

Plans Panel (East)

Thursday, 20th January, 2011

PRESENT: Councillor D Congreve in the Chair

Councillors R Finnigan, R Grahame,
P Gruen, G Latty, M Lyons, K Parker,
J Procter, A Taylor and D Wilson

122 Chair's opening remarks

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

123 Late Items

Although there were no formal late items, Panel Members were in receipt of the following additional information to be considered at the meeting:

Application 10/04677/FU – 261 Roundhay Road LS8 – written representations from Councillor Arif Hussain (minute 134 refers)

124 Declarations of Interest

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

Application 10/03637/LA – Richmond Hill Primary School Clark Crescent LS9 – Councillor Grahame declared a personal interest as he had met with the Headteacher and Officers about the application (minute 133 refers)

Application 10/03637/LA – Richmond Hill Primary School Clark Crescent LS9 – Councillor Lyons declared personal interests through being the former Chair of Governors of Mount St Mary's RC Primary School which had merged with Richmond Hill Primary School and through previously being a Ward Member for the area (minute 133 refers)

Application 06/06976/FU – Clonmore Farm King Lane LS16 – Councillor Lyons declared a personal interest as a member of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as Metro were in contractual arrangements with the applicant (minute 135 refers)

Application 23/312/04/FU – Kalon Ltd Wide Lane Morley LS27 – Councillor Finnigan declared a personal interest as a member of Morley Town Council which had commented on the application (minute 127 refers)

Agenda item 17 – eight sites in Beeston Hill and Holbeck – Councillor Gruen declared a personal interest as the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods and Housing as the applications related to a PFI scheme providing 100% social housing. Councillor Gruen stated that whilst he had some knowledge of the applications he had not formed any decision on them (minute 136 refers)

125 Minutes

RESOLVED - That the minutes of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 16th December 2010 be approved

126 Matters arising from the minutes

With reference to minute 109 of the meeting held on 16th December 2010, Application 10/04283/FU – 51 Pondsfield Drive LS25, which Panel was minded to refuse, Members were informed that the applicant had now withdrawn the application

127 Request to withdraw items from the agenda

The Chair informed Members that in respect of Application 10/04241/RM – 16A Church Lane LS17 – an issue had been raised by a Ward Member in respect of the Inspector's decision letter on the outline planning permission. A request to withdraw the report to consider this matter was made

In relation to application 23/312/04/FU – Wide Lane Morley LS27 – a request to withdraw the report was made to address a late concern from the neighbouring land owner about the noise levels set out in the suggested planning condition

In response to a question from the Panel, the Lead Officer stated that it was the intention to bring a report back at the earliest opportunity

RESOLVED - To withdraw the above items from the agenda

128 Application 10/02898/FU - Erection of detached 5 bedroom house with attached double garage to equestrian/kennels/cattery - Cleavesty Centre Cleavesty Lane East Keswick LS17

Further to minute 106 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 16th December 2010 where Panel resolved not to accept the Officer's recommendation to approve an application for a five bedroom detached dwelling house with attached double garage, Members considered a further report

Officers presented the report and informed Panel that since the previous meeting the applicant had lodged an appeal against non-determination which had been validated by the Planning Inspectorate and confirmation had been received that this would be dealt by a Public Inquiry

As the Panel could not now determine the application, an indication was sought on how it would have determined the application had it been in a position to do so

If the Panel would have been minded to refuse the application, minor amendments to the suggested reasons for refusal contained in the submitted report were suggested

RESOLVED - That if Panel had been able to determine the application, it would have refused permission for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposed dwelling constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would result in harm to the rural character and appearance of the Green Belt and to the objectives of Green Belt policy by virtue of the siting, scale and design of the proposed dwelling. In the absence of very special circumstances sufficient to justify the setting aside of the presumption against

inappropriate development, the proposed dwelling is considered to be contrary to policies GP5, N32, N33 of the adopted UDP and to the guidance contained in PPG2

2 The proposed dwelling is considered to be of a contemporary design that is out of keeping with the surrounding area (particularly with the nearby East Keswick Conservation Area) that is characterised by traditional forms of architecture thereby causing harm to visual amenity of this Special Landscape Area. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policies N13, GP5 and BD5 of the adopted UDP and to the guidance contained in PPS1 and in the East Keswick Village Design Statement

129 Application 10/04417/FU - Retrospective application for one storage shed and one new storage shed to front of Bingley Cottage 41 Church Lane Bardsey LS17

Further to minute 111 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 16th December 2010 where Panel deferred consideration of a retrospective application for a storage shed and one new shed at Bingley Cottage to enable further discussions to take place on possible resiting of the sheds, with possible reasons for refusal of the application being included if agreement could not be reached, Members considered a further report

Officers presented the report and stated that the applicant did not wish to relocate the sheds

RESOLVED - That the application be refused for the following reason:

The Local Planning Authority considers that the existing and proposed sheds by reason of their prominent siting to the front of the dwelling will harm the character and appearance of the Bardsey conservation area. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policy N19 of the Unitary Development Plan Review (2006)

130 Application 10/04398/FU - Glazed balcony to existing flat roofed rear extension - 34 Thorp Arch Park Thorp Arch LS23

Further to minute 110 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 16th December 2010 where determination of an application for the removal of a restrictive condition imposed upon application 31/143/01/FU at 34 Thorp Arch Park to enable the use of a flat roof of a single storey extension as a terrace together with the erection of a glazed balcony to the edge of the proposed terrace, was deferred to enable further discussions to take place, particularly on a revised proposal suggested by the applicant, Members considered a further report

The Panel was informed that the applicant had since withdrawn the compromise solution which had been outlined in the previously submitted report and wished for the application to be determined as set out before Members

Receipt of a further letter of representation from the resident at 32 Thorp Arch Park was reported

Whilst the Officer's recommendation was to grant permission, in view of some of the comments expressed at the previous meeting, a possible reason for refusal based on the Panel's concerns had been included in the report

RESOLVED - That the application be refused for the following reason:

The Local Planning Authority considers that the removal of the restrictive condition and the erection of the balcony and glazed screen represent an un-neighbourly and intrusive form of development which will increase the perception of activity within close proximity to the common boundary and will lead to an increased perception of overlooking. This is then considered harmful to the residential amenity of the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling, contrary to the aims and intentions of policy GP5 of the Unitary Development Plan (Review) 2006

131 Application 10/03600/FU - Change of use and alterations of house in multiple occupation to 3 flats including rear dormer and car parking to rear at 182 Harehills Avenue Harehills LS8

Further to minute 114 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 16th December 2010 where Panel resolved not to accept the Officer's recommendation to approve an application for a change of use of 182 Harehills Avenue LS8 to 3 flats, Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out a possible reason for refusal of the application, for Panel's consideration

RESOLVED - That the application be refused for the following reason:

The Local Planning Authority considers the proposed development to be unacceptable due to the number of conversions of family houses to flats along the terrace row, such that any further conversions of this nature would have cumulative detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings, due to intensification of use and increased activity. In addition, the development would adversely impact on the existing residential character of the area and balance of housing mix, where there is an increasing need for family accommodation. As such, the proposed development is considered to be contrary to policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review) 2006, policy SGH1 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance 6: Development of self contained flats and Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development

132 Application 10/03826/FU - One 3 bedroom agricultural workers' dwelling with attached garage at Riverside Nurseries Linton Common Linton LS22

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought permission for one 3 bedroom dwelling with attached garage at Riverside Nurseries, Linton Common LS22 for an agricultural worker

Permission for the siting of a temporary static caravan on the site was granted by Plans Panel East at its meeting on 22nd November 2007 (minute 144 refers)

Members were informed that the proposal was to erect a permanent dwelling on the site in place of the caravan. Whilst there was a general presumption against new residential development in the Green Belt, horticultural activities fell within the definition of agriculture and new agricultural dwellings were justified in cases where it could be established that the business was viable and there was a functional need for an on-site residential presence. The Council's Agricultural Surveyor had

considered the information submitted by the applicant in respect of viability and the functional need and was satisfied these tests had been met

The Panel was informed that the proposed dwelling house would be subject to a condition tying the occupancy of the property to employment at the Nursery and that the proposals were acceptable in highways terms

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

Members commented on the following matters:

- whether there was a need for 24 hour attendance on the site for emergency maintenance and that one of the largest nurseries in the city, Redhall, did not require a continuous presence on their site
- that the property would not be for an agricultural worker, but for the person who ran the business, as stated by the applicant's agent
- highways issues, in that Linton Lane which was a single, unmade track in poor condition and already had a number of houses served by it
- that a more modest, 1 bedroom property, rather than the 3 bedroom house being proposed might be more suitable
- that the proposal sought to secure development in a desirable location within the Green Belt

Members considered how to proceed

RESOLVED - That the Officer's recommendation to grant permission be not accepted and that the Chief Planning Officer be asked to submit a further report to the next meeting setting out possible reasons for refusal of the application based upon the Panel's concerns relating to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, failure to demonstrate a functional need for the development and the scale of the proposals

133 Application 10/03637/FU - Demolition of existing school and erection of replacement school with nursery soft and hard play areas, car parking, landscaping and provision of replacement rugby pitch with 8m high ball stop fencing to 3 boundaries - Richmond Hill Primary School Clark Crescent Cross Green LS9

Plans, drawings, photographs and graphics 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 replacement school at Richmond Hill Primary School LS9, together with a replacement rugby pitch and ball stop fencing

Members were informed that the proposal would involve the erection of the new school on a protected playing pitch, with temporary off-site playing provision during the construction process; the demolition of the existing school and finally the construction of the replacement rugby pitch, with a completion date for these works expected to be November 2012

Officers stated that Sport England had withdrawn their objection to the proposals and that clarification had been sought from the Rugby Football League that the pitch sizes were acceptable. An additional condition requiring the multi-use games area to be constructed to required standards would be included. If minded to approve the application an additional condition relating to highways was requested and condition no 20, relating to the welly walk should be deleted

Members were advised that a travel plan monitoring fee of £500 per annum over a 5 year period would be paid by the applicants/school to ensure effective implementation and up-dating of the plan

Receipt of a letter from Hilary Benn MP was reported, with the details of this being read out for Members' consideration

The Panel heard representations from Education Leeds and an objector who attended the meeting

Members commented on the following matters:

- the difficulty in securing funding for schools and that a new school was needed in this area
- the success of the East Leeds Amateur Rugby League Club (ELARLC) who used the protected playing pitch and that being relocated for a period of time would have an impact, particularly a financial one
- concerns that ELARC's needs had not been properly considered, that assurances which had been given had not been implemented and that Officer support for the club in this matter should be put in writing
- concerns at the proposal for a three form entry school
- highways issues, whether 45 car parking spaces were sufficient; that currently there was congestion in the area and there was an absence of on-street parking controls in the immediate area surrounding the school. The Panel's Highways representative stated that the majority of pupils walked to the current school; that the proposed car park layout would be an efficient in/out system, with the number of spaces being provided being at the top end of the UDP threshold and that TROs would be implemented in discussion with Ward Members
- the possibility of negotiations taking place which could satisfy both parties and that details of these should be reported back to Panel

Members considered how to proceed

RESOLVED - That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, with the deletion of condition no 20 and additional conditions relating to:

- multi-use games area to be constructed to required standards
- details of baffle arrangement to be erected at pedestrian access point
- a project plan to be submitted for agreement (including arrangements for playing provision for the ELARLC during and post construction of the school)

That details submitted pursuant to the above condition to be reported back to Panel for consideration and determination

(After consideration of this matter, Councillor Gruen left the meeting)

134 Application 10/04611/FU - Change of use involving alterations and 3 storey rear extension of shop (A2) with living accommodation over, to shop (A2) with 2 one bedroom flats over and integral garage - 261 Roundhay Road LS8

Plans 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 for a change of use and extension of 261 Roundhay Road LS8 to form a shop and 2 one bedroom flats. Members were

advised that the site was in the Gipton and Harehills Ward and not Kippax and Methley Ward as stated in the report

Officers were of the view that the proposals would result in overlooking and that the three storey extension would be intrusive and incongruous. Discussions had taken place with the applicant to seek revisions to reduce the impact of the scheme on the neighbouring property; the applicant had declined to amend the scheme

The Panel heard representations on behalf of the applicant

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

1 In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority it is considered that the proposed three storey extension would by reason of its scale, north-westerly projection, overall height and prominent siting in context with its surroundings, represent an intrusive and incongruous form of development being specifically prejudicial to the architectural integrity of the adjacent property at 263 Roundhay Road and character of the street scene as a whole. As such, the proposed development is contrary to Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) and Planning Policy Statement PPS1: Sustainable Development

2 In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority it is considered that the proposed development would, by reason its siting and height result in overlooking of residential properties and garden areas situated on Back Hill Top Mount resulting in a loss of privacy for their occupants and general deterioration in the enjoyment of their property. As such, the development is prejudicial to interests of residential amenity thereby conflicting with Policies GP5 and BD5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) and the City Council's Supplementary Planning Guide – Neighbourhoods for Living

135 Application 06/06976/FU - Laying out of access and erection of two storey sports changing rooms, tractor shed and creation of 21 sports pitches with car parking and landscaping - Clonmore Farm King Lane Moortown LS17

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought permission for creation of 21 sports pitches, changing rooms, car parking, landscaping, access and a tractor shed at Clonmore Farm King Lane LS16, which was situated in the Green Belt and in a Special Landscape Area

A previous report on the application had been considered by Plans Panel East at its meeting held on 15th February 2007 (minute 295 refers) where Panel approved the application in principle and delegated final approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to conditions and the completion of a S106 Agreement. The S106 Agreement had not been completed and Members were informed that whilst there had been no changes to the content of the proposed development since that time, the reason for the applicant's – Leeds University - proposals for sports pitches was driven by the Council's need for additional burial space at Lawnswood Cemetery together with the possible provision of a Park and Ride facility at Bodington Hall

Whilst burial space at Lawnswood Cemetery was still needed, as only family burials continued to take place there, the emphasis had now moved more towards the NGT scheme which was aimed at improving transport in Leeds

If minded to approve the application, an extension of the time limit to implement the permission to 7 years was sought in order to tie in with timescales for the NGT

An Officer from the NGT Team attended the meeting and responded to questions from the Panel

Members discussed the following matters:

- the size of the proposal and whether if the Council was not moving forward on buying land from the University for burial purposes that the scheme could be reduced. Members were informed that the University of Leeds wished to house all their sporting facilities in one location for management purposes so was not seeking to reduce the number of pitches it required
- the links between the development, burial space and the NGT scheme, with Officers stating that the grant of planning permission for the pitches would provide a basis for negotiations with the applicant and enable the proposed Park and Ride Scheme at Bodington Hall to progress. Regarding the NGT scheme, the new government had asked for the proposals to be resubmitted after an initial halt and an expression of interest had been placed by the Council with Department of Transport
- that the application was premature in view of the other issues relating to it

RESOLVED - That determination of the application be deferred for a further report to be submitted to Panel setting out further information on how the grant of planning permission could be linked to the implementation of the NGT project at Bodington Hall and to include an update on burial provision

136 Eight sites in Beeston Hill and Holbeck

(Prior to consideration of the following matters, Councillor Finnigan and Councillor Procter left the meeting)

Plans graphics and photographs were displayed at the meeting

Panel considered a position statement on reserved matters applications for residential development of 8 sites and full applications for refurbishment works in Beeston Hill and Holbeck

Outline planning permission had been granted by Panel at the Plans Panel East meeting held on 23rd October 2008 (minute 127 refers) and since that time there had been a pre-application presentation to Members in October 2010

Officers outlined the amendments which had been made to the scheme in view of Members' previous comments and stated that around 500 flats had been demolished across the sites to make way for 275 new dwellings which would be 100% social housing in a mix of 149 houses and 126 flats. To meet the funding timescales it was intended to bring the applications to the February Panel for determination

Members were informed that overall, there had been a reduction in the amount of render being used within the scheme; that revisions to the landscaping scheme would be made and it was felt there would be acceptable levels of planting provided. Following discussions with Councillor Nash on the scheme, the applicant had agreed to remove all public communal seating from the proposals and that whilst

the existing green areas would be improved and upgraded, there would be no additional public greenspace, although private green areas were being provided

A detailed presentation on each site followed

Members commented in general on the scheme as follows:

- that the amount of render needed to be reduced, with Members being informed that some of graphics displayed at the meeting had not been updated to reflect the changes already made to this
- that ginnels should be removed from the proposals
- that off-street parking was needed and should be overlooked for increased security
- that the landscaping scheme should not include tree planting in gardens, with trees being sited in the main on highway verges
- the lack of play areas and open spaces in the scheme
- that details of the tree species should be provided and that it was inappropriate to site large trees close to houses
- to note the response from the Council's Regeneration Officer who attended the meeting that residents could chose to be rehoused if they wished
- that further information was needed on the temporary rehousing and compensation process/provision for those residents whose homes would be refurbished as part of the proposals and that obtaining photographic evidence before refurbishment commenced should be considered
- that appropriate health and safety measures be taken if removing canopies which contained asbestos. Members were assured that the legislation around asbestos removal would be complied with
- that the drains should be adopted. Members were informed that a condition relating to drainage would be included and that in the main, existing adopted drainage was being used
- the need to ensure all details are fully covered in the contract with the provider

In terms of site specific comments by Members, these were:

- Folly Lane
 - reduce render
 - revisit ginnels
 - proposed cherry tree unsuitable in this location
- Holbeck Towers
 - remove render from top of gable
 - design out ginnels
- Coupland Road
 - no comment
- St Luke's Green
 - provision of walls to front boundaries instead of railings
 - houses to be moved further back to increase depth of frontage
- Coupland Place

- no comment
- Malvern Road
- incorporate incidental open space into gardens
- Bismarck Street/Bismarck Drive
- replace timber cladding with brick
- remove trees to triangular area of grassed land
- replace balconies with Juliet balconies
- reconsider front boundary treatment
- Fairfax Road
- block at head of cul-de-sac considered to be too dominant and should be reduced/split in two
- Meynell Heights
- sample panels of cladding materials to be presented to Panel
- photographs of the Sherburn Court development or other similar buildings to be provided to Panel ahead of the meeting, for consideration
- replace dark grey around edge of building with light grey to match the plinth

RESOLVED - To note the report and the comments now made

(Following consideration of this matter, Councillor Lyons left the meeting)

137 Skelton Grange, Cross Green and Knostrop Waste Treatment site

Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer providing information on the progress of the anticipated Energy from Waste (EfW) facility planning applications, also referred to as Energy Recovery Facility (ERF)

A pre-application presentation had been made to Members in August 2010 by Biffa for a commercial and industrial EfW facility and the Council was in the process of procuring its own residual waste treatment plant which would incorporate an EfW facility. A site visit to an EfW facility in Sheffield had taken place in November 2010 and several Panel Members had attended with Officers

In view of the concerns regarding safety and monitoring which were raised during the pre-application presentation, an Officer from the Environment Agency (EA) attended the meeting to explain the regulatory and permitting role of the EA and to respond to questions from the Panel

Members viewed a film showing an EfW facility

Mr Longden, a Regulatory Officer in the EA provided the following information and responded to Members' questions

- that as a statutory consultee, the EA would advise the LPA on how proposals could affect the environment
- an Environmental Permit for an incinerator could be granted without planning permission being in place

- that the EA must be satisfied that a proposal for such a facility met directives, with the application being assessed technically and consulted upon with a range of people including the local community and experts
- matters such as highways issues, visual appearance and opening hours were not matters the EA would address, as these related to the planning permission
- once the permit was in place, the compliance programme was implemented which would comprise a range of methods including monitoring; inspection; audits and review reports. If issues did arise, the EA would work with the operator to resolve them but that enforcement action could be taken if needed as in the case of a Stop Notice being served on a facility on the Isle of Wight and a fine of £30,000 handed out to a company in Kent
- as to whether there was a health and safety risk posed by an incinerator, that a report from the Health Protection Agency (available on EA website) which used the best available technologies concluded there was no significant impact to health and that limits on emissions existed
- that the storage of heavy metals did not relate to issues of safety but that this material was reused in aggregates
- that dioxins could have an impact but that the limits were set in line with World Health Organisation levels
- in terms of siting of such facilities, the EA did not advise on the most appropriate sites as it was beyond their remit. However, the EA would look to ensure that an applicant had demonstrated that the proposals were technically possible and that they met the best available technologies
- that sites had to comply with regulations and that operators tend to operate within a safety margin of the permitted emission level the plant operated at. In terms of monitoring, the site visited by Panel was visited 8-10 times per year and was continuously monitored to a specific standard
- there is a scheme of monitoring which has to be complied with; that equipment had to be tested and calibrated and officers undertaking the monitoring had to be qualified. Monitoring reports would be submitted to the EA as set out in the Permit and would show the daily/hourly average during the monitoring period together with details of any exceedences
- in respect of whether any one way of dealing with metal waste was preferable, much depended upon the technology being used together with consideration of the waste content and the use of the residual waste
- in terms of which method, ie landfill or incineration was least harmful to the environment, that both had different impacts; that landfill space was running out; that recycling as much as possible was important and that both methods were controlled to minimise their impact. As such, incineration is considered to be more sustainable

- in respect of possible accidents, the tubes carrying the steam generated from the hot gases may occasionally fail, therefore there is a requirement for the operator to stop feeding the waste in. Whilst the furnace cannot stop burning, there would be an abatement system in place, and it would be unlikely this pipework would rupture. In such cases there would be an emergency plan and access to the site might wish to be controlled as an emergency response. However, Mr Longden stated he was not aware of evacuation plans beyond the site
- where an accident had occurred, the Environmental Permit could require an operator to improve technology if required and the various different improvements sites could make were currently being reviewed, however as long as the improvements were recognised as the best available technologies, they would be acceptable
- regarding energy use where possible the EA would look for the operator to have re-use of the energy and there would be tax incentives for this but as this was a commercial agreement, the EA could not insist upon it. Mr Longden reiterated that the EA did not have an interest in the siting of such facilities and that it would be for the applicant to demonstrate how the energy generated would be re-used
- in terms of comparisons between emissions generated from the tower or a trunk road or inner city motorway, the height of the tower – 80 – 90m high would mean that the distance of the emissions would be much greater than a car on the road, so the concentrations were lower
- that the concerns raised about the possibility of legionella in the water stack emissions were matters for the HSE and not the EA
- regarding monitoring reports and exceedences, limits would be set for elements and bottom ash components and these would be monitored. In relation to the emissions from the stack, limits would be set and these would depend upon the type of plant it was. Data would be logged half-hourly and hourly together with some 10 minute averages and a daily average. There were allowances for 3 hourly exceedences in a day to allow, for example, for the distribution of waste across the grate. A graph would be produced and submitted, depending on what the Permit said; EA Officers would also visit. Wherever there is an exceedence a Notice has to be submitted to the EA including details of what had been done to bring it back into compliance. If the exceedence would not be brought back consideration would be given to shutting the facility down
- Environmental Permits once issued lasted indefinitely until they were surrendered but did include review periods, particularly where there had been legislative changes
- the monitoring reports were public as were the compliance reports, and for this area, these would be held at Phoenix House. Additionally, operators were required to make their environmental information public
- that the height of the stack could vary but the higher it was, the less impact there would be on air quality at ground level. Stack heights were from 40 – 100m but the higher the stack was the more expensive the scheme would be

- in terms of the ERF process, this was used worldwide and the WHO report stated there was no significant impact on human health from it

It was suggested that a representative from the Environment Agency and the Principal Minerals Planner should attend a future meeting of the relevant Area Committee and Community Forum

The Chair thanks Mr Longden for the presentation and the information which had been provided

RESOLVED - i) To note the contents of the report and the comments now made

ii) That Officers provide Members with a sample Permit, for information and consideration

(Towards the end of the discussions on this matter, Councillor Latty left the meeting)

138 Date and time of next meeting

Thursday 17th February 2011 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds