

## PLANS PANEL (WEST)

THURSDAY, 26TH JULY, 2012

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

Councillors M Coulson, J Hardy, T Leadley,  
P Wadsworth, C Gruen, C Towler,  
J Bentley, R Wood and M Harland

### 26 **Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

Councillors J Hardy and P Wadsworth declared an interest in Agenda Item 8, Garages to rear of 15 Silk Mill Gardens, due to their positions on the West North West Homes ALMO.

Councillor J Bentley declared an interest in Agenda Item 8, Garages to rear of 15 Silk Mill Gardens due to previous involvement with objectors to the application.

Councillor P Wadsworth declared an interest in Agenda Item 11, Gable House, Rawdon as he was known to the applicant. He withdrew from the meeting for the discussion and voting on this item.

### 27 **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor J Walker. Councillor M Harland was present as substitute.

### 28 **Minutes - 14 June 2012**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 June 2012 be confirmed as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

#### Minute 12 – Declarations of Interest

- To include personal and prejudicial declarations from Councillors J Hardy and P Wadsworth in respect of Minute 18 – Silk Mill Gardens due to their positions on the West North West Homes ALMO.

#### Minute 15 – University of Leeds, Bodington Hall, Otley Road

- That Councillor J Bentley's vote against the recommendation be recorded.
- To amend first bullet point to read 'Retention of the playing fields and whether these were included in the site'.

#### Minute 17 – Leeds Girls High School

- To amend third bullet point to read 'Section 106 agreement for affordable housing – Some Members had previously indicated a preference towards the purchase of HMOs in the area'.

**29 Application 10/04924/FU - Former St Joseph's Convalescent Home, Outwood Lane, Horsforth - Appeal**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer informed Members of the appeal decision against the refusal of full planning permission for a replacement part2, part3 and part 4 storey care home with 34 self contained flats, 39 dementia/respite/nursing care rooms, chapel, lounges, dining area, activity rooms and function room with car parking and landscaping at the former St Joseph's Convalescent Home, Outwood Lane, Horsforth.

Members were reminded of the planning history of the site and the Panel's most recent refusal due to the impact on the conservation area and the impact of the proposed dementia block. The application had received a unanimous refusal from the Panel and this view was supported by the Inspector following the appeal.

Members welcomed the decision of the appeal and in response to a question, it was reported that the Council had not applied for costs as it was not felt that the applicant had acted unreasonably.

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

**30 Application 12/01295/FU - Garages to rear of 15 Silk Mill Gardens, Cookridge, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to an application for a pair of domestic garages to the rear of 15 Silk Mill Gardens, Cookridge, Leeds.

The application had previously been considered at the June meeting of Plans Panel (West) when it had been deferred for further consideration regarding access to the site. Further legal advice had been taken since that meeting and it was now reported that the application should be considered in relation to planning terms only and that issues surrounding access could not be used as grounds for refusal. The applicant had clarified that the garages would be for domestic use for storing vehicles and would be let to local users.

In response to Members questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Entrance/exit to the site.
- Inclusion of the condition that required the retention of existing boundary planting.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved subject to conditions detailed in the report and an additional condition concerning the retention of the hedge to the boundary as referred to in the report.

**31 Applications 12/02326/FU and 12/02465/LI - 87 Otley Road, Headingley, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application and listed building consent for the change of use of a shop (Class A1) to financial and professional services (Class A2) with associated alterations to the listed building at 87 Otley Road, Headingley.

Photographs of the building were displayed.

The following issues were highlighted in relation to the application:

- The applicant was likely to use the premises as a letting agency.
- The application had been referred to Panel due to representations from Ward Members and local interests. There had been nine letters of objection and concern regarding the large number of letting agencies in the area. This did not constitute grounds to refuse the application.
- The building had not been identified as primary or secondary shopping space.
- The application was recommended for approval.

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

- There had been similar applications that had been recommended for refusal. These had been in defined shopping areas which were covered by policy that could be applied to the use of the properties.
- There would not be a requirement to apply for permission to revert back to Class A1 usage.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved subject to conditions detailed in the report...

**32 Application 12/01481/FU - Land adjacent to 47 St Michael's Lane, formerly known as 45 St Michael's Lane, Headingley**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for a part three, part four storey block of 41 studio flats with ancillary office space, landscaping and car parking at land adjacent to 47 St Michael's Lane, Headingley.

Members were shown photographs and site plans.

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

- The proposed scheme had been amended from an initial proposal for 45 studio flats down to 41. Part of the Section 106 agreement had been amended to reflect this.
- Additional representation received from local objectors.
- The proposals fell outside the Headingley Conservation Area.
- The site was previously used for industrial purposes.

- Members were informed of previous planning refusals at the site and existing permission that had been granted on appeal for another scheme on the site.
- Car parking provision met UDP guidelines and there would be no permits for residents.
- The footprint of the proposed development was similar to that of the proposals that had extant permission.

A local resident addressed the meeting with concerns regarding the application. These included the following:

- Concern that the development was too large for a narrow site.
- Concern regarding the potential for increased noise and disturbance, particularly with the roof terrace.
- Problems regarding litter and rubbish in the area which would be increased should this scheme be approved.
- There was already a significant amount of student accommodation in the area and there had been a decline in the number of students coming to the city.
- Strong objections had been received from 19 residents.
- The proposals would not provide high quality homes.
- In response to Members questions, it was accepted that the site needed filling but it was felt the proposals were too much for the space involved. Further concern was expressed over car parking provision.

The applicant's representative addressed the meeting regarding the application. The following issues were highlighted:

- The applicant had undertaken extensive consultation with local residents and Council officers.
- The Council's Design and Review Panel felt that it was a better design than the proposal that had extant permission.
- The scheme would direct students away from traditional student housing and release those properties back on to the open market.
- The objections only represented a small fraction of the local population and only 2 had been received from residents within 150 metres of the site.

In response to Members comments and questions, the applicant's representative reported that the number of proposed flats had been reduced due to a change from cluster flats to studio flats. He also informed the Panel that the consultation had included writing out to 36 local residents, local interest groups and Ward Councillors. It was further reported that the proposed roof terrace had been assessed by noise consultants and had felt to be acceptable.

Further to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- A noise assessment of the proposed roof terrace had been carried out by Environmental Health officers.
- Policy on shared surfaces – this would not apply to the proposals as they would be private land.
- The number of allocated parking spaces came within guidelines.
- There would be no through access of the site.
- Suggestions that conditions should be attached to the use of the roof terrace, it was reported that there would be difficulty enforcing any conditions but noise levels could be monitored.
- The size of the proposed flats fell within housing standards.
- Concern regarding the lack of greenspace.

**RESOLVED** – That approval be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to conditions outlined in the report and an additional condition regarding acceptable noise levels to the boundary to ensure that the use of the roof terrace can be controlled to minimise noise disturbance to residents in the surrounding neighbourhood. Officers to consult Environmental Health to determine a suitable dba rating at the boundary.

### **33 Application 12/02118/FU - Gable House, 11A New Road Side, Rawdon, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the change of use of a house to a dental practice at Gable House, 11A New Road Side, Rawdon, Leeds.

The application had been referred to Plans Panel at the request of a local Ward Councillor over concerns regarding the lack of off street parking and it had been further requested that Members should undertake a site visit.

Members were shown photographs of the property and surrounding area, including a nearby public car park, and it was reported that the property itself did not provide parking at the maximum level that the UDP would recommend. It was also reported that the property fell in a commercial area flanked by a medical practice and a school and was not ideally placed for use as a dwelling. Photographs of the public car park showed that only 5 out of 20 available spaces were being used in a photograph taken during mid morning and it was only at school opening and closing times that there were pressures on parking space. It was therefore felt that there was sufficient nearby parking and not sufficient grounds to refuse the application.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved subject to conditions detailed in the report.

### **34 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday, 16 August 2012 at 1.30 p.m.