

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 22ND DECEMBER, 2016**

**PRESENT:** Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, B Anderson,  
J Bentley, D Congreve, M Coulson,  
R Finnigan, S Hamilton, S McKenna,  
E Nash and R Wood

### **47 Late Items**

There were no late items. Minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2016 had been distributed as a supplement to the agenda.

### **48 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

Councillor D Congreve informed the Panel that although not pecuniary, he did have an interest in Agenda Item 7, Applications 16/03676/FU and 16/03675/FU – Land off New Village Way, Churwell, Morley and that he would be leaving the meeting during the discussion of this item. Councillor Finnigan also informed the Panel that he had an interest in this application due to his Membership of Morley Town Council.

Councillor Congreve withdrew from the meeting during the discussion and voting on this item.

### **49 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of councillors A Smart and C Towler.

Councillors S Hamilton and S McKenna were in attendance as substitutes.

### **50 Minutes - 24 November 2016**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2016 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **51 Applications 16/03676/FU & 16/03675/FU - Land off New Village Way, Churwell, Morley, LS27 7GD**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented applications for engineering and ground works to facilitate residential development of 46

dwellings with associated access, car parking, landscaping and public open space at land off New Village Way, Churwell, Morley.

The application had been deferred at the previous meeting to allow for further negotiation on house/room sizes, site layout, school provision, further information on air quality and highways implications.

Members had visited the site prior to the meeting in November and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on the applications.

Further issues highlighted included the following:

- All properties now met size standards. This had meant an increase in the number of 2 bedroom dwellings.
- There had been no objections raised by the air quality team. Air quality monitoring had previously been carried out at residential properties close to the M621 and all levels had measured below recommended requirements. The site was therefore considered suitable for residential development with regards to air quality and no mitigation was required.
- It was reported that there would be expansion in local primary schools which would accommodate for this development. With regard to secondary provision there were proposals for a new free school in the area. There would also be a CIL contribution from the developer towards the provision of education.
- Access to the site was not considered to be a problem as there was access via two loops to the main road.
- Although there were challenges for development at this site, it was felt that the benefits of a full affordable housing contribution and CIL contribution outweighed the harm of development and it was recommended that the applications be approved.

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

- A thorough assessment of school places had been carried out and had taken account of demand generated by new housing.
- Noise limits from the motorway would still exceed guidelines at some properties but only with regard to outdoor areas.
- The nearest bus stops were 880 metres from the site and had high frequency services to the city centre.
- The width of the carriage way to the site was in line with requirements.
- There was currently sufficient space at Cottingley and Churwell Primary schools to accommodate additional pupils.
- The site fell within the catchment of two Clinical Commissioning Groups. There had been no objection to the proposed development with regard to the provision of GP services.

- Some concern was raised that issues relating to health provision, carriageway width and noise disturbance had not been adequately addressed.

## **RESOLVED –**

- (1) Application 16/03675/FU – That permission be granted subject to the specified conditions
- (2) Application 16/03676/FU – That approval be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions specified (and any others which might be considered appropriate) and the completion of a legal agreement within 3 months from the date of resolution, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Chief Planning Officer to include the following obligations:
  - Affordable housing – 15% (7units) on-site in accordance with Core Strategy policy H5
  - Green Space Maintenance
  - £10,000 to install a new 'live' nus information display at Bus Stop number 10325
  - Local employment initiatives

In the circumstances where the undertaking has not been completed within 3 months the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.

## **52 Applications 16/04153/FU & 16/04154/LI - Spenfield, 182 Otley Road, Headingley, LS16 5AA**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application and listed building application for part demolition and conversion of Spenfield to create six apartments and studio flat, construction of seven terraced dwellings on the car park to the rear with associated boundary treatments, landscaping and car parking.

The applications had been considered at the meeting of the South and West Plans Panel at the meeting held in October 2016 when approval for Application 16/04153/FU had been deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer and Application 16/04154/LI had been granted. Subsequent to the meeting in October, a complaint had been made that reported differentiations in height were less than actually reported and that there had also been an error in notifying local residents. The decision notices had been put on hold to allow for this additional report to address these issues.

Members had visited the site prior to the meeting and the meeting in October and site plans and photographs were displayed during discussion of the applications. A model of the proposals was also available for inspection.

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

- There had been no additional issues raised with the further objections received.
- The differentiation in height and distances as previously reported was explained.
- The proposed apartment block met requirements with regards to distance from existing residential properties.
- The proposed apartment block sat comfortable with the listed building and the proposals would give a beneficial re-use of the Spenfield Building.
- It was recommended that the application be approved.

Local residents addressed the Panel with concerns and objections to the application, these included the following:

- The new terrace would obscure views for existing residents and the plans were not fitting within the conservation area.
- There had not been any significant change to the initial proposal that had been refused.
- The ground floor of Spenfield had been described as of museum quality and should be preserved and an alternative use found.

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

- All the concerns raised by the Planning Inspector had been addressed including comments regarding internal alterations.
- The steps in the terrace were now in line with the fall of the land.
- There was a 20% reduction in shadowing in comparison with the previous scheme.

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

- There had been engagement with Ward Members.
- Concern that flat roofs were not in keeping with the neighbourhood design statement or conservation area.
- Historic England had supported the form, scale and design of the proposals and the fact that they did not compete with the listed building.
- There were no issues with overlooking from the proposed apartments.
- The loss of views from existing properties would not form grounds for refusal of the application.

## **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That Application 16/04153/FU be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions listed in the appended report and the prior completion of a Section 106 agreement to cover the following:

- Contribution of £48,425.79 for off-site greenspace provision and £6,737.50 towards a scheme for sustainable travel

In the circumstances where the Section 106 Agreement has not been completed within 3 months of the panel resolution, the final determination of the applications shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.

- (2) That application 16/04154/LI be granted listed building consent subject to the conditions listed in the appended report.

Condition 1 of both applications shall be subject to a variation to require the development to be commenced before the expiration of two years from the date of the approval.

### **53 Preapp/16/00513 - Kirkstall Forge, Abbey Road, Kirkstall, Leeds, LS5 3NF**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer informed Members of a pre-application presentation for Phase 2 of the Kirkstall Forge development (Plots E and F) comprising 112 houses and apartments, circa 1900 square metres of retail space, amenity space and a new public square.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of this item.

Members were reminded that Phase 1 of the Kirkstall Forge had been approved in September 2015. This had consisted of an office block which was due to open in August 2017. A reserved matters application would follow in early 2017 and this pre-application asked the Panel to consider appearance, scale, layout and landscaping.

The applicant's representatives addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- Work on the site had been ongoing for many years to produce a sustainable mixed use site comprising of homes, restaurants, shops and a railway station.
- The railway station opened in 2016 and the first office building on site was midway through construction.
- There was a focus on skills and training initiatives for local people which would include pathways to employment.
- Phase 2 would include 112 dwellings consisting of 96 houses and 16 apartments along with 1900 square metres of retail space.
- There would be a mix of house types and all houses would have a minimum of two parking spaces. CGI images of the proposed

development were shown which displayed proposed house types, highways and parking arrangements.

- Provision of a residential refuse strategy and retail servicing strategy
- Open areas and play spaces.

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

- 26% of properties would be 4 bedroom, 56% 3 bedroom with the remainder 2 bedroom.
- Houses would benefit from generous glazing with large room windows to provide a bright and airy environment.
- The commitment to landscaping would include the planting of semi-mature trees. It was important to create a natural landscaping scheme.
- Affordable housing – there would be a contribution via a commuted sum. There would be more detail regarding this at the next stage of development.
- Concern regarding lack of space between blocks of housing and the size of the blocks.
- Concern that the appearance of the buildings was bland austere. It was reported that there would be a texture to the architecture not demonstrated in the images and would be of a quality brickwork design. There would also be generous landscaping.
- Safety and security – this would be considered prior to a reserved matters application.
- Balcony sizes – the balconies would provide an expansion of the living room areas.
- The site would be enriched with public spaces and all properties would have external amenities which would include roof terraces and courtyards.
- Riverside safety – there would be a robust balustrade along the riverside.
- In response to questions outlined in the report, the following was discussed:
  - Members broadly supported the scale and layout of the development though some concern had been expressed regarding spacing between housing and the number of houses in some blocks.
  - With regard to the emerging appearance, there had been some concern that the designs gave an austere and bland appearance. It was felt that more detail on architecture and materials to be used before a better judgement could be given on the final appearance.
  - With regard to the emerging landscape scheme it was reported that there was potential for more greenery of buildings and roof terraces could be used for this.
  - More detail on the delivery of the Section 106 agreement, with particular regard to affordable housing was requested.

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

**54 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday, 17 January 2017 at 1.30 p.m.