

PLANS PANEL (WEST)

THURSDAY, 13TH OCTOBER, 2011

PRESENT: Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, M Coulson, K Groves,
J Hardy, J Harper, T Leadley, J Matthews,
P Wadsworth, R Wood and D Wilson

54 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Plans Panel (West).

He reported that site visits had been requested for the following items:

- Agenda Item 10 – Application 11/02847/FU – 21 Lower Wortley Road, Wortley, LS12
- Agenda Item 15 – Application 11/01803/ADV – Leeds Bradford International Airport

RESOLVED – That Agenda Items 10 and 15 be deferred to allow for site visits to take place.

55 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Taggart declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 12, Applications 11/03008/LI & 11/03009/FU – The Manor House and Clitheroe House, Our Lady and All Saints Church, Manor Square, Otley, LS 21 due to his position as Chair of West Yorkshire Joint Services Committee and the fact that the West Yorkshire Archaeological Service had made comment on the application. Councillor Hardy also made the same interest due to his position as a substitute Member of West Yorkshire Joint Services Committee.

56 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Chastney. Councillor D Wilson was in attendance as substitute.

57 Minutes

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2011 be confirmed as a correct record.

58 APPLICATION 11/03274/FU - British Home Stores, Bridge Road, Kirkstall, LS5

The report of the Chief Planning Officer informed the Panel of progress on an application submitted by Metric Property, Kirkstall for a mixed retail development at the British Home Stores site on Bridge Road.

Members were shown site plans of the application and alterations that had been made were explained. These included access, car parking and the

service road. Ward Members had commented on the new proposals and had given their support and encouraged the developers to work with neighbours and community involvement. Further issues highlighted included the inclusion of an Ionic Clock, the use of car parking at the site by users of the rugby pitches, use of the footbridge and Section 106 contributions for public transport.

Members attention was brought to the conclusions in the report on which they were invited to comments. In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Further to concerns that there would be higher volumes of traffic, it was reported that a revised assessment had been carried out by Urban Traffic Control and there had been no further issues or significant differences to the previous scheme.
- Use of the footbridge – there was no formal permission granted to users of the rugby fields but it was used on a casual basis.
- Views across to Kirkstall Abbey – the proposed development was a storey lower than previous plans, there were no pictures of the view from the Abbey and these would be provided before the determination stage.
- Concern regarding the reduction in car parking – it was reported that discussions to increase the proposed car parking were ongoing.
- Public transport contribution – this did not include the New Generation Transport scheme.
- Environmental works – work along the river boundary and the provision of a survey on Otters.

RESOLVED – That the proposals be agreed in general.

(Councillor Taggart declared a personal interest in this item due to his position as a Board Member of Kirkstall Valley Park and Councillor Harper declared a personal and prejudicial interest due to previous discussions surrounding the application and left the meeting following her declaration and took no part in the discussion or decision making on this item)

59 APPLICATION 11/03503/FU - Adjacent to Emmott House, Town Street, Rawdon, LS19

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to an application for an amendment to an approved application for a 4 bedroomed detached dwelling house with integral garage on land adjacent to Emmott House, Town Street, Rawdon. The application had been referred to Plans Panel because of its retrospective nature.

A site visit had taken place earlier in the day and Members were shown copies of the site plans, original site plans and photographs of the development.

The application had been made for re-siting as the building had been erected 2 metres closer to Emmott House than in the original plans. There were also

amendments to the elevation of the building. Objections had been raised by the owner of Emmott House. It was further reported that there had been a previous approved application for Emmott House to have an extension at the front which would face the new building. This application had now expired.

The objector to the application addressed the Panel and raised concerns regarding the distance of the new building to Emmott House, the height of the building and that amendments to the application had been made without his knowledge or being informed by Leeds City Council. Members questioned the objector and issues discussed included the progress on the building works and the previous application for an extension to Emmott House.

The agent for the application addressed the Panel and referred to the previous application that was granted and the revisions that had been made which led to the submission of the second application. In response to Members comments and questions, it was reported that planning permission had been granted prior to the sale of the land concerned and confirmed that a hedge closer to Emmott House than on the plans and the reason for the new building to have been erected in its position.

RESOLVED – That the report be approved subject to the conditions specified in the report.

60 APPLICATION 11/02569/FU - 82 Moorland Road, Pudsey, LS28

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to the application that was presented to the September meeting of Plans Panel (West). It was reported that Building Control had met on site with the applicants and builder and that agreement had been reached for identified defects to be rectified. Building Control would continue to monitor the development. Further discussion was held regarding the patterned brickwork on the development and the removal of the first floor of the extension. The Panel was informed that neighbours were happy with the revised proposals and amendments and Members were asked to consider giving a time limit for the works to be carried out.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved and that works be completed within a nine month time limit.

61 APPLICATION 11/02795/EXT - Former Woodside Dyeworks, Low Lane, Horsforth, LS18

The report of the Chief Planning Officer informed Members of an application for the extension of time for the implementation of an outline planning permission (reference 08/04075/OT).

It was reported that there was a proposed change to the provision of affordable housing within the application and also a change to the developers contributions.

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

- Inclusion of rail travel with Metrocard contributions. Concern was raised that there had been changes to the price of Metrocards since the initial application and it was requested that a revised figure be pursued.
- Concern that the provision of affordable housing didn't reflect what was previously agreed. It was reported that Council policy had changed since the initial application.

RESOLVED – That the application be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions outlined in the report and subject to revisions for the metro card provision regarding the inclusion of rail travel and pricing.

Councillor Leadley requested that his abstention from the voting on this item be recorded.

62 APPLICATIONS 11/03008/LI & 11/03009/FU - The Manor House and Clitheroe House, Our Lady and All Saints Church, Manor Square, Otley, LS21

The report of the Chief Planning Officer was brought to Plans Panel following a request by a Ward Member who was concerned about the impact of the proposed parking on the setting of the listed building and character and appearance of the conservation area. There was also concern about the detail of the rear elevation of the extension to Clitheroe House.

Photographs and site plans were shown at the meeting.

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

- Car parking could be restricted to occupants of the apartments.
- That occupancy of the apartments be kept under control of the Diocese.
- Disappointment was expressed that the opportunity to improve the rear elevation of the extension had not been taken.

RESOLVED – That the planning permission and listed building consent be granted, subject to the conditions discussed and detailed in the report.

63 Application 07/01373/FU - Carnegie College Campus, Church Wood Avenue, LS16

The report of the Chief Planning Officer detailed a request to vary permission granted in 2008 regarding a Section 106 agreement that stipulated that student occupiers undertook not to use a car in association with their occupation of the flats. It was reported that there was spare capacity for parking at the campus and a proposal to allow students to use the parking had arisen following discussions with Leeds Metropolitan University, Ward Members and local residents further to concerns regarding parking on local streets.

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

- Enforcement issues
- Provision of resident only parking in the surrounding areas.
- A suggestion that Leeds Metropolitan University could contribute towards the provision of resident only parking zones.

RESOLVED – That the proposed variation to the S106 legal agreement to permit the use of the car park by student occupants of the flats at the campus be agreed.

64 APPLICATION 11/02910/OT - Netherfield Mills, Netherfield Road, Guiseley, LS20

The report of the Chief Planning Officer which referred to a recent appeal decision following a public inquiry. The planning permission granted on appeal was an outline consent which was valid until March 2014, and was subject to a requirement to provide affordable housing at a ratio of 30% which was Council policy at the time of the appeal decision in March 2011. Following the approval of an Interim Affordable Housing Policy by the Executive Board in May 2011 which reduced the ratio of affordable housing to 15%, the applicant had submitted an application on the basis of provision at the 15% level.

Further issues in relation to the application included the following:

- Developer contributions
- The applicants would be on-site from December 2011 and would be building 40 dwellings per year
- There would be a further application from the developer.
- Removal of a condition regarding surface water control
- A query regarding sustainable homes certification in relation to building regulation changes.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred and delegated for approval subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement within three months from the date of the resolution to ensure the developer contributions outlined in the report and subject to other conditions also outlined in the report.

65 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday, 10 November 2011 at 1.30 p.m.