building as a school at New Horizon Girls School Newton Hill Road LS7, Members considered a further report

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and stated that following the meeting in November, further discussions had taken place and a revised scheme which created more usable space had been submitted, with this now being recommended for approval

Members were informed of the receipt of two further letters of representation from the neighbour at 2 Harehills Lane requesting provision of obscure glazing of the first floor windows facing his property; the relocation of the front entrance to address noise issues; that a TPO covered tree within the site needed to be trimmed and the replacement of the boundary fence with a conifer hedge. Objections from two other neighbouring properties were also reported

Whilst Officers had considered these points it was not felt necessary to amend the recommendation and the issue around noise nuisance could be controlled by condition

The Panel was informed that comments made about the size of the school by the local MP and cited by an objector had been clarified, with Officers being informed that Fabian Hamilton MP had not stated that the school had outgrown the premises

The Panel heard representations on behalf of the applicant and an objector who attended the meeting

Members discussed the following matters:

- that the applicant had done much to address the previous concerns
- the fine cut of the stone on the existing building and how close the extension would match this
- the suggestion by a neighbour that not all local residents had been notified of the revised application

Officers stated that the file indicated that the revised application had been advertised in the usual way, ie in the local press and on lampposts

**RESOLVED** – That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report

(During consideration of this item, Councillor Taggart joined the meeting)

**202 Applications 09/01970/FU and 09/04179/FU - Erection of 1 block of 4 three bedroom and 4 four bedroom terrace houses each with integral garage and removal of condition 23 (affordable housing provision) of application 08/03698/FU - Parkfield Mills Queens Road Morley LS27**

(Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this matter, Councillor Leadley withdrew from the meeting)

Further to minute 96 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2009 where Panel approved in principle changes to the housing mix to be provided on part of the site but did not accept the Officer's recommendation to remove the condition requiring 25% affordable housing provision, Members considered a further report providing additional information and a possible reason for refusal of the application based on the Panel's previous comments

The Head of Planning Services stated that following a meeting with the Chair of Plans Panel East, Morley North and South Ward Members, Officers and the applicant, two further affordable units had been offered bringing the total number of units to 9 across the whole site which equated to affordable housing provision at 18%. In terms of the S106 Agreement, the applicant would provide all of the greenspace contribution before occupation of any further houses in the final phase

Morley Town Council had considered these proposals and had accepted that what was currently being offered was probably the best possible outcome on this site, at this time

Members commented on the following matters:

- that discussions on the level of affordable housing had been lengthy and that much work had been necessary to secure agreement of 25%; what was being offered was less which was not acceptable
- in circumstances such as this, the possibility of legally requiring a developer, within a specified period of time, to provide additional affordable housing if the housing market improved
- the current economic situation and the difficulties now being faced by developers following a buoyant period during which considerable profits had been made
- that developers were aware of the policy on affordable housing before embarking on schemes and that the recession should be a reason to provide more affordable housing
- that although Morley Town Council seemed willing now to accept the proposals, that the Panel had to consider the wider implications of the scheme
- that if a reduced level of affordable housing was accepted on this scheme how similar requests on other sites could be resisted

The Panel's Legal representative stated that an approach to issues of affordability based on viability assessments which could result in a more flexible approach to the delivery of affordable housing across a development was currently being considered. However this was focussed on a mechanism for regulating future developments rather than developments which were proceeding pursuant to consents which had been given in better economic times

The Head of Planning Services whilst noting Members' comments stated that despite the lack of profit for the developer there was a commitment to complete the scheme and that an improved offer of affordable housing had been negotiated. Furthermore the government had stated the need for LPAs to be flexible in the current economic circumstances

In this particular case development was at an advanced stage; that if the application was refused the developer would most likely go to appeal; that the Council could be at risk of losing the case as the affordable housing policy allowed

for financial viability to be taken into account and that the additional two units which had been offered and the greenspace contribution could be lost

Regarding the possibility of other developers seeking a reduced level of contributions and/or affordable housing, that an open book policy was the only way to examine the financial viability of a scheme as had been done in this case

Members considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED-** To approve in principle and to defer and delegate final approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report and subject to the completion of a unilateral undertaking relating to the transfer of affordable housing and payment of greenspace contribution

(Under Council Procedure Rule 16.5 Councillor Lyons required it to be recorded that he voted against the matter)

(Councillor Leadley resumed his seat in the meeting)

**203 Application 09/03976/FU - Re-cladding of and alterations to offices to form 2 four bedroom semi-detached houses each with attached double garage - Spear Fir Bardsey LS17**

Further to minute 179 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010 where Members deferred determination of the application for further negotiations, the Panel considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer

Officers presented the report which sought permission for a reduced scheme comprising two dwellings so providing a less intense development within the greenbelt

The proposed materials would be reclaimed stone and slate which was considered more appropriate to the setting

The Panel was informed that Councillor Rachael Procter had requested that a 10m buffer strip be required, with this being conditioned as part of an approval

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report

**204 Application 09/05196/RM - Reserved Matters application for one four bedroom detached house at South Lodge Woodacre Crescent Bardsey LS17**

Further to minute 178 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010 where Panel resolved not to accept the Officer's recommendation to approve a Reserved Matters application for a four bedroom detached house at South Lodge Woodacre Crescent LS17, Members considered a further report

Officers informed the Panel that the matter had been referred to the Compliance Team within the Department to take enforcement action against the unauthorised building

The Head of Planning Services informed the Panel that since the report had been written, the applicant had submitted an appeal against non-determination. As Members could no longer consider the matter, an indication was required on what the Panel's decision would have been, had it been in a position to determine the application

**RESOLVED** - That had the Panel been in a position to determine the application, that it would have been refused for the following reason:

The building, by virtue of its height and prominence within the streetscene, results in an overdominating feature which is detrimental to the character and appearance of Bardsey-cum-Rigton conservation area, contrary to policies GP5, N13 and N19 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) and the guidance in SPG 13: Neighbourhoods for Living, SPG 17: Bardsey-cum-Rigton Village Design Statement, Bardsey-cum-Rigton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, PPS1, PPS3 and PPG15

**205 Application 08/06412/FU - Amendments to siting & design of plots 145 & 146 from approved scheme (33/555/05/RM) within the Allerton Bywater Millennium Village development off Station Road Allerton Bywater WF10**

Further to minute 175 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February 2010 where Panel deferred consideration of the application to re-site and amend the design of properties on plots 145 and 146 of the Millennium Village development at Allerton Bywater to enable further discussions to take place on the proposals, Members considered a further report

The applicant had offered to alter the main material from art stone to red brick but was not willing to amend the siting of the properties or offer further design alterations

Members commented on the following matters:

- that Ward Members had not been involved in the discussions as had been requested
- that the proposals would result in overlooking of the existing bungalows
- the possibility of siting the two properties elsewhere in the site. The Panel was informed that the Millennium Village development comprised several plots to be developed in different phases. Within the context of this site, there was no room to site the properties in a different location

Members considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - That the Officer's recommendation to approve the application be not accepted and to defer and delegate the reasons for refusal to the Chief Planning Officer based upon the Panel's concerns relating to overlooking, dominance and the impact of the proposals on the residential amenity of neighbours

**206 Applications 08/06741/FU and 08/06742/FU - Extension to existing conference and exhibition centre for a period of 10 years and temporary car parking and erection of temporary plinth and support base for statue - Leeds United FC Ltd Elland Road Holbeck LS11**

Further to minute 238 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> April 2009 where Panel considered the applications together with a mixed-use development and the proposed extension to the east stand at LUFC, Elland Road LS11, Members considered a further report

Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Prior to considering the report, the Panel's Legal representative was asked to clarify the position in relation to when Members could be considered to have a prejudicial interest through attending matches

The Panel was informed that arising from an Ombudsman case, if Members were season ticket holders at the club or attended regularly then these would be considered to be prejudicial interests with Members needing to make a declaration and leave the room

Following this advice, no further interests were declared (minute 191 refers)

Officers presented the report which sought temporary planning permission for a ten year period for an extension to the existing conference and exhibition area, temporary car parking and erection of temporary plinth and support base for the Billy Bremner statue

Previously the Panel had approved, in principle, a 5 year temporary permission, however a longer period was being sought to enable the facilities to be considered for use if England was chosen to host the 2018 World Cup

Some improvements had been made to the previous design of the conference and exhibition centre which had rationalised the frontage of the building

Members were informed that the applicant was keen to commence on site to enable the work to be completed before the FIFA committee carried out inspections in August 2010

The number of car parking spaces to be provided would be 154 and not 140 as stated in the report and additional spaces for disabled parking would be provided. Highways had considered the proposed layout of the car park and satisfied with this

Concerning the siting of the Billy Bremner statue, an updated plan had been requested from the applicant

**RESOLVED** - To approve the applications in principle and to defer and delegate final approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions set out in the submitted and subject to an amendment to condition 5 to state 154 car parking spaces and the addition of the words at the end of the condition 'or suitable alternative agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority' and the submission of a revised siting plan for the Billy Bremner statue and the completion of an agreement under Section 106 of the Planning Act to require a travel plan and monitoring fee (£3,000) and a local training and employment undertaking

**207 Application 10/00412/FU - To erect new divisional police headquarters comprising offices, storage areas, custody suite, multi-level car park and secure yard at Former Greyhound Stadium - Elland Road LS11 - Position statement**

(Prior to consideration of this matter, Councillor Matthews left the meeting)

Plans, drawings, photographs and artists's impressions were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Members considered a position statement on proposals to erect a new divisional police headquarters on the former Greyhound Stadium on Elland Road, adjacent to LUFC

Officers presented the report and stated that whilst some images of the buildings had been provided, the layout would be part of a Reserved Matters application

The proposals were for offices, a 40 cell custody suite, a storage area, a 400 space multi-storey car park and surface parking of 100 spaces

The main access would be on Elland Road with an area of public realm being laid out to the front of the public access. A secondary emergency access which would also be used for service vehicles would be situated on Heath Road

Members were informed that the principle of development was acceptable to Officers but there were concerns at the scale of the proposals particularly the relationship between the 4 storey building and 277 Elland Road

Regarding highways issues, further information was being sought on the matters set out in the submitted report

In response to a question from the Panel, it was confirmed that the intention was for the headquarters to replace the police stations at Millgarth and Holbeck

Members commented on the following matters:

- whilst further information was awaited in relation to office use, the operational reasons why the police wanted to locate on this site should also be considered as part of the application
- the concerns raised by Highways at the level of parking required; the lack of justification for this and the need to consider that the site would be operating 24/7 with limited public transport available for staff after 11pm
- that the police used a range of vehicles and the view that there would be a reason for the amount of parking which had been requested
- whether a Green Travel Plan (GTP) had already been provided and the need to give the GTP careful consideration as although buses ran past the site, their destinations were limited compared to Millgarth and Holbeck
- the impact of the proposals on match day parking and whether mitigation measures would be put in place
- the likely increase in attendances if LUFC were ever promoted and the further impact this would have on highways issues and car parking
- that there had been good consultation locally about the application and local residents were supportive and wanted the development to proceed

Officers provided the following responses:

- that some of the parking spaces requested would be used for operational vehicles which were currently parked elsewhere
- that a framework GTP had been submitted and following contact with Officers, the applicant was undertaking more work on this

Regarding match day parking, a detailed discussion took place during which the following points were made:

- there was a suggestion that part of the multi-storey car park could be used for club officials, but further information was required. Members raised concerns at this suggestion which they considered could have security implications
- that Officers were of the view there was sufficient car parking for spectators. That the level of parking had been assessed some years ago when an application for an arena on the site was being considered with 2750 spaces being the number decided upon. Concerns were raised at this suggestion particularly in view of the level of on-street parking on match days both around the ground and some distance away. Whilst a figure of 2750 spaces had been considered to be

sufficient, Officers were informed that this had not been agreed by the local Ward Members who considered a figure of 4000 spaces was more realistic

- the need to ascertain whether people were having to park on the highway or were choosing to do this
- the possibility of extending the residents' parking scheme as part of the application

In relation to the specific questions asked of Members in the report, the following responses were provided:

- mixed views about the principle of development on the site, with some Members supportive of this whilst others had concerns, particularly in view of the proximity of LUFC which would have a major impact
- regarding scale and layout, generally acceptable but concerns about the relationship to 277 Elland Road and how that transition in scale was handled on site given level differences. There was also concern at the possible impact on residents of Heath Road which was a narrow road and would require adequate planting to help the relationship across the road
- in relation to highways matters, to note the comments which had been made together with the view that the use of the access on Heath Road needed to be clearly defined given its residential character otherwise it could give rise to substantial complaint locally

**RESOLVED** - To note the report and the comments now made

(During consideration of this matter, Councillor Leadley left the meeting)

## **208 Date and time of next meeting**

Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> April 2010 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds