

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

TUESDAY, 17TH MAY, 2016

PRESENT: Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors J Bentley, M Coulson, P Gruen,
J Heselwood, E Nash, C Towler and
P Wadsworth

109 Opening Comments

The Chair announced that this would be the last meeting attended by Martin Sellens, Head of Planning Services. Members paid tribute to Martin and his significant and valuable contribution to planning across Leeds during the past 36 years. Martin thanked Members for their comments and support during his career. Members wished him a long and happy retirement.

Members were informed of the appeal decision regarding Application 15/05904/FU – Former White Bear, Dewsbury Road, Tingley, which was refused by South and West Plans Panel in December 2015. The application had been recommended for approval following previous concerns regarding amenity and highways safety and overturned by the Panel on grounds of harm to residential amenity (Noise and disturbance), highways and pedestrian safety and consideration of public health implications and the proximity of Woodkirk Academy. The Inspector had dismissed the appeal on the grounds of noise and disturbance from the potential use of Dewsbury Old Road and the impact on the amenity of residents. There was no reference made to public health implications. There had been no application for costs.

110 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of a disclosable pecuniary interest.

Councillor C Towler informed the Panel that she would not be taking part in the discussion or voting on Agenda Item 10, Application No. 15/04884/RM – Reserved Matters Application for residential development on land to rear of Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge as she had a relative who lived adjacent to the site.

111 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors J Akhtar, B Anderson, R Finnigan and A Smart.

Councillors P Gruen and P Wadsworth were in attendance as substitute Members.

112 Minutes - 21 April 2016

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 April 2016 be confirmed as a correct record.

113 Application No. 16/00184/FU - Dormer Windows to front and rear and new window opening to first floor side at 37 Woolin Crescent, Tingley, WF3 1ET

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for dormer windows to the front and rear and new window opening at 37 Woolin Crescent, Tingley.

The application had been considered at the Panel meeting held on 21 April 2016 when it was resolved to defer the application to allow Members to visit the site.

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

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

- The proposed dormers would be finished with upvc cladding.
- Members were shown aerial and streetscene photographs of existing dormers in the area.
- The rear dormer would be allowed under permitted development rights if it was finished with matching materials.
- It was recommended that the application be refused on the grounds of design guidance.

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

- With reference to other nearby properties that had similar dormer extensions, it was reported that these had been installed prior to current design guidance.
- There had not been any objections from neighbouring properties.
- The majority of dormers in the area were finished with upvc.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved.

114 Application No. 16/01757/FU - Single Storey Extension to front at 35 - 45 Brudenell Grove, Hyde Park, Leeds, LS6 1HR

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a single storey extension to front of retail unit at 34-45 Brudenell Grove, Hyde Park, Leeds.

Members attended 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 extension would increase ground floor retail space at the property on the ground floor. There were six flats above the retail unit.
- The proposal was for a flat roofed extension and the front would have a series of metal poles interspersed with roller shutters.
- It was reported that the forward projection would not be in fitting with the character of the area and was considered to be harmful to the street scene.
- The application had been recommended for refusal and brought to Plans Panel at the request of a Ward Councillor.

A Local Ward Councillor and the Applicant addressed the Panel. Issues raised included the following:

- The front of the site had suffered from graffiti and anti-social behaviour and there were piles of rubbish to the rear.
- The applicant was willing to invest in an area that had not seen any recent investment.
- The proposals would improve the area for residents.
- The application was for a family run business which had local experience with other stores in prime locations.
- The business supported local communities and events.
- The extension would enable a purpose built area for the sale of fruit and vegetables and the encouragement of healthy choices.
- The proposals would also be beneficial to other nearby businesses.
- There would be an approved waste management scheme and service management plan.
- In response to questions from Members, the following was discussed:
 - The proposals would not affect parking arrangements.
 - The extension was vital for the success of the business.
 - The extension would not encroach on the footpath and there would still be an area of the forecourt inbetween the extension and the footpath.

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

- Suggestions of different styles of shutters.
- The current frontage was unsightly and covered in graffiti.
- There were similar structures elsewhere.
- Improvements for waste with proper enclosed bin storage to the rear.
- There was no concern with regards to flood risk.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved.

115 Application No. 15/04158/FU - Demolition of Garages and Erection of attached pair of Semi-Detached Houses with associated amenity space to Garage Site adjacent to 11 St Ann's Lane, Burley, Leeds, LS4 2SE

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the demolition of garages and erection of attached pair of semi-detached houses with associated amenity space at 11 St Ann's Lane, Burley, Leeds.

The application had been deferred at the meeting held on 21 April to allow the applicant opportunity to reduce massing and dominance of the 2.5 storey element of the proposal. Panel Members had visited the site prior to the April meeting. Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on the application.

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

- Members were informed that there had been a reduction in height on the 2.5 storey element of the proposal by 1.9 metres. Due to the resulting loss of floor space, it had been proposed to extend the ground floor by 2.5 metres.
- Members were shown the impact of shading and overshadowing on neighbouring properties. This was not as significant as the previous proposal.
- There had been further representations from a local resident objecting that the reduction was still not sufficient and an objection had been received from a local Ward Councillor.
- Distances between the proposed property and neighbouring properties were considered acceptable within guidelines.
- The application was recommended for approval.

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

- There would be velux style windows on the extension. The Coach House already had velux windows.
- Members were reminded that the key issue was the reduction in dominance and massing.
- Some concern was expressed regarding the blandness of the design. It was reported that the material design had not changed and much of the building would be enclosed.
- Members showed broad support towards the proposed revisions.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved.

116 Application No. 15/04884/RM - Reserved Matters Application for Residential Development of 135 Dwellings on land to rear of Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a reserved matters application for a residential development of 135 dwellings on land to the rear of Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting and 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:

- Access to the site – vehicular access was shown as well as pedestrian and cycle access from Cookridge.
- An indicative outline application had been approved by City Plans Panel in April 2015.
- An indicative housing plan was shown. Housing on the site would be separated by a public open space.
- There would be a mix of housing and all proposed houses and distances between met planning guidelines.
- Retention of trees and additional planting and landscaping.
- Drainage plan – the site was at a higher risk of flooding without a drainage plan. The flood risk areas were away from residential properties and the drainage plan had been scrutinised and it had been concluded that the scheme was suitably robust.
- Affordable housing would be provided with 2 bedroom semi-detached properties.
- There had been a number of additional objections following the publication of the report but these did not raise any new substantive matters.
- It was recommended that the application be approved.

Local residents addressed the Panel with objections to the application. These included the following:

- Flooding and drainage – an independent Hydro geologist had expressed an opinion that the plans should not be approved. Reference was also made to the following:
 - Underground aquifers that held water – this had not been properly surveyed.
 - The statements about flood risk had been misleading.
 - Installation of drainage would increase the velocity of water draining from the site and cause flooding elsewhere.
 - More information was needed regarding the underground water levels and water flows.
- The site was not easy to access for pedestrians and alternative access was via very steep steps.
- There were no school places in the area.
- There would not be sufficient and safe access for site vehicles to access the site during construction.

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

- The applicants had spent 18 months working on the detail of the site following the Reserved Matters application. A hydro geologist had been engaged

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with additional condition to ensure details/schedule of chimneys are submitted identifying specific key plots within the site and such details/schedule to be agreed by officers and subsequently implemented.