

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 28TH NOVEMBER, 2024**

**PRESENT:** Councillor P Wray in the Chair

Councillors N Manaka, A Rontree,  
B Anderson, S Firth, Z Hussain, R Jones,  
P Stables and J Bowden

### **SITE VISITS**

The following Members attended the site visits:

N Manaka

B Anderson

R Jones

Penny Stables

A Rontree – only attended the site visit for Land east of Owlcotes Lane and south of Woodlands Road, Stanningley.

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

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

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

There were no exempt items.

#### **55 Late Items**

There were no late items.

#### **56 Declarations of Interests**

No declaration of interests were made at the meeting.

#### **57 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Parnham and France-Mir. Cllr Bowden attending the meeting as a substitute for Cllr Parnham.

#### **58 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2024, be approved as a correct record.

#### **59 24/03369/FU - No. 16 Chiltern Court, Rodley, Leeds, LS13 1PT**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer set out an application for the change of use from a C3 (Dwelling House) to a C2 (Residential Institution) as a young person's supported accommodation at No. 16 Chiltern Court, Rodley, Leeds, LS13 1PT. The report recommended to the Panel to grant permission subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report.

Slides and photographs of the site and proposals were presented by the Planning Officer who outlined the application as detailed in the submitted report. It was noted that the application had been before the Panel on the 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2024 where Members had resolved to accept the Officer's recommendation to grant planning permission subject recommended conditions but the addition of a condition that required that prior to the first occupation of the development details of a means of pedestrian access / exit from the site directly onto Town Street to be submitted and approved by the LPA and that residents in care at the site would be restricted from owning a car/vehicle to be secured through a legal agreement (Section 106).

Members were informed that the application was being brought back to the Panel as the applicant had challenged the necessity of imposing a condition for the access/ exit onto Town Street and the mechanism of a Section 106 to secure residents in care do not have access to car/vehicle ownership.

Details of reasons for challenging the additional conditions and Section 106 agreement were provided in the submitted report at Paragraphs 2 and 3.

The Panel were also advised that 2 more objections from local residents had been received relating to car/vehicle parking issues.

Questions to officers then followed, with officers responding to questions raised which included the following:

- Clarification on the difference between a Section 106 agreement and a planning condition. Advice was received from both Planning Officers and the Legal Officer.
- Parking for care staff to the site. It was noted that there would be 2 care staff always present.
- Highways policy for number of cars per residents at a property. It was noted that the policy stated 1 car per 3 residents and this application was policy compliant.
- It was noted that the applicant had said that residents would not normally have the means to buy, tax or run a car/ vehicle.

Members comments included:

- It was the view that the breaking through of the wall in front of the property was not necessary.
- Paragraph 3 of the submitted report would still be covered by a condition which was summarised at Condition 7 in the report. It was noted that a full condition would be drafted by officers.
- There were double yellow lines already along the road.
- Members were finding it difficult to refuse the officer recommendations.

The Area Planning Manager summed up the debate.

Upon voting, a motion was put forward to move the officer recommendations, as per the submitted report. This was moved and seconded, and it was:

**RESOLVED** - To grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report.

**60 23/04830/FU - Land East Of Owlcotes Lane And South Of Woodlands Road, Stanningley, Pudsey, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the erection of a part 6 storey, part 4 storey, building comprising of 19 apartments (Class 3) and commercial space (Class E) with associated parking, landscaping, and ancillary facilities at land east of Owlcotes Lane and south of Woodlands Road, Stanningley, Pudsey, Leeds. The officer's recommendation was for approval subject to conditions specified in the submitted report and the completion of a Section 106 agreement.

Panel Members 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 the representations received as detailed in the submitted report.

The application was brought to Plans Panel at the request of Cllr Andrew Carter who had raised concerns in regard to the design in relation to the massing and bulk of the proposed block, a lack of external amenity space and highway safety concerns in relation to additional vehicle movements, congestion, insufficient parking and rat-running.

A letter of support had been received from Cllr Peter Carlill which outlined he supported the re-development of a brownfield site given a demand for smaller properties within the ward along with the development creating local employment opportunities through the coffee takeaway kiosk, subject to ward members being involved in further discussions surrounding the Section 106 monies for traffic management in the vicinity.

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

- In relation to green space amenity an off-site contribution of £23,511.70 was to be secured via a Section 106 agreement. This sum would be spent on green space enhancements within the Calverley and Farsley Ward subject to consultation with Parks and Countryside. A small external area of private amenity space was to be provided as part of the design to be used by residents of the development, with soft landscaping, seating and interactive features.
- £30,000 was to be secured through a Section 106 agreement for the implementation of a traffic management scheme. It was noted that it would not be possible to close off any part of the roads due to commercial premises requiring access.
- In relation to the proposed coffee takeaway kiosk, it was noted that this would not be a destination premises but would provide takeaway only,

therefore parking would not be an issue. However, a condition could be added to restrict delivery times to the kiosk.

- Details of the low carbon technology was to be submitted to the authority which must be compliant with policies EN1 and EN2 and separate building control. Paragraphs 75 and 76 of the submitted report provided details on this.
- Bio-diversity net gain would be through the landscaping and planting of trees.
- Some concerns were raised in relation to the massing and scale of the development and highway issues.
- There was support for the scheme, which was close to bus and train links, which may encourage people to not have cars.

The Area Planning Manager summed up the debate.

Up on voting, a motion was put to move the officer recommendations, as per the submitted report. This was moved and seconded, and it was:

**RESOLVED** – To approve subject to conditions specified in the submitted report and the completion of the Section 1069 agreement and an additional condition in relation to; Deliveries to the coffee kiosk to avoid peak times.

**61 22/07648/FU - Fleet Lane, Oulton, Leeds, LS26**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the erection of a wedding venue, 33 holiday lodges, and a café/community hub building at Fleet Lane, Oulton, Leeds, LS26. The officer's recommendation was for refusal of planning permission for the reasons set out in the submitted report.

Members had visited the site prior to the meeting.

The panel was shown slides and photographs throughout the officer's presentation which included the following information:

- The applicant had made changes to the application since the position statement was received by the Panel on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2023. These changes were set out at Paragraph 6 of the report.
- The site contains wharves, once used for the import and export of fuel by canal. It was noted that this is protected as 1 of only 3 left in Leeds.
- It was noted that the proposed development would spread across the site compared to the previous buildings on this site.
- The proposal site falls within the Leeds SFRA Flood Zone 3a. Members were advised that the site had not passed the Sequential Test required by the NPPF.

Cllr Golton the Ward Councillor for Rothwell and Mr Law a local resident spoke in support of the application. Mr Windress the applicant's agent was also present to answer questions. In support of the application the Panel received information which included:

- It was the view that the Environment Agency was using outdated evidence in relation to flood risks for this area.
- The proposed development would bring benefits of employment to the area.
- The current site is an eyesore, and this development would improve the look of the site and the area.

The Panel were asked to disregard an email sent to the Panel Members by Mr Law, as Officers had not received the email and were unable to comment on it.

Questions from the Panel Members included:

- The information and evidence in relation to flood risk and the proposed mitigation of flooding.
- Vehicular access to and from the site.
- Impact of the proposed development on St Aiden's RSPB nature reserve.
- The Principal Planning Officer provided information in relation to the consultation with the Environment Agency in relation to their data on flood risk in this area.

Members comments included:

- The design was appealing especially given the buildings on the site currently, and there was an understanding of the benefits that such a development could bring to the local community for employment.
- There were still concerns in relation to flooding.
- There were still concerns in relation to the impact on the green belt.
- It was the view that this site was an eyesore and did require something doing to it.
- The development had good merits, however there were still too many concerns, but there was recognition for the views of the residents and for something to be done with this site.

The Area Planning Manager summed up the discussions.

Upon voting, a motion was put forward to move the officer recommendations, as per the submitted report. This was moved and seconded, and it was:

**RESOLVED** – That the application be refused planning permission for the reasons set out in the submitted report.

## **62 Date and time of the Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note the next meeting will be held on Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> January 2025, at 1.30pm.

*The meeting concluded at 15:30*