

NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 24TH JUNE, 2021

PRESENT: Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors E Nash, N Sharpe, M Midgley,
B Anderson, A Lamb, A Garthwaite,
S Hamilton and G Latty

10 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

11 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There was no exempt information.

12 Late Items

There were no late items.

13 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

However, Cllr Midgley declared an other interest with regard to Agenda Item 7 20/04235/FU – Change of use of light industrial/offices and construction of two storey front and first floor extensions to form residential recovery care home at Hopewell Mill, Hopewell Terrace, Kippax, Leeds, LS25 7AQ. It was noted that as local ward councillor she had made a representation to object to the application and was of the view that she could not participate with an open mind.

Cllr Midgley vacated the meeting whilst this item was discussed.

14 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Almass, Flint and Stephenson.

Cllrs Garthwaite, Hamilton and Latty were in attendance at the meeting as substitute members.

15 Minutes - 27th May 2021

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 27th May 2021, be approved as a correct record.

16 Application 20/04235/FU – Change of use of light industrial/offices and construction of two storey front and first floor extensions to form residential recovery care home at Hopewell Mill, Hopewell Terrace, Kippax, Leeds, LS25 7AQ

Minutes approved at the meeting
held on Thursday, 22nd July, 2021

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the change of use of light industrial /offices and construction of a two storey front and first floor extensions to form residential recovery care home at Hopewell Mill, Hopewell Terrace, Kippax, Leeds, LS25 7AQ.

Slides and photographs were shown throughout discussions.

Members were informed of the following points:

- Maps were shown which set out local landmarks near to the application site. The landmarks included a Methodist Church, St Mary's Church and a school. The application site is in a cul-de-sac and is the only commercial development with the rest of the cul-de-sac used for residential purposes.
- It was noted that the whole of the site was within the ownership of the applicant.
- Timber fencing is the current boundary treatment to the frontage.
- The gable end of the property is blank except for one window which overlooks the garden of no 17 Hopewell Terrace. It was noted that this would be used as a landing. No 21 Hopewell Terrace has an extension which adjoins the commercial property.
- The proposal was for a range of single and two storey buildings. It would have parking for 6 vehicles and a disabled bay. There is to be a small outside terraced area for the use of residents. The floor plans showed communal rooms which included dining, lounge, meeting rooms and office space. Bedrooms all have en-suite facilities with at least one window for natural light and ventilation, a lift serves all floors. It was noted that all rooms were of an adequate size.
- The plans showed a dormer in the roof space.
- The new extension would have bi-fold doors, existing archways were to be reinstated. Materials would be of redbrick with rendering in contemporary design.
- Representations had been received from all three local ward councillors and from residents within the cul-de-sac and the wider village, plus two from outside the immediate area.
- Two letters of support had been received, including one from the Parish Council.

Members noted the following updates:

- One additional representation had been received from a local resident who raised similar objections to those already received and included within the report. These were in relation to;
 - Alcohol can be bought nearby
 - School is nearby
 - It would better used as a youth centre
 - There have been issues with the nearby alleyway
 - Car parking

- It was noted that an additional condition is to be added requiring the applicant to submit a parking management plan for approval by the Council.
- This would be a 16 bed C2 use, with a previous application for a care home in 2017 having been granted approval. It was noted that the nature of the occupancy for this application was different, but the use class remains as previously approved.

Members discussions included the following:

- Previous granted approval and planning history of the site.
- Parking and safe access and egress of the site.
- Amenity space for future residents of the facility.
- Concerns raised by objectors, including highway safety, overlooking, impact of construction traffic, impact on local area and the potential for anti-social behaviour arising.
- Sustainability of the proposed facility.

Responding to Members' questions, officers and the applicant Mr Fearnley provided the following information:

- The previously-approved permission related to an application for a care home for the elderly. The current proposal was for a residential recovery care home. It was noted that for the purposes of planning the two uses fall into the same category of use. Therefore, if the 2017 planning permission was implemented, the resultant development could also be occupied as a recovery care home.
- It was also recognised that no material changes to the site or its contextual circumstances were to be made, but that the application proposal in this instance did involve the addition of a second floor served by a dormer window compared to the previously-approved permission.
- The parking spaces would be used mainly by staff who would be on a 24 hour rotation. The facility would have a non-visitor policy, however, family members may collect loved ones on a Sunday to take them out for the day, with them returning to the facility at the end of the day.
- It was recognised that the cul-de-sac did narrow and that there was only one access gate, but that this reflects the existing topography and previous history of the site. The proposal is seeking to make the best use of the land available and that is within the applicant's ownership, taking these factors into account.
- The architect who was in attendance at the meeting said that a pedestrian access point could be included, to provide a separate ingress/egress point for vehicles and pedestrians.
- There was no evidence to link this type of facility to anti-social behaviour or crime.
- Mr Fearnley explained that he was recovering from alcohol dependency and that was his reason for the change of use with this application (as opposed to the previously-approved 2017 permission) to a recovery care facility from elderly care home. When trying to find a facility for himself it had been difficult.

- Mr Fearnley provided an explanation for Members of how this type of facility operates. He advised the Panel that many residents in this type of facility did not often use outside space but preferred to stay either in their rooms or use the centre intervention space. The facility would be staffed 24 hours on a rotational basis. Residents would only leave the facility on organised walks or for visits (usually once per week) to their family. It was difficult to say how long a person would stay at the facility as it was based on an individual's recovery process. Anyone who was found to be in drink or walked out of the facility (separate from the planned-for 'exit' opportunities) would be asked to leave and could not return.
- Mr Fearnley said that he had researched the financial sustainability of this type of facility and it was a viable development. It was acknowledged that during the pandemic there had been an increase in people becoming alcohol dependant and so seeking this type of facility.
- It was acknowledged that there had been concern raised in relation to increased anti-social behaviour in an alleyway. However, the alleyway was not near the proposed facility. The facility would have CCTV and lighting for security purposes.
- In relation to access for construction vehicles a condition had been put in place. Access would be between 8:00am and 5:00pm with half day on Saturday. Mr Fearnley advised that any materials would be delivered directly to the site and stored there.
- This application does not fall within major development category therefore, it is not required to comply with EN Policy. However, the proposal does involve the re-use of an historic building and it is proposed that it would be energy efficient.
- Mr Fearnley advised that he is an electrical mechanical contractor and any environmental efficiencies would be considered.
- Deliveries to the site would be limited, as there is the ability to combine deliveries of materials using the electrical contractor business premises as a base and so reduce the need for multiple deliveries from individual suppliers. Construction hours will correspondingly be limited and the applicant will be expected to submit and adhere to an approved Construction Management Plan. Draft conditions no. 6 and no. 7 are proposed to deal with this.
- Outside amenity space would be large enough to seat all 16 residents should the need arise.

Members comments included:

- No issues with this type of facility in other areas of the city, it was recognised that this type of facility provided good results for its residents.
- Residents concerns were acknowledged in relation to parking issues but noted the additional condition proposed in relation to parking management (including limiting to staff-only parking and ensuring no on-street parking in the vicinity).
- Of the view that amenity space was small, but acknowledged that there may be limited requirement for this from residents and there was

some access to nearby outdoor / public amenity spaces on an arranged basis.

- Concerns remained regarding the 'tight' access way, but with the opinion that the separate access offered by the applicant / architect was required to reduce conflict between vehicles and pedestrians.

RESOLVED - To grant approval as set out in the submitted report with additional conditions:

- a) Control parking provision with the submission and approval of a parking management plan (including consideration of arrangements for staff-only parking and to ensure no on-street parking in the vicinity as far as reasonably possible)
- b) Separate pedestrian access to be provided to reduce conflict between vehicles and pedestrians

17 21/03414/FU - Replacement of existing conservatory with single storey rear extension at No. 45 Plane Tree Croft, Alwoodley, Leeds, LS17 8UQ

Cllr Midgley return to the meeting at 14:40 for the consideration of agenda item 8.

The report of the Chief Planning Officer set out an application for replacement of existing conservatory with single storey rear extension at No. 45 Plane Tree Croft, Alwoodley, Leeds, LS17 8UQ

Slides and photographs were shown throughout the presentation.

Members were advised that this application had been brought to Plans Panel due to the applicants being employed within the Development Management Team at Leeds City Council. The Council's Officer Delegation Scheme (Council (non-executive) functions) sets out that where this is the case an application cannot be determined by the Chief Planning Officer under delegated powers.

The Panel were informed of the following points:

- This is a semi-detached house with an existing conservatory. The application requested the replacement of the existing conservatory with a rear single storey extension, with a parapet roof and slight mono-pitch lean to roof to allow for maintenance of the roof.
- The proposed single storey extension would project 3 metres from the original rear wall of the property, which is the same as the conservatory it would replace. The width will be 3.5 metres and the overall height would be 3.6 metres to the top of the mono-pitch lean to roof and 3.5 metres to the top of the parapet wall. This would be a reduction in height of 0.3 metres compared with the existing conservatory.
- The proposed single storey rear extension would be set 0.2 metres away from the common boundary with No. 47 Plane Tree Croft and would have a distance of 4.1 metres to the common boundary with No. 43 Plane Tree Croft.

- Glazed doors are proposed to the single storey extension which face the North and West elevations.
- No objections have been received from neighbouring properties.
- Materials would be similar to those already used for the property.
- A condition in relation to Permitted Development is in force for the whole estate which is why the application requires permission, otherwise it would be able to be pursued under automatic permitted development rights pertinent to householder extensions.

Members had no questions in relation to this application and could see no issues with the proposed extension.

18 RESOLVED – To grant permission as requested in the submitted report.
Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED – To note the next meeting of the North and East Plans Panel will be on Thursday 22nd July 2021, at 1:30pm in Civic Hall.

The meeting concluded at 14:50