

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 9TH JULY, 2015

PRESENT: Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, A Castle, B Cleasby,
M Coulson, R Finnigan, J Heselwood,
E Nash, A Smart, C Towler and R Wood

10 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

Members were advised that an appendix to Agenda Item 9, Application 14/07043/FU – 80 Cardigan Road contained information relating to financial matters and was considered to be exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4 (3).

11 Late Items

There were no late items however supplementary information for Agenda Item 9, 80 Cardigan Road, Headingley, Leeds.

12 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

13 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor J Bentley.

Councillor B Cleasby was in attendance as a substitute member.

14 Minutes

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 4 June 2015 be confirmed as a correct record subject to the inclusion of Councillor A Castle's apologies for absence.

15 Application 14/04182/FU - 10 Hillcrest Rise Leeds LS16

The report of the Chief Planning Officer informed the Panel of an appeal lodged against the refusal of application 14/04182/FU for a two storey front and side extension with raised timber deck to a detached house at 10 Hillcrest Rise, Leeds.

Members were reminded that main reasons for refusal included the design of the front extension and the impact on protected trees. The applicant had

demonstrated to the Inspector that they would do their utmost to prevent to the trees and the appeal was upheld.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

16 Application 15/00923/FU - Former Leeds Girls High School Victoria Road LS6

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a residential development comprising of 48 apartments, 43 townhouses and retention of Rose Court Lodge at the former Leeds Girls High School, Headingley Lane, Headingley, Leeds.

Site Plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this application.

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

- The application had been deferred from the previous Plans Panel meeting to allow further discussion regarding Members concerns over the increased number of flats proposed, car parking and the affordable housing mix.
- The following changes had been made to the application:
 - Block 10 – this had been proposed for a set of 10 flats – it would now be 3 townhouses.
 - The gatehouses which had initially being proposed as a pair of flats in each would now be semi-detached houses.
 - Additional parking would be secured on the site.
 - There would be two affordable housing units on site and there would be a commuted sum to bring vacant properties in the locality back into use.

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

- There would now be 48 flats and 43 houses on the site.
- Rose Court was proposed to be apartments but was not included in this application.
- Concern that the commuted sum would not be sufficient to bring enough houses back into use for affordable housing.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report and subject to Section 106 agreement.

17 Application 14/07043/FU - 80 Cardigan Road LS6

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the change of use and alterations to a former day care facility and offices to form

Minutes approved at the meeting
held on Thursday, 6th August, 2015

26 flats and associated external works, including demolition of ramp and rear extension, at 80 Cardigan Road, Headingley, Leeds.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting. Site Plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this application.

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

- The site fell within the Headingley Conservation area.
- The building was previously under Leeds City Council ownership and used as a day care centre.
- It was proposed there would be a one way access system with access from Carding Road and exit on to Chapel Road. This would involve the lowering of the rear wall to improve visibility.
- Most of the landscaping at the site would be retained.
- There would be a mix of studio and one and two bedroom flats over all four floors of the building.
- A previous application at the site had been for 47 flats with significant extensions to the building.
- The proposed flats were smaller than guidance within the Leeds based standards.
- The applicant had agreed to not let the flats out to anyone under the age of 21.
- There would be no affordable housing or greenspace contribution due to viability issues.
- The proposals would bring back into use a vacant building and there would be improvements to landscaping and boundaries.

A local Ward Member addressed the Panel with concerns regarding the application. These included the following:

- The highways arrangements were not suitable – Chapel Lane was a very busy road to accommodate exiting traffic
- Concern regarding the loss of the wall to the rear.
- Tenancy of such a development could be problematic and would lend itself for student accommodation.
- The proposed flats were too small.
- The proposals would not address the attempts to rebalance the population of Headingley.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel. Issues raised included the following:

- The proposals would bring a vacant building back into use.

- The applicant had struggled to provide a viable scheme for the site and the viability of these proposals had been accepted by the District Valuer.
- The flats would be aimed at young professionals due to the easy access to Leeds City Centre.
- The proposals to remove the extension and ramp would improve the conservation area.

Members went into private session.

RESOLVED – That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following part of the agenda designated exempt on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as designated as follows:

The appendix to the main report referred to in Agenda Item 9, Application 14/07043/FU - 80 Cardigan Road, LS6 under Schedule 12 Local Government Act 1972 and the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). It is considered that if this information was in the public domain it would be likely to prejudice the affairs of the applicant. Whilst there may be a public interest in disclosure, in all the circumstances of the case, maintaining the exemption is considered to outweigh the public interest in disclosing this information at this time

Following the private session and in response to Members comments and questions the following was discussed:

- Concern regarding the size difference between the proposed flats and that specified in the guidance.
- Concern that the flats would be used for student accommodation.
- There was felt to be insufficient car parking at the site.
- Members supported the re-use of the building but did not support the proposals in their current form.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred for further discussion with the applicant with regard to the size of the flat units and possible reduction in numbers, reconsideration of the reduction of the wall at egress, reconsideration of parking numbers and submission of a revised viability statement.

18 Applications 14/07072/FU and 14/07073/FU - Land off Daisy Hill Close Morley LS27

Reports of the Chief Planning Officer presented applications for the variation of condition 2 of planning approval 13/00625/FU for amendments to

residential development and alterations to plot 12 involving repositioning of house and single detached garages to plots, 3, 4 and 13 on land off Daisy Hill Close, Morley.

Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this item.

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

- The site had been sold since approval had been granted.
- There was a PAS site to the rear and other sides were surrounded by residential properties.
- Changes to the proposals included the following:
 - Changes to internal road layouts which would increase boundary distances.
 - Addition of garages to plots 3, 4 and 13.
 - Repositioning of the proposed house for plot 12.
 - The applications were recommended for approval.

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

- Concern regarding access to the site and the loss of another greenfield site in Morley. It was suggested that the application be deferred and delegated to allow further consultation with Ward Members regarding the statement of construction practice. It was reported that this had already been agreed as part of the previous approval and that both Ward Members and residents would be consulted.

RESOLVED – That the applications be approved as per the officer recommendations and conditions outlined in the reports.

(Councillor Finnigan requested that his vote against approval for this application be recorded).

19 Application 14/04851/FU - Savins Mill Way Kirkstall LS5

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the construction of 2 new retail units (class use A1) and associated amendments to car parking at Savins Mill Way, Kirkstall, Leeds.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting. Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this application.

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

- The new units would go on an area currently used for car parking and recycling facilities.
- Current car park occupancy reached a maximum of ninety percent and it was felt there was sufficient parking on site.
- Members were shown details of the road layouts and it was reported that it would cause an increase of between 9 and 14 cars per hour. In mitigation, the developer had offered £25,000 towards traffic signal improvements.
- There would be no further capacity for future expansion at the site.
- The 2 proposed new units could create up to 87 jobs.
- The application was recommended for approval.

A local Ward Member addressed the Panel with concerns regarding the application. These included the following:

- The gyratory was at capacity and needed a further traffic study carrying out. Timings between traffic lights did not allow traffic to flow and this caused tailbacks on feeder roads. It was felt that there needed to be a fundamental review of the gyratory performance.
- Impacts on traffic from nearby development sites.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel. Issues raised included the following:

- The modelling for the traffic incorporated other development proposals in the area.
- The proposed development would not cause an increase to traffic during peak periods – it was felt the proposals would only attract passing trade during peak traffic times.
- There would be a significant contribution towards transport improvements.

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

- The possibility of alternative entrances to the site.
- Concern regarding the shared cycle way and footpath – it was reported that there would be improvements to existing footpaths.
- Inclusion of local employment in the Section 106 agreement.
- The possibility of connecting the overhead canopies between the units.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved in principle but deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to Section 106 agreement, separation of footpath and cycle way and addition of a local employment clause.

20 Application 15/02081/FU - 2 Ibbetson Rise Churwell LS27

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and retrospective consent for fence to rear garden at 2 Ibbetson Rise, Churwell, Morley.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting. Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this application.

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

- The application had been brought to Panel as the applicant was an Elected Member.
- The majority of the fence measured 2 metres in height but was higher in places due to a variation in levels.
- The proposed extension would not cause any overshadowing of neighbouring properties.
- Objections had been made by residents of a neighbouring property.

Members discussed the proposals and the possibility of lowering the fence. It was felt that there would only be minimal overshadowing.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report.

(Councillor Dawson who was in attendance but not taking part in the meeting declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item as the owner of the property concerned)

21 Application 15/00500/FU - 115 Back Middleton View LS11

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a detached two and half storey building consisting of five one bedroom flats on cleared site formerly occupied by garages to the rear of Back Middleton View, Beeston, LS11 8LG.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting. Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this application.

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

- The site was formerly housed a single storey car repair garage and was surrounded by Victorian terraced properties.
- Previous permission had been granted in 2008 for two 5 bedroom flats.
- There would be 5 car parking spaces and bin and cycle storage.
- The proposals were 12.5 metres from the nearest property.
- Reference to letters of objection received.
- The applicant had been asked to consider family housing but this was not felt to be viable.
- The application would provide much needed housing and was recommended for approval.

A local resident addressed the Panel with objections to the application. These included the following:

- The design of the flats did not fit within the area.
- There would be an increase in noise and disturbance in the area.
- There were already problems with parking in the area and the proposals would also increase traffic.
- The flats would not attract the right kind of resident and there had already been problems from other properties in the area.

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

- Concern regarding proposals to have hedging around the perimeter.
- A preference to see houses rather than flats.
- There was a demand for one bedroom flats in the area.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report and with alterations to condition 13 to remove hedging to the perimeter,

22 Date and time of next meeting

Thursday, 6 August 2015 at 1.30 p.m.