

# Public Document Pack

COUNCIL MEETING 23 MARCH 2016

ADDITIONAL MINUTES

This page is intentionally left blank



Councillors

**Legal & Democratic Services**

Governance Services

1st Floor West

Civic Hall

Leeds LS1 1UR

Contact: Kevin Tomkinson

Tel: (0113) 24 74357

Email: kevin.tomkinson@leeds.gov.uk

Our Ref:

Your Ref:

18 March 2016

Dear Councillor

**COUNCIL – 23<sup>rd</sup> MARCH 2016**

Please find attached for your attention minutes that were not available when the agenda was despatched.

Please attach these papers to your agenda for the meeting.

Many thanks.

Yours sincerely

**Kevin Tomkinson**  
Principal Governance Officer



## INNER NORTH WEST COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, 3RD MARCH, 2016

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

Councillors J Akhtar, J Bentley, S Bentley,  
G Harper, C Towler and N Walshaw

### 28 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors J Chapman and J Walker.

### 29 Minutes - 10 September and 17 December 2015

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meetings held on 10 September and 17 December 2015 be confirmed as correct records.

### 30 Open Forum

In accordance with the Community Committee Procedure Rules, the Chair allowed a period of up to 10 minutes for members of the public to make representations or ask questions within the terms of reference of the Area Committee. The following issues were discussed:

A representative of the Opal Neighbourhood Network informed members of the consultation for the Welcome In Community Café Project.

Members were informed of problems with noise nuisance occurring in the Midland Road area.

With regard to the Maple Grove Development and the decision of the developer to go to appeal regarding the refusal for planning for student accommodation, concern was expressed regarding the amount of time and work that would be involved in the subsequent public enquiry.

Use of Rose Court as a school site.

Hyde Park Unity Date – Members were asked for their support in seeking an extension for the 2016 event.

Springbank Villa – a search at West Yorkshire Archives had shown the site to be in the ownership of Park Lane Properties which was in conflict as to what was previously understood. It was suggested that a further search be carried out through Planning Services to ascertain the ownership.

Thanks were expressed for the staff who worked on Woodhouse Moor and contributed to the maintenance of flower beds and carrying out patrols.

Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Plan – there was to be a further meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> March. City and Hunslet Members had been consulted and had agreed to keep involved regarding issues around their wards and ward boundaries.

Hyde Park Road – demolition of student block for more student flats. This was one of the original park buildings and there had been difficulty finding information on the planning website.

Royal Park Site – Hyde Park Source had held a consultation meeting and were looking to work up a scheme for the site. The caretaker's cottage would not be demolished and it was hoped to get a mixed use for the cottage, possibly as a base for PCSOs and other council organisations.

The Community Committee was asked to contact West Yorkshire Police to allocate further resources for the 'King for a Day' BMX event that was due to take place at Woodhouse Moor.

### **31 Inner North West Children's Engagement Event**

The report of the West North West Area updated Members on the engagement event that took place with children and young people in January 2016. The report also informed Members how the children and young people would like to see Youth Activities Funds being spent in the area.

It was reported that 57 children from 13 schools attended the event and that there had been mainly positive comments from the young people that had attended. This was the first time the event had been held in Inner North West and would be repeated across the City. The event would be used to commission services following input from young people rather than waiting for bids.

Members congratulated those involved in organising the event and further discussion focussed on the provision of a multi sports event which had been highlighted as a preferred activity.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That the report be noted.
- (2) That the feedback from the event be used to help shape priorities for Youth Activities Fund spending in the 2016/17 financial year.

### **32 Inner North West Children's Profile**

The report of Performance Management & Improvement Children's Services provided the Community Committee with children's profile information within the Inner North West area.

Issues highlighted from the report included the following:

- Reducing the number of looked after children
- Work in relation to domestic violence
- School places – evidence of an increased demand
- Attendance levels

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

- There had been a slight increase in the number of looked after children in the area.
- There had been a reduction on school attendance.
- Reading ability – The importance of early years development was stressed.

**RESOLVED** – That the report be noted.

### **33 Wellbeing Fund and Youth Activities Fund Allocation Report**

The report of the West North West Area Leader advised the Inner North West Community Committee of the following:

- The current position of the Wellbeing budget and Youth Activities Fund budget.
- The Wellbeing budget available for 2016/17.
- The Youth Activities Fund budget available for 2016/17.
- Those projects for consideration and approval from the Wellbeing Budget allocation for 2016/17.
- Those projects for consideration and approval from the Youth Activities Fund allocation for 2016/17.

Members were informed that there had been a reduction to Wellbeing Revenue budgets for the 2016/17. Applications recommended from the commissioning rounds for revenue and capital funding were highlighted in the report.

**RESOLVED** –

- (1) That projects approved since the last Community Committee meeting on 17 December 2015 be approved.
- (2) That the available Wellbeing Budget and Youth Activities Fund allocations for 2016/17 be noted.
- (3) That projects listed in Table 5 of the report, a total of £87,861 from the Wellbeing Budget allocation for 2016/17 be approved.
- (4) That projects listed in Table 6, a total of £10,700 from the Wellbeing Capital Budget be approved.

## **34 Area Update Report**

The report of the West North West Area Leader provided Members with a summary of recent sub group business as well as a general update on other project activity. A copy of the latest Inner North West Community Committee update newsletter was appended to the report.

Issues highlighted from the report included the following:

- Projects approved via delegated decision for Youth Activities in the half term and Easter holidays.
- Details of Community Centre free lettings.
- Update from the inner North West Housing Advisory Panel.
- Funding to commemorate the Battle of the Somme – it was reported that there would be £1,000 available for each Community Committee and it was proposed to fund a bugler in every Community Committee area of the City. Any remaining funds could be used to support locality events. Members discussed possible events including the involvement of local schools and the Royal Armouries.
- A request was made for public involvement with the Student Changeover Committee as there had not been any public representation during the past two years.

### **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That key messages from sub groups be noted and actioned as appropriate.
- (2) That community centre free lets approved since the last meeting be noted.
- (3) That the update from the Inner North West Housing Advisory Panel be noted.
- (4) That the Inner North West Community Committee update letter be noted.
- (5) That the £1,000 budget for the inner North West Community Committee for events to commemorate the First World War, Battle of the Somme be noted.

## **35 Dates, Times and Venues of Community Committee Meetings 2016/2017**

The report of the City Solicitor asked Members to give consideration to agreeing the proposed Community Committee meeting schedule for the 2016/17 municipal year and to also consider whether any revisions to the current meeting and venue arrangements should be explored.

The following dates had been proposed for the 2016/17 municipal year:

- Thursday, 16 June 2016 at 7.00 p.m.
- Thursday, 22 September 2016 at 7.00 p.m.
- Thursday, 15 December 2016 at 7.00 p.m.
- Thursday, 23 March 2017 at 7.00 p.m.

Minutes to be approved at the next meeting of the  
Inner North West Community Committee

**RESOLVED** – That the proposed meeting schedule for the 2016/17 municipal year be agreed.



## CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 3RD MARCH, 2016

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

Councillors P Gruen, D Blackburn,  
S Hamilton, G Latty, T Leadley,  
C Campbell, A Khan, K Ritchie, E Taylor,  
G Wilkinson, E Nash and C Towler

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

There were no appeals against the refusal of inspection of documents.

### **107 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public**

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

### **108 Late Items**

There were no late items submitted for consideration.

### **109 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

No declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests were made.

However Councillor Leadley declared a significant other interest in PREAPP/14/0066) Residential Development, Outline for Circa 170 dwellings at land between Thorpe Lane and Bradford Road, Tingley as he knew the owner of an adjacent site.

### **110 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Walshaw, Ingham and R Procter.

In attendance as substitutes were Councillors Nash, Towler and Wilkinson.

### **111 Minutes - 11th February 2016**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 11th February be approved as a correct record. Subject to the following insertion being made:

Minute No. 104      PRE-APPLICATION Reference PREAPP/15/00956 –  
Proposal for mixed use residential development at Left Bank, Former Hydro  
Aluminium Foundry, Clarence Road, Hunslet, Leeds 10

“Members attended a site visit prior to the commencement of the meeting”

## **112 Matters Arising**

Minute No 93 Outline application 14/06534/OT at Quarry Hill

It was agreed the wording for the correction to the minutes of the meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2016 to do with this item be amended to read;

“There was an agreement in place with Caddick and Leeds City Council for a multi storey car park to be built. However this would not be built unless it was established that it was viable to do so. “

Minute No. 104 PRE-APPLICATION Reference PREAPP/15/00956 – Proposal for mixed use residential development at Left Bank, Former Hydro Aluminium Foundry, Clarence Road, Hunslet, Leeds 10

It was confirmed to Members that the rubbish deposited on the river banks had not been cleared yet, this would be raised with the applicants as the planning application is submitted and progresses further.

## **113 84 KIRKSTALL ROAD, LEEDS LS3 1LS PLANNING APPLICATION REF. 15/05029/OT VARIATION OF CONDITION 3 (APPROVED PLANS) OF APPROVAL 11/01850/EXT TO ALLOW A VARIATION IN MIX OF ACCOMMODATION, AMENDED DRAWING TO INDICATE RESIDENTIAL USE ADJACENT TO KIRKSTALL ROAD AND AMENDMENT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING REQUIREMENT**

**RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION REF. 15/05030/RM FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT UP TO 11 STOREYS COMPRISING RESIDENTIAL WITH GROUND FLOOR A3/A4 UNIT, UNDERCROFT CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPED PUBLIC SPACE**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which proposed a variation of condition 3 (approved plans) of approval 11/01850/EXT to allow a variation in mix of accommodation, amended drawing to indicate residential use adjacent to Kirkstall Road and amendment of affordable housing requirement and a reserved matters application ref. 15/05030/RM for mixed use development up to 11 storeys comprising residential with ground floor a3/a4 unit, part undercroft and part surface car parking and landscaped public space.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application. Members had also attended a site visit prior to discussion of the item.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- Affordable housing provision had been reduced from 15% to 5% in line with current adopted Core Strategy policy. However it was highlighted that the number of residential units had increased to 107;
- Where flats had north facing windows provision had been made for these to be dual aspect;
- Details of the materials to be used for construction of the building;
- The screening work to be undertaken to reduce the visual impact of the car park, this to be a planted solution to create a green wall. Furthermore Members were shown designs of a deck (green screen) above the car park which would partially screen parked cars;
- Concerns about the effects of wind on the development had been considered and landscaping had been proposed as a way of mitigating against this.

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

- The change from a mixed use development to a residential only scheme, which Members considered, on the face of it, seemed like a big change to the application. Members were informed that the approach being used here was consistent with our general approach as the proposed building occupied the same floor space, scale and footprint parameters set by the outline approval;
- It was noted that the north facing courtyard of the building would mean a lack of sunny amenity space for the residents and that the proposed planting would be limited due to restriction on the types of plants that would grow in a north facing area;
- Members discussed that it would be preferable to turn the building round. However the Panel were informed that the layout plans had been approved in 2011 and that it was not now possible to request the developer to change these pursuant to the reserved matters application;
- The possible effect of strong winds on the development and how this had been mitigated against;
- Flooding was discussed and it was confirmed to Members that flood water from the recent floods had reached the Kirkstall Road side of the building. However the proposed floor level would be 1 metre higher than the height reached by the floods;
- The location of the affordable housing within the development. It was confirmed that as yet it was undecided where this would be; and
- Members confirmed that they would prefer to see the car park associated with the development to be constructed using block paving to help reduce the amount of surface water run off.

Throughout discussion of this item Members sought assurance about the likely start date for meaningful construction of this development. The architect to the scheme confirmed that the developer was actively marketing the

scheme and that a condition existed which meant the developer had to commence within one year of approval of the scheme. The Head of Planning Services also commented that officers would investigate ways of ensuring it was a meaningful start on site as part of the implementation of the scheme.

The Chief Planning Officer confirmed that concerns raised about the effects of wind could be dealt with as part of the conditions imposed on the developer and that further work would be done with the developer in relation to securing appropriate design mitigation measures. It was also confirmed that if the developer did not make a start on the scheme within a year then a fresh application would be required to be made.

## **RESOLVED –**

To DEFER and DELEGATE the two applications to the Chief Planning Officer for approval , subject to the specified conditions at Appendix 1 of the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate), and following the completion of a Deed of Variation to the original Section 106 Agreement to cover the following amended obligation:

- Affordable Housing at 5% of the total proposed units in accordance with current Leeds Core Strategy policy for this location. The remainder of the Section 106 agreement as amended in 2011 remains unchanged and would be carried forward by Deed of Variation onto application 15/05029/OT:
- Public Transport Infrastructure Improvements (SPD5) contribution £24, 824
- Off-site landscaping contribution for works in the vicinity of the site £10,000
- Off-site highways works contribution for works in the vicinity of the site £50,000
- Travel Plan measures car club trial provision contribution £6,500
- Travel Plan monitoring fee £5,220
- Public access through the site
- Provision for enhancement to Traffic Regulation Orders in the local area up to £5,000
- Cooperation with local jobs and skills initiatives
- Management Fee £5,250

- 114 Pre-application presentation PREAPP/14/00627 Demolition of existing shared rugby/cricket stand and replacement shared North/South stand and demolition of existing Southern Terrace and replacement South Stand to Rugby Ground, St Michaels Lane, Headingley Pre-application presentation PREAPP/14/00660 Residential Development for circa 40 dwellings at land off Weetwood Avenue, Weetwood. Pre-application presentation PREAPP/14/00661 Residential Development, Outline for Circa 170 dwellings at land between Thorpe Lane and Bradford Road, Tingley**

Members received a report of the Chief Planning Officer and received a pre application presentation on behalf of Leeds Rugby for the demolition of existing shared rugby/cricket stand and replacement shared North/South stand and demolition of existing Southern Terrace and replacement South Stand to Rugby Ground, St Michaels Lane, Headingley, the residential development for circa 40 dwellings at land off Weetwood Avenue, Weetwood and the development of circa 170 dwellings on land between Thorpe Lane and Bradford Road, Tingley.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application. Members had also attended a site visit prior to discussion of the item on all three sites.

The Head of Planning Services introduced the report and explained the ownership of the Weetwood and Tingley sites and how they related to the application to develop the North/South Stand and the South Stand at Headingley Stadium.

Members were shown a video of how the proposed stands would look.

Representatives of the developer, were in attendance and provided the following additional information:

- That Headingley Stadium made significant contributions to the local economy and that these proposals were critical to securing the future of Test Match cricket when the staging agreement was considered in 2019. During Test matches 650 people are employed and that the Stadium, generates £4.8 million in visitor spending each year;
- The residential sites at Tingley (171 dwellings) and Weetwood (46 dwellings) if approved would provide funding for and enable the development of the stands. The representative took the Panel through the details of the residential sites;
- The development of the North / South Stand would meet ECB requirements to stage International Cricket. The developments as a whole would result in an increase in the capacity of the cricket ground and a reduction in capacity at the rugby ground;
- The benefits to the community that the rugby and cricket clubs make through their charitable foundations; and
- That the Rugby South stand would have to be built first followed by the dual North / South Stand

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

- The history behind Leeds Rugby's ownership of the Tingley and Weetwood sites, the prices paid for the sites and the current values;
- The possibility for value engineering to reduce the costs of developing the stands;
- Traffic in the area on match days and that work would be required to be done to mitigate against the effect of this;
- Noise on matchdays was considered and it was noted that the new stands would be designed to reduce the impact of crowd noise;
- Timings of the development and the reliance on the sale of the land at Tingley and Weetwood for housing in order to progress the stands. Furthermore it was confirmed that additional funding would also need to be found to complete the stands but that all money from the sale of the two residential sites would be used for the stands;
- The number of applications was discussed, Members commented that they would have preferred one application to encompass the re-development of the North / South Stand and the South Stand;
- Members commented that further work would need to be done in relation to the applications to build houses at Tingley and Weetwood and that the development at Tingley was too dense;
- Members noted that if the North/South Stand was re-developed there would still be no guarantee of international cricket after the 2019 staging agreement ends between Yorkshire CCC and the ECB;
- It was noted that the clubs undertake charitable work and that the stadium is an asset to Leeds. However Members commented that there were no obvious benefits to the residents of Tingley and Weetwood who would lose green belt land and gain more houses putting pressure on roads, schools and health centres; and
- It was confirmed that Leeds Rugby and Yorkshire CC had no other saleable assets.

The Panel then heard from the Weetwood Residents Association who objected to the proposals. Information put forward included:

- That Weetwood Residents Association supported developments at Headingley Stadium but not at the cost of losing valuable greenbelt;
- Allowing the development of the Weetwood site to fund the stadium would possibly be a breach of planning process; the residents association considered that this was not a circumstance exceptional enough to develop greenbelt;
- The development of the stands did not fairly and reasonably relate to the development of the greenbelt land and would not provide public amenity to Weetwood residents;
- If the developments were to proceed there is no guarantee of international cricket at Headingley; and
- That the proposals would need to be determined by the Secretary of State.

The Head of Planning Services read out three emails from ward members commenting on the proposals, these were from:

- Councillor Walshaw (Headingley) who highlighted concern over the design of the stadium and commented that work needs to be done to improve the flow of traffic around Headingley on matchdays and deal with noise;
- Councillor Dunn (Ardsley & Robin Hood), who raised concerns about the loss of green space in Tingley and likely traffic implications; and
- Councillor Renshaw (Ardsley & Robin Hood) who raised strong objections to the loss of green belt at Tingley and further pressure on infrastructure at Tingley.

Members further commented that they wanted to see world class sporting facilities in Leeds. However they felt this was an enabling application being used to contribute to facilities in Headingley and that the people of Tingley and Weetwood would feel little benefit and lose important green belt. Members recognised that these two sites were in the Draft Site Allocation Plan but not in phase 1 but that they were still greenbelt land. Besides this Members felt that much more work would need to be done to improve the layout of the residential developments.

Members responded to the questions featured at paragraph 6.23 of the submitted report as follows:

1. Members wished to see Headingley re-developed and were supportive of this taking place. However the Panel had concerns about bringing forward development of the green belt at Weetwood and Tingley ahead of the conclusion of the site allocations process.
2. Members felt that they did not have enough information to comment on the design of the residential sites or Headingley Stadium. They did feel that there were too many dwellings on the Tingley site, that the apartments in the Weetwood scheme should be removed and that careful consideration would need to be given to the relationship of the new south rugby stand to dwellings on St Michaels Lane.
3. Members were concerned about the loss of the urban green corridor at Weetwood and the impact this could have on the Conservation area.
4. Members felt that careful consideration needs to be given to the highways surrounding the stadium but also the impact to highways by building new houses at Tingley and Weetwood.
5. The other issues members wished to raise at this stage were the importance of local people benefitting from any development and also that flooding would need to be considered at the Tingley site. Finally Members considered that legal advice should be sought in relation to the “enabling development” issue with regards to both the Weetwood and Tingley sites

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the report and presentations be noted.

**115 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

1.30pm Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> March 2016.