SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 17TH MAY, 2018

PRESENT: Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, S Arif, J Bentley, P Gruen, S Hamilton, T Leadley, E Nash, D Ragan, P Wadsworth and N Walshaw

103 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest.

Councillors S Arif, P Gruen, D Ragan and N Walshaw informed the Panel that they were known to the applicant for Agenda Item 7, Application 18/01138/FU – 238 West End Lane, Horsforth and would be treating the application with an open mind, on planning grounds only and without pre-determination.

Prior to consideration of this application, the Chair informed the meeting that she had requested that this application be referred to Plans Panel for determination. This was done before she had been made aware of the identity of the applicant. She informed the Panel that although she was able to consider the application with an open mind, given the circumstances and to avoid perception of bias she left the meeting during the discussion and voting on this item.

A nomination was sort for a Chair to consider the application.

RESOLVED – That Councillor N Walshaw assumes the Chair for the duration of Agenda Item 7, , Application 18/01138/FU – 238 West End Lane, Horsforth

104 Minutes - 12 April 2018

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 April 2018 be confirmed as a correct record.

105 Application 18/01138/FU - 238 West End Lane, Horsforth Leeds, LS18 5RU

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a detached dwelling at 238 West End Lane, Horsforth, 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.

Issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The application was for a detached house to the rear of 238 West End Lane.
- Although consent had been given for similar properties in the area this application was not considered to be in the same context as previous approvals in the locality had been granted under a different policy framework.
- Objections had been received from neighbouring properties on the grounds of potential noise and disturbance and damage to amenity.
- Further objections had been received from Ward Councillors regarding the property being out of character for the area.
- The application was not considered to be policy compliant and was recommended for refusal.
- The applicant disagreed with the reasons for refusal. Issues highlighted included the following:
    - The development would not be harmful to the character or patter of development in the area.
    - The scale and massing would not be harmful to others views.
    - The house would be situated on the lower part of the plot and be surrounded by trees.
    - The single storey element could be done under permitted development rights.
    - There would only be minimal vehicle movement.
    - The lack of road frontage to the proposed property would not make it out of character with other properties in the area.

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

- The applicant wanted to build the property for a relative and to meet their care needs.
- It was not disputed that it would be a back garden development but there were others in the area.
- Existing properties would still retain reasonable sized garden areas.
- There would not be significant noise and disturbance and the applicant would be happy to see conditions to have windows facing existing properties obscured.
- There would not be significant overshadowing of other properties and gardens.
- In response to questions from the Panel, it was reported that there had not been any further discussion regarding the size of the development or distance from neighbouring properties.

The Panel heard from local residents with concerns and objections to the application. These included the following:

- This was development of back garden land with no road frontage and out of context and character for the area.

- The plans were contrary to planning policy.
- The proposal would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties amenity and be intrusive on others privacy.
- The proposal would dominate all surrounding properties.
- Boundaries were closer than set out in Neighbourhoods for Living guidelines.

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

- There had been some discussion with regard to amending the proposals but the applicant wanted the proposals as they were to be determined.
- The plans showed a height of 9.2 metres. There were no cross section drawings to demonstrate that the height would actually be lower.
- There was a significant shortfall in the distance from windows to neighbouring properties.
- As the proposals stood, they were not policy compliant and it was suggested that the officer recommendation for refusal be supported although some Members were not adverse to the principle of development in the location.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused as per the officer recommendation.

106 Application 18/00367/FU - Land at 245 Elland Road, Beeston, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the change of use of land to car sales, siting of a porta cabin and storage container (to accommodate a generator) and fencing on land at Elland Road, Beeston, Leeds.

Members visited 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:

- There was an outstanding highways issue due to the proximity of a pedestrian crossing to the site entrance.
- The site had previously been used for coach parking and as a haulage depot.
- The site was mainly hard standing and currently used for match day car parking.
- The Highways Officer informed the Panel that the issue with regard to the pedestrian crossing could be resolved by moving the entrance to the site closer to the boundary wall next to the adjacent public house.
- It was recommended that the application be approved with a further condition regarding gating and access arrangements.

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

- The existing access must have previously been used.
- The pedestrian crossing was installed in 2007. The site had been nacant since 2002.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and conditions outline din the report. Further condition to ensure detailed plan of access arrangement with particular regard to the width of the access to be submitted for consideration by the Highways Authority.

107 Application 17/07502/FU - Total Riverside Garage, Kirkstall Road, Burley

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for works to the southern boundary at Total/BP, Riverside Garage, Kirkstall Road, Leeds.

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 proposals included the installation of new palisade fencing and structural gabions to the river bank to the rear of the garage to secure a landslide.
- The application had been referred to Panel following objections from a Ward Councillor regarding flood risk in the area and that the scheme should be deferred until more was known about the Flood Alleviation Scheme.
- It was reported that there were a number of conditions that would ensure works were carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment.
- The Application was recommended for approval.

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

- Ground levels would not be raised for the proposed works. It was reported that raising ground levels at this site could worsen flood risk elsewhere.
- There had been consultation with Ward Councillors and the Flood Alleviation Team. The Flood Alleviation team had agreed with the proposed conditions.
- The proposals would stabilise the banking without compromising the flood alleviation scheme.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation.

108 Application 17/07450/FU - Land at Sissons Lane, Middleton, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for 18 affordable dwellings to vacant site on land at Sissons Lane, Middleton.

Members visited 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 site was close to facilities and services and considered to be a sustainable location.
- There had not been any objections from local residents.
- There had been some concern from Local Ward Councillors with regard to local lettings policies but they were overall supportive of the scheme.
- The application was recommended for approval subject toconditions detailed in the report.

In response to concerns regarding an unsightly flue to the rear of properties on Sissons Road, it was reported that this would be investigated.

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

109 Application 17/05126/OT - Land off Fall Lane and Meadowside Road, East Ardsley

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a mixed use development with medical centre, retail, six flats and fifteen dwellings at land off Fall Lane and Meadow Side Road, East Ardsley.

Members visited 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 application had been considered at the Panel meeting in April 2018 when it had been deferred for further information regarding the occupation of the commercial units and further negotiation with regards to the housing mix and layout.
- Since the publication of the Agenda further supporting correspondence had been sent by local residents and Ward Councillors although there were some concerns regarding car parking and whether there was a provider for the health centre.
- It was reported that there would be a further condition to remove permitted developments for change of use for the health centre and pharmacy buildings.
- Further to previous concern regarding the site layout, it was reported that due to constraints of the site including a change in levels, it was

difficult to make significant amendments. In context of the wider area it was felt that 3 storey properties were acceptable and appropriate.
- With regards to greenspace provision, it was reported a sum was paid in 2008 as part of the adjoining development which actually included this site.
- A viability assessment had shown that it would be unreasonable to pursue further greenspace contributions and there was already extensive greenspace in the locality with a network of public footpaths.
- With regard to the provision for a health centre and pharmacy, discussions had opened with the local Care Commissioning Group. There was an identified local demand.
- There was a proposed agreement for maintenance of landscaped areas within the conditions to the application.
- The application was recommended for approval.

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

- Due to viability issues there would be no provision of or contribution towards affordable housing.
- The site needed to be developed and the provision of further health care facilities was much needed in the area.

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

110 Application 17/07967/FU - The Bungalow, Moor Knoll Lane, East Ardsley

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a single storey rear extension, side extension and access ramp at The Bungalow, Moor Knoll Lane, East Ardsley.

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 bungalow was on an isolated site away from other properties.
- The application had been referred to Panel at the request of a Ward Councillor due to concerns of encroachment onto greenbelt land.
- The Extension would be single storey with a pitched roof to tie in with the existing building.
- The extension was to provide independent living space for a disabled relative. These were considered to be special circumstances for development on greenbelt land.
- Due to the very special circumstances, the application was recommended for approval.

In response to Members comments and questions it was reported that such an application would not normally be recommended for approval. It was also believed that the building to the north of the site that was previously used for garage/stables had now been removed.

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