

## **NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 16TH NOVEMBER, 2023**

**PRESENT:** Councillor J Akhtar in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, J Heselwood,  
D Jenkins, R Jones, J McKenna, M Millar,  
N Sharpe and R. Stephenson

### **SITE VISITS**

The following Councillors attended the site visits:  
Cllr Akhtar, Cllr Anderson, and Cllr Jones.

#### **52 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

**53**

#### **54 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There were no exempt items.

**54**

#### **Late Items**

There were no late items.

#### **55 Declaration of Interests**

No declarations of interest were made at the meeting.

#### **56 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies.

#### **57 Minutes - 19th October 2023**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2023, be approved as a correct record.

#### **58 22/05970/RM - Reserved Matters Application for residential development of 407 dwellings within the Northern Quadrant to approve details in relation to access (save for those details approved by the Outline permission), layout, scale, appearance and landscaping (Condition 1) pursuant to Outline Planning permission 12/02571/OT; on land at Phase A of the Northern Quadrant, East Leeds Extension, Leeds, LS14.**

The Reserved Matters application was presented to Plans Panel to seek views on the proposals for 407 dwellings on the first phase of the development within the Whinmoor Fields, 'Northern Quadrant' of the East Leeds Extension. This followed a pre-application presentation for 423 dwellings, which had been brought to the Panel on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2022.

Members had attended a site visit earlier in the day. Slides, photographs and CGI's were provided throughout the officer presentation.

Members were informed of the following points:

- This application related to the north-western part of the 'Whinmoor Fields' site, spanning from Wetherby Road to east of Coal Road. The application is one of a number of Phases that already benefits from an outline planning permission for means of access and erection of up to 2,000 residential properties, retail, health centre, community centre and primary school development. It was noted that the remainder of the site was to be developed by others.
- Members were informed that the primary means of access via the East Leeds Orbital Road (ELOR) and through the site in the form of the spine road were fixed under the outline consent. The spine road will serve the interior of the site and will connect to neighbouring phases of the development and is designed to accommodate bus services.
- Previously the area had been used as agricultural fields and there is vegetation along the edges of the site with significant trees and hedges along the north side of Red Hall Lane and the west side of Coal Road.
- It was noted that there is no specific house type character locally in terms of architectural style. The submitted proposal indicated three broad character areas – the 'rural edge' abutting ELOR, a 'contemporary' area along the spine road and the 'urban edge' spanning across the southern side of the site. Details of house types and materials was set out at Paragraph 9 of the submitted report. The proposed houses would be predominantly 2 storey, 2.5 storey with room in loft space, and 3 storey apartments.
- Routes around the site would be linked by footways and cycles lanes and would connect to ELOR, future development sites and also the existing residential area to the south. A buffer of trees and hedgerows would be planted along ELOR, in addition to the planting already carried out as part of the ELOR scheme. The spine road would take a route through the site with tree planting within verges proposed. The streets are arranged in a deformed grid, providing connected loops within the site.
- On the site there would be dwellings for wheelchair uses, as well as accessible and adaptable dwellings, in accordance with policy.
- Affordable housing throughout the site is to be provided, in accordance with policy.
- There would be a 'gateway feature' on entry to the site from Wetherby Road but this was still to be decided through local community engagement.
- The site would have a formal Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP), as required by the S106 Agreement on the outline consent. In response

to Members previous comments, the proposal would now also include two less formal Local Areas of Play (LAPs).

- A revised drainage strategy including the provision of two new swales to improve water quality and aid biodiversity.
- There is currently landscaping along ELOR, but the development would add to this with further planting of trees and shrubs.
- Workshop sessions had taken place with the developers on designs for the blocks of flats, however there was still work to be done on these. It was noted that the details of the houses had progressed, though there were also to be further discussions.
- Further to comments from Members, there would be a growing area on the site within one of the greenspaces.

The applicant addressed the Panel and provided the following information:

- Since the pre-application a series of meetings and workshops had taken place with officers, and it was the view that the applicant had responded positively to comments.
- Members were advised that all dwellings were now to be gas free and heated by electrically powered air source heat pumps. This exceeds the current Building Regulations and the Council's planning policy requirements.
- There was to be a further workshop with officers to work on the finer details of the scheme. The applicant is aware that some refinement is still required in terms of boundary treatment, footpath connections and design – particularly of the apartment blocks. These elements, among others, will be discussed with officers.
- The applicant was in control of the whole site and wanted to start work on the development as soon as possible.
- The S106 Agreement on the outline consent contains a large number of obligations and contributions, including the ELOR contribution, primary school, public transport and parks. The development would also attract significant Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payments.

It was noted that at the site meeting, Members had questions in relation to width of footways and cycles lanes as it was the view that the one parallel to Red Hall Lane may not be wide enough and could cause conflict with users in future.

Responding to this, the applicant stated that in other areas across the site, appropriate separation distances have been provided for – so it was not envisaged that on those shared footway-cycle lanes there would be any concerns regarding the conflict of users. In addition, it was likely that only the one parallel to Red Hall Lane would be used by commuters other than simply residents. Such that only that stretch was likely to be used at any speed by cyclists. It was agreed that officers would consider the ability and implications of widening the cycle lanes, so they were the same as ELOR and discuss further with the applicant.

In response to questions from the Members the Panel were informed of the following:

- There are currently no plans to install solar panels and the air source heat pumps should be sufficient. However, changes to the Future Homes Standards may make solar panels statutory on new build and be required by the time there is build-out of the phase.
- The applicant would include fencing to play areas but was currently proceeding as advised.
- It was acknowledged that Members were unhappy with the design of the flats on the entrance to the site from Wetherby Road and this would be looked at during future design discussions.  
Members noted that the small piece of land outside the red line boundary would remain undeveloped as the applicant had not been able to have dialogue with the owner. However, it would not appear out of character with the development and is sandwiched between two areas of greenspace.

Officers provided the following information in response to questions from the Panel:

- The S106 agreement was secured for the extension of bus services to loop through the site on the spine road. The spine road had been designed to ensure that the buses could use the route to serve the development. It was recognised that wider consultation on the bus services in Leeds was still ongoing.
- Parking had been allocated to the front and side of dwellings for balance and to allow for verges.
- Members were advised that Coal Road would remain open so there was access to ELOR but there would be a point closure at a point in time when the spine road meets Coal Road. Separately, Highways had required a signalised junction as part of the Red Hall scheme (subject of a separate planning application) and should this go ahead there may not be the need for the point closure, but this can only be resolved through submission of evidence via a condition discharge application. The Red Hall application would be brought before Panel for consideration.

Members were invited to provide feedback, in response to the following key questions and their responses were as follows:

**1. Do Members have any observations in relation to the detailed means of access and connectivity?**

- Given the discussions had in relation to Red Hall Lane junction it was the view that this should be actioned so that it would be consistent with the comments of Cllr Grahame provided at the previous meeting. It was suggested that the developer should look at this again with the other applicants in line with what has been suggested by the East Leeds Extension (ELE) Consultative Forum.

**2. Do Members have any comments on the proposed layout of the development?**

- Members wanted the developers to look at again at the block of flats in the gateway to the site as it was the view that the drive into the site could be over-dominant. It was suggested at a previous meeting that a pair of semi-detached properties would be better in this position. It was not thought appropriate to have such a large building in the gateway to

the site. Members agreed that a streetscene section through this part of the site may be helpful.

**3. Do Members have any comments in relation to the landscape proposals?**

- Landscaping was good.

**4. Do Members have any comments about the appearance and elevations of the proposed houses and apartments or the scale and siting of the proposed buildings?**

- The houses were well designed. However, Members were of the view that the design of the blocks of flats was not of appropriate standard of design and should be looked at again.

**5. Are there any other matters which Members would wish to raise?**

- No further matters were raised.

**RESOLVED** – To note the content of the report and presentation.

**59 Subject: 23/05615/FU – Single storey side extension; alterations to the rear including replacement of rear window with patio doors and associated steps; extension of existing patio area to rear with new balustrade, retaining wall and boundary treatment to side; demolition of the existing storage annex and detached garage to rear at 277 Lidgett Lane Gledhow Leeds LS17 6PD**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer requested the consideration on an application for a single storey side extension; alterations to the rear including replacement of rear window with patio doors and associated steps; extension of existing patio area to rear with new balustrade, retaining wall and boundary treatment to side; demolition of the existing storage annex and detached garage to rear at 277 Lidgett Lane Gledhow Leeds LS17 6PD.

Members had attended a site visit earlier in the day. Photographs and slides were shown throughout the presentation.

Members were informed of the following points:

- This application had been brought to Plans Panel due to the applicant being an Elected Member.
- The proposed single storey side extension was to measure 8.47m in length, 2.23m width, under a pitched roof with an overall height of 3.47m. The extension was to be set back 0.5m from the main frontage of the dwelling, and 0.8m from the western side boundary facing 279 Lidgett Lane. The extension was for a shower room, utility room and a garden storage room.
- The materials proposed were red brick walls, slate roofing, and white uPCV openings to match with the existing house.
- An obscure glazed window was proposed to the front elevation serving the shower room. A window and new side entrance were proposed for the western side elevation to serve the utility room. A roller shutter door was proposed to the rear elevation serving the garden storage room. Two roof lights were proposed on the pitch roof.

- Alterations to the rear of the property included replacing the rear facing opening to allow for double leaf patio doors to allow direct access to the patio area.
- Steps were proposed to overcome the level difference between the ground floor level and rear patio. The existing rear patio was to be extended to have a projection of 3.0m and gradually increase to 5.0m. The proposed patio would measure the same width as the plot and same height as existing. At the end of the patio a retaining wall and balustrade are proposed.
- A new timber privacy fence of 1.8m in height was proposed along the eastern edge of the raised patio, which shares the eastern side boundary with 275 Lidgett Lane.
- An existing storage annex to the rear of the property and the detached garage at the end of the driveway would both be demolished.
- The application was publicised by means of Neighbour Notification Letters. It was noted that no responses had been received.

Members were advised of the following:

- There was limited impact to the local neighbourhood.
- No dominance or overshadowing to neighbouring properties, or privacy issues.
- There were no design character issues with the proposed patio.
- Existing trees were not likely to be impacted.
- The privacy screen would not cause any over-dominance or encroachment to the neighbouring property at 275 Lidgett Lane.
- There would be enough parking for up to 3 cars at the front of the property when the garage was demolished.

**RESOLVED** – To grant permission subject to the specified conditions set out in the report.

**60 23/05807/FU – Part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension at 36 Parkland Crescent, Meanwood, Leeds, LS6 4PR**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer advised the Plans Panel of an application for part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension at 36 Parkland Crescent, Meanwood, Leeds, LS6 4PR.

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

Members were provided with the following information:

- This application had been brought to Plans Panel due to the applicant being employed within the Development Management Team at Leeds City Council.
- The proposed extension would wrap around the side and rear elevations of the property and would project 1.37m from the side elevation and 3.2m from the rear elevation.

- The two-storey element of the extension would have a dual pitched roof form with a gable end to the rear and one roof light window to the side. It would have a matching eaves height to the main roof and the ridge level would be set slightly below the main ridge line. The ground floor rear element would have a flat roof with roof lantern on top.
- The extension included the insertion of bifold doors and a new window to the rear at ground floor level, as well as one window at ground floor level to the north west side. There would also be two new windows at first floor level to the rear.
- The extension would be painted cement render and double roman interlocking tiles to match the existing house.
- The surrounding properties are of a similar scale and design, with many already extended to the rear.
- No representations had been received to the proposal.

Members were advised of the following points:

- It was the view that the proposed application was of an appropriate scale, design and size.
- There would be no harm to the character of the wider area.
- The application was within current guidance.
- The separate side extension with the boundary property could have some impact to the neighbouring property but not to a detrimental level and there are no windows to the side of the extension.
- There would be some overlooking to properties and gardens but not excessively so.
- The rear garden would still retain sufficient space for amenity purposes and separation distances.
- There would be no loss to hardstanding currently used for the parking of cars off-road and therefore the proposal would not result in any loss of parking provision. The existing access arrangements to the site would also remain unchanged.

**RESOLVED** – To grant permission subject to the specified conditions set out in the report.

## 61 Date and Time of Next Meeting

**RESOLVED** – To note the next meeting of North and East Plans Panel will be on Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> December 2023 at 1.30pm.

*Meeting concluded at 3pm*