

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 5TH SEPTEMBER, 2024

PRESENT: Councillor P Wray in the Chair

Councillors N Manaka, A Rontree,
B Anderson, S Firth, M France-Mir,
Z Hussain, R Jones, A Parnham and
P Stables

SITE VISITS

The site visit was attended by Councillors P. Wray, R Jones, M France-Mir, A Parnham and N Manaka prior to the meeting.

22 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

23 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no exempt items.

24 Late Items

There were no late items.

25 Declarations of Interests

In relation to Agenda Item 7 -24/01430/FU - Change of use from Dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to 5 bed HMO (Use Class C4); insertion of 2no. rooflights to rear; infill of first floor rear window; new lightwell and render to rear at 21 Longroyd Terrace, Beeston, Leeds LS11 5JH.

- Cllr Wray advised the Panel that although he was the Ward Councillor for Riverside and Hunslet, he had not been involved in conversations with residents about the proposals for the HMO, and he would be considering this application with an open mind.

In relation to Agenda Item 8 -23/01441/FU Restaurant with drive-thru (Use Class E and Sui Generis) including car park alterations, landscaping, and associated works at Land Adjacent Unit 1, Kirkstall Retail Park, Savins Mill Way, Kirkstall, Leeds, LS5 3RP.

- Cllr Rontree informed the Panel this application was in his ward and he had been in consultation with the residents and the applicants. Therefore, he would be withdrawing from the meeting during consideration of the item.

26 Apologies for Absence

No apologies were received.

27 Minutes of the previous meeting - 1 August 24

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 1st August 2024, be approved as a correct record.

28 24/01430/FU - 21 Longroyd Terrace, Beeston, Leeds, LS11 5JH

Members considered the report of the Chief Planning Officer which presented proposals for change of use of existing C3 residential dwellinghouse to a 5 bed House in Multiple Occupancy (HMO) C4 at 21 Longroyd Terrace, Beeston, Leeds LS11 5JH.

The report recommended to the Panel that the application be granted subject to conditions, as set out within the submitted report.

Slides and photographs of the site and proposals were presented by the Planning Officer who outlined the application and contents of representations received as detailed in the submitted report.

Representations were made by Ward Councillor Carlisle in objection to the proposals. Councillor Carlisle provided responses to the questions raised by Panel Members, which in summary, related to the following:

- Parking issues in the area.
- Crime and anti-social behaviour

Representations were made to the Panel by the applicant's agent. In response to questions from the Panel it was noted that the purchase of the property was still ongoing and at the time of the meeting there had been limited consultation. However, the applicant would be happy to engage with the community going forward.

Questions and comments from Panel Members then followed, with officers responding to the questions raised, which in summary, included the following:

- Issues in the community relating to Parking, crime, and anti-social behaviour. It was noted there had been no reports of anti-social behaviour related to any of the current HMOs in the area.
- Number of HMOs in the area. It was noted that there were approximately 490 properties in the area with 14 registered HMOs. Members were advised that officers would have concerns if there were more than 20% HMOs in an area, and there should be no more than two consecutively in a row of houses.
- A management plan for HMOs can be agreed to ensure that HMOs are run properly.
- It was acknowledged that when the bin store and cycle storage were erected in the courtyard to the rear of the property it would not leave a large space for residents to use.
- It was suggested that a working group be established to recommend guidelines for Members when considering applications for HMOs. The Chair said that he would take this suggestion to the meeting of Plans Panel Chairs.

RESOLVED – To grant permission with the conditions set out in the submitted report, with an additional condition in relation to the agreement of a management plan.

1. Time limit for full permission (3yrs).
2. Implement in accordance with approved plans / specifications.
3. Implement cycle and bin storage facilities.
4. Agreement of an operational management plan.

29 23/01441/FU - Land Adjacent Unit 1 , Kirkstall Retail Park, Savins Mill Way, Kirkstall, Leeds, LS5 3RP

Prior to the start of this item Cllr Rontree withdrew from the meeting. Minute 25 refers.

Members considered the report of the Chief Planning Officer which presented proposals for a restaurant with drive-thru use Class E and Sui Generis including car park alterations, landscaping, and associated works at land adjacent unit 1, Kirkstall Retail Park, Savins Mill Way, Kirkstall, Leeds, LS5 3RP.

The report recommended to the Panel that the application be deferred and delegated for approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the planning conditions specified within the submitted report.

Panel Members referenced above had attended a site visit prior to the meeting.

Slides and photographs of the site and proposals were presented by the Planning Officer who outlined the application and contents of representations received as detailed in the submitted report.

The Panel heard representations from Cllr Venner the Kirkstall Ward Councillor and a resident of Kirkstall in objection to the application. Following this they answered questions in relation to:

- Traffic congestion.
- Safety issues in relation to the entrance and exit to the site, and pedestrians using this site and the retail park.
- Traffic accidents at the junction.
- Air quality in the area.

The applicant's agent made representation to the Panel and following the representation responded to questions in relation to:

- Highways modelling undertaken by the applicant, including predicted traffic volumes.
- Parking capacity.
- Operational Deliveries.
- Deliveries for takeaway.
- Safety impact assessments.

Questions and comments from Panel Members then followed, with officers responding to the questions raised, which in summary, included the following:

- Highways data in relation:
 - to the current congestion at this junction,
 - the number of accidents at this junction. It was noted there that since 2021 there had been 30 collisions at this junction with 8 of those serious. The majority of accidents was due to driver error.
 - the use of the yellow box cameras
- Poor air quality, which until recently had been a hot spot in the city.
- Concerns in relation to cyclists accessing the drive through restaurant to pick up takeaway deliveries.
- Concerns in relation to the blocking of the bus lane by customers, and delivery drivers.
- Through flow of traffic round the retail centre.
- Car park capacity for both the retail centre and the proposed restaurant.
- Concerns for pedestrians accessing and exiting the retail centre and restaurant.
- Suitable location for delivery vans. It was noted that deliveries to the restaurant would be 1 per day, occasionally 2. They would use the same controlled delivery hours of those retail stores already located at the retail park.
- It was acknowledged that Kirkstall currently has some huge housing development underway. Members were advised that the predicted volumes of traffic would increase without this application for the restaurant. Currently there are 21,000 vehicles using the A65. Contributions from the applicant would be used to improve the traffic light system at the junction.
- It was noted that as part of the modelling exercise undertaken by Highways, all safety aspects were considered.
- Community safety aspect. It was recognised that with the proposed restaurant it would mean that the area would be better lit and there would be more people around, making it safer for pedestrians. However, it may also attract young people to congregate and there was the potential for anti-social behaviour. It was noted that the Police had not been asked for their comments on the proposal.

Members considered a number of options for their decision and were provided with advice and guidance from planning officers and the legal officer.

RESOLVED – That Panel be minded to refuse permission, based on concerns regarding traffic impact, and safety of pedestrians and cyclists in and around the site, and for the detailed reasons for refusal to be brought back to the Panel for further consideration.

30 **Date and time of the next meeting**

RESOLVED – To note the next meeting would on Thursday 3rd October 2024, at 1.30pm.

The meeting concluded at 4pm.

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Thursday, 3rd October, 2024