

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 17TH MARCH, 2022

PRESENT: Councillor E Taylor in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,
S Hamilton, P Wray, S Burke, D Collins,
T Smith, D Jenkins and G Almass

79 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals.

80 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There was no exempt information.

81 Late Items

There were no late items.

82 Declarations of Interests

Councillor Wray informed the Panel that he had submitted an objection to Agenda Item 8 - Block B, Victoria Riverside, Atkinson Street, Hunslet and would be withdrawing from the Panel for that item.

In relation to Agenda Item 7 – Bramhope Primary School, Tredgold Crescent, Bramhope, Councillor Anderson informed the Panel that his wife was a governor at Bramhope Primary and that he would be treating the application with an open mind.

83 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors R Finnigan and D Ragan.

Councillor G Almass was in attendance as substitute for Councillor D Ragan.

84 Minutes - 17 February 2022

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 February 2022 be confirmed as a correct record.

85 Application 21/09/09894/FU - Bramhope Primary School, Tredgold Crescent, Bramhope

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for proposed alterations and extension to the existing school building including new landscaping and reconfiguration of site access and car parking and new 2.4 metre boundary fencing.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

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

- The proposals would move the school from 1.5 form entry to 2 form entry per year increasing pupil numbers from 328 to 420.
- There would be new extensions to the existing building, new pedestrian access to the front, new car parking and perimeter fencing to the site.
- There had been a high level of public interest into the application, mainly in objection due to the potential for highway congestion and the loss of an undesignated footpath . There had been some support with regards to the safeguarding and safety of children.
- The site was mainly surrounded by residential areas.
- The school was split between two buildings with the undesignated footpath running between.
- Part of the site fell within the greenbelt.
- Physical extensions to the school would be relatively small with most of the expansion being provided by reconfiguration of the internal layouts.
- Car parking would be increased by 19 spaces at the Breary Rise car park, which would double the amount of parking available.
- There would be improved connectivity between the school buildings.
- There would be some tree loss and re-planting would be at a rate that was more than compliant with policy. There would be further investigation as to whether the sycamore tree towards the entrance could be retained but there was some difficulty due to a change in levels.
- There would be further landscaping and hedge planting to screen the car park.
- The site does not currently have secure perimeter fencing and can be accessed by the public.
- The footpath that went through the site had not been registered prior to the application. A claim as a right of way had since been submitted. Should the application be granted, this would become a separate legal matter.
- The existing loop arrangement on Breary Rise which is currently used as a pick up and drop off point would no longer be accessible to the public.
- The main access off Tredgold Crescent will continue to be shared with the medical centre.
- There would be the introduction of a school street order to prevent the picking up and dropping off of children on Breary Rise during these periods. There would also be measures to protect key junctions.

There would be a condition to monitor the highway position so that further consideration could be given to any unforeseen issues.

- There would be improvements for pedestrians including the widening of traffic islands on Leeds Road.
- It was considered that harm to the greenbelt was limited, particularly with the additional planting and there were very special circumstances for development within the greenbelt including the need for the safeguarding and safety of the children and the need for additional school places in the area.
- The application was recommended for approval subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

Local residents and a Ward Councillor addressed the Panel with objections to the application. These included the following:

- The access path could be retained whilst fencing off the two sections of the school to maintain security. Minor adjustments could be made to existing fencing so the footpath could remain. There was a similar arrangement at a school elsewhere in Leeds.
- There was no alternative footpath to the southwest of Brearly Lane and this would divert pedestrians to more dangerous routes.
- There would be increased pedestrian traffic which would increase the risk.
- The closure of the path would hinder people with limited mobility. The path was in a better state of repair than others and had railings to assist people up steps. It was a safer route than crossing Breary Lane. Breary Lane was not considered safe enough for a pedestrian crossing and was therefore not safe for pedestrians. It was disingenuous to conduct the traffic survey during the lockdown.
- Increasing the size of the school would lead to more vehicles, pollution and danger to residents.
- There has not been a comprehensive or effective travel plan devised.
- The proposals would just force people to park elsewhere and move the existing problems to other streets.
- In response to questions, the following was discussed:
 - There would be an increase in vehicles causing nuisance. The proposed traffic measures were not sufficient.
 - Living near a school should not prevent people from being able to access their driveways.
 - People were being advised to keep active but there were no other safe footpaths to use.
 - Objections focussed on the traffic plan and lack of mitigation. Local residents were strongly opposed to the application.
 - Alternative options for a footpath had been explored.

The applicant and their representatives addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- The school had outstanding performance which was part of the reason for the proposed expansion.
- There would be several highways improvements which included the creation of a school street, parking restrictions, improvements to traffic islands and increased car parking.
- Although part of the site fell within the greenbelt this was outweighed by other factors.
- The school currently lacked sufficient perimeter boundary.
- As a result of consultation with residents and Ward Councillors there would be increased planting and tree replacement.
- There would be three main benefits:
 - The opportunity to improve security.
 - The opportunity to address the two school legacy and create a one school culture and the ability to move freely between the buildings.
 - The ability to improve the delivery of the curriculum and move away from having mixed age classes.
- In response to questions, the following was discussed:
 - Seven trees would be lost from the site. There would be thirty five new trees in total and additional shrub planting.
 - It was not known at this stage whether the biodiversity gains would be compliant with policy.
 - All traffic mitigation measures including road crossings had been investigated. It had not been possible to install a crossing on Breary Lane. There would be a condition to monitor the situation to identify any more measures that may be required.
 - There had been efforts to promote walking to school and cycling. Passes were issued to parents who needed to park on site.
 - There would still be pedestrian access to Breary Rise.
 - The school building had generous sized classrooms and good facilities with potential for improvement.
 - There had not previously been the financial means to install boundary fencing.
 - A diversion to the path had been considered but a suitable diversion could not be found. There were other existing paths that could be used.
 - Approximately 26 to 28 cars currently accessed Breary Rise during the hour before and after school. It was thought that this would spread to other streets in the area.

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

- The trigger to address climate change policy did not apply to this application. There would be the installation of electric vehicle charging points and the construction would be carried out in the most efficient way possible.
- With regard to the conversion of Breary Rise to a school street, it was reported that the cost of the Traffic Regulation Order would be met by

the applicant. With regards to resident's permits the initial costs would be met by the applicant.

- The possibility of installing an additional speed hump on Breary Lane will be considered. The road is subject to a 20MPH speed limit.
- It was expected that closing Breary Rise would displace traffic across a further seven streets where the impact would be less severe. The introduction of double yellow lines at junctions would allow traffic to move more easily.
- An amount of money would be set to one side should there be a need for further works following the highway monitoring period.
- A condition could be added regarding the hours of work during construction.
- The school would be added to the priority list for traffic enforcement.
- The proposals for increasing the pupil numbers had been subject to public consultation.
- The scheme was policy compliant from a highways perspective.
- The additional intake of pupils could be managed without extension or alteration to the school building.
- Closure of the footpath would be determined under separate legislation and not due to the determination of the application.
- There were no concerns with the school expanding, just the impact on the local neighbourhood and traffic.
- Concern that the school street would commit the council on future funding.
- Concern that the proposals would not be carbon neutral and the loss of mature trees.
- The school could expand without planning permission and that would have an impact on the highway without the proposed mitigation measures.
- The need for perimeter fencing was essential.
- There was no clear justification for retaining the footpath.
- Concern that the proposals would not effectively mitigate the highways issues.

RESOLVED – That permission be granted subject to the conditions outlined in the report and the following additional conditions:

- Condition to cover post first use additional highway mitigation measures if required.
- Service Management Plan
- Access gates to be set back a suitable distance from the highway.
- Levels
- Hours of construction

(Councillor Almass left the meeting during the discussion on this item and Councillor Anderson left at the conclusion of this item.)

86 Applications 20/01828/FU & 20/01957/LI - Block B, Victoria Riverside, Atkinson Street, Hunslet, LS10 1EU

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application and listed buildings application for the conversion of a retail unit into five flats with changes to parking arrangements and elevations at Block B, Victoria Riverside, Atkinson Street, Hunslet, LS10 1EU.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the applications.

The following was highlighted in relation to the applications:

- It was proposed to convert a space originally intended for retail into five flats.
- There was car parking to the front of the building and there would be electric vehicle charging bays.
- The layout of the flats was displayed. There would be four one-bedroom flats and one two-bedroom flat.
- There had been objections to the applications mainly due to the loss of a potential retail facility and the lack of provision elsewhere in the area.
- Locations of the nearest retail outlets were shown.
- Commercial units that had been proposed in an adjacent development had been converted into flats.
- There was no policy requirement to retain the retail use.
- The applications were recommended for approval.

A local resident addressed the Panel with objections to the application. He was supported by a local Ward Councillor. The following was discussed:

- Residents who had bought properties had been promised a retail facility.
- It was important to have more local shopping facilities, particularly for families with children.
- A retail facility would provide more of a community feeling in the area.
- The other nearest shops required a car journey as the road layout in the area was not suitable for pedestrians.
- The proposals were opposed to addressing climate emergency concerns as people would need second cars, make short car journeys and rely on deliveries.
- In response to questions, the following was discussed:
 - The development can't sustain the amount of parking.
 - Hunslet centre was the nearest location for other retail outlets. This required traversing major roads.
 - The proposals would make it necessary for residents to have cars.
 - The applicant had originally made the offer of a retail unit as part of the original planning permission.
 - It was not felt that there had been a sufficient effort to market the retail unit.
 - The applicant had advertised the change of use to flats without consulting residents.

- The nearest food retail outlets required a car journey due to the distance and roads to be crossed.

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

- The applicant had engaged the service of an estate agent to market the retail unit. There had not been any firm interest over a period of two years.
- The area for the bin store that would have been used for the retail store would no longer be used. There would be no additional bin storage. If arrangements proved to be inadequate it was expected that there would be increased collections and/or additional bins ordered to be stored in the existing bin stores. This would be subject to a condition. It was felt that the proposed capacity was adequate.
- There would be internal cycle storage for the flats.
- The retail unit could be converted to flats under permitted development.
- There was no condition for the provision of a retail unit.
- The decision to convert to flats could be premature when there will be further nearby residential development.
- Concern that developments of this kind had a lack of retail facilities and lack of facilities in this neighbourhood.
- There was no evidence to show that a retail unit would not be viable.

RESOLVED – That planning permission and listed building consent be approved subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

- Also additional informative to advise applicants/owners of where additional waste refuses bins can be ordered from.

87 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday, 14 April 2022 at 1.30 p.m.