

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 13TH FEBRUARY, 2020**

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

Councillors B Anderson, K Brooks,  
C Campbell, S Hamilton, J Heselwood,  
P Wray and D Blackburn

### **63 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

With regard to Agenda Item 9, Application 19/05843/FU – Unit 12, Moorfield Business Park, Moorfield Close, Yeadon; Councillor Campbell informed the Panel that he would be speaking in objection to the application and would not be taking part in the voting for this item.

With regard to Agenda Item 10, Application 19/02597/FU – Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge; Councillor Anderson informed the Panel that he would be speaking in objection to the application and would not be taking part in the voting for this item.

### **64 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors R Finnigan and D Ragan.

Councillors D Blackburn and M Shahzad were in attendance as substitutes.

### **65 Minutes - 16 January 2020**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2020 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **66 Application 19/04309/FU - 47 Westover Road, Bramley, Leeds, LS13 3PB**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for alterations to basement level to form a new bay window and two light wells to side and rear at 47 Westover Road, Bramley, Leeds.

The application had been considered at the Panel meeting held in January 2020 when it had been deferred to allow Members opportunity to visit the site.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed throughout the discussion of the application.

The following was highlighted:

- There had been a further written representation from a local Ward Councillor reiterating previous comments about the application facilitating the use of the property as a HMO.
- Further to concerns regarding the impact of the property becoming an HMO Members were reminded that the use of the property as a 6 bedroom HMO was allowed without.
- The basement of the property could be used for residential purposes without the application.
- The key issue for consideration was the impact of the light wells on the character and appearance of the building and of the conservation area.
- Approval would improve amenity for residents and the application was recommended for approval.

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

- Planning permission would be required to increase the property to a 7 bedroom HMO.
- Concern regarding the amount of light that the actual light wells would let in. The windows proposed replicated those that were already there.
- A condition could be added to remove permitted development rights.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved in accordance with the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report.

**67 Application 19/03367/FU - Land off Moorhouse Avenue and Old Lane, Beeston, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to an application for 41 dwellings and 8 apartments (Use Class C3) with associated internal access, car parking and landscaping at land off Moorhouse Avenue and Old Lane, Beeston, Leeds.

The application had been considered at the previous meeting when it had been deferred to allow officers to bring the application back to seek detailed reasons for refusal.

Following the last meeting, Officers had formulated reasons for refusal due to the lack of affordable housing, greenspace and small garden sizes. The applicant was now in discussion with a registered social landlord to deliver a 100% affordable housing scheme on the site. This would include greenspace contributions and towards bus stop improvements.

It was now recommended that the application be deferred for a three month period to develop a revised scheme and if not then refusal be deferred.

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

- The applicant had an extension of time agreed till the end of March. Following this there was potential for the sale of the land to fall through.
- A fresh application would extend time limits due to issues such as re-advertising of the application.
- There had been some further progress on layout and landscaping.
- Further to questions regarding viability, the applicant's representative addressed the Panel. The scheme would now be delivered on behalf of a housing association who would be eligible for grant funding. Further consideration would be given to garden sizes and the scheme would be policy compliant in relation to affordable housing and the greenspace contribution. The applicant would work with Ward Councillors with regard to delivery of the off-site greenspace contribution.
- Members were supportive of a 100% affordable housing scheme.

**RESOLVED** – That the refusal be deferred for a 3 month period to allow the applicants time to revise the application (partnered with a social registered landlord, to provide a 100% affordable housing scheme). Should such negotiations prove unsuccessful, delegate the refusal of the application to officers for the following reasons:

- 1) The offered commuted sum of £135,000 is insufficient to provide both an adequate commuted sum for the provision of green space and an affordable housing contribution. The proposal would be contrary to policy H5 of the adopted Core Strategy or both policies H5 and G4 of the adopted Core Strategy
- 2) Local Planning Authority considers that the proposal constitutes over-development of the site, due to the lack of on-site green space and small private (rear) garden areas which would offer the future occupiers a poor level of amenity on plots 5, 6, 7, 45 and 46. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy P10 and G4 of the Core Strategy and saved policies GP5 and BD5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan and the adopted SPG 'Neighbourhoods for Living – A Residential Design Guide'.

**68 Application 19/05843/FU - Unit 12, Moorfield Business Park, Moorfield Close, Yeadon**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the change of use of offices (B1) to a dental practice (D1) at Unit 12, Moorfield Business Park, Moorfield Close, Yeadon.

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 referred to Panel at the request of a local Ward Councillor.
- The application related to the ground floor of an existing office unit.

- Details of additional parking and bicycle storage.
- There would be 5 full time staff.
- There was 22 parking spaces on site which would leave 15 spaces for the dentist's surgery.
- The proposals complied with policy with regards to change of use.
- The proposals were policy compliant with regards to car parking.
- Landscaping – trees would remain, there would be some hedging lost but this was balanced with the addition of bicycle storage for sustainable travel.
- The application was recommended for approval.

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

- Change of use – this was a different type of use compared to others on the site.
- Parking – parts of the site were heavily parked up and there was concern that people would park on nearby residential streets.
- Confusion as to whether the application was policy compliant with regard to car parking and concern regarding the loss of greenspace for additional parking spaces and potential damage it would cause to an existing tree.
- In response to questions it was reported that Ward Councillors did get complaints regarding parking on nearby streets. There were also concerns regarding the loss of greenspace and the impact on policies relating to climate change.

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

- Parking – discussions with Highways had stated that 12 spaces were acceptable with regards to the operation of the practice.
- The site was office and industrial and there was residential in the area.
- The applicant would not have applied for the site if it was thought not to be suitable.
- There would be electric vehicle charging points and storage for 10 bicycles.
- Environmental impacts – there would be small changes to landscaping and protection for the roots of trees could be achieved through conditions to the application.
- In response to questions, the following as discussed:
  - There had been an assessment with regards to the tree.
  - There would be signage for patient's parking spaces and patients would be notified of arrangements when booking appointments.
  - There was pedestrian access and public transport links. This had been considered as part of the NHS bid for the practice. The applicant would be willing to make improvements for more direct pedestrian access.
  - The proposals for cycle storage had been suggested by Highways. The applicant felt that so many was not necessary.

- The tandem parking spaces would be for the use of staff.
- The electrical charging point was included at the request of highways. The Highways Officer reported that this was in accordance with policy and that with regards to cycle storage this would only be one space to three members of staff.

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

- There was no requirement for a biodiversity gain.
- Concerns regarding pedestrian and public transport access – it was reported that a condition could be made for pedestrian access from High Street.
- Further to concerns on loss of greenspace, it was reported that cycle storage could be reduced and additional planting could be introduced.
- The applicant would be willing to have a reduced number of parking spaces.
- Concern that pedestrian access was not suitable for wheelchair users.
- Monitoring and enforcement of parking – it was suggested that a condition could be added to the application for the submission of a travel plan.

A motion was made to defer and delegate the approval with additional conditions relating to the following:

- Pedestrian access that was DDA compliant
- Landscaping
- Reduction of the proposed cycle storage
- Removal of the tandem parking spaces
- Submission of a travel plan

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved in principle with decision deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the following:

- Additional condition to secure pedestrian access through wall from High Street and ensuring path DDA compliant in surfacing etc.
- Submission of plan showing additional landscaping to South East corner of greenspace.
- Submission of revised plan showing removal of 2 Tandem parking spaces.
- Submission of Plan showing Cycle store reduced to 5 spaces maximum.
- Personal permission to applicants Expert Orthodontics Ltd to ensure use cannot be more intensive.
- Condition requiring submission of Travel Plan.

**69 Application 19/02597/FU - Land off Moseley Wood Gardens, Cookridge, Leeds 16 and Application 19/02598/FU - Land off Cookridge Drive, Cookridge, Leeds**

The reports of the Chief Planning Officer presented the following:

- An application for 61 dwellings with associated infrastructure including public open space and landscaping (access through Phase 1 from Moseley Wood Rise) at land off Moseley Gardens, Cookridge, Leeds.
- An application for a new vehicular access from Cookridge Drive to Phase 2 of Moseley Green development at land off Cookridge Drive, Cookridge, Leeds

Members visited the sites prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout discussion of the applications.

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

Application 19/02597/FU:

- Phase 1 of the Moseley Green development was partially complete.
- A proposed layout was displayed.
- There would be a formal public open space to the west of the site and further greenspaces to the northern and southern boundaries.
- There had been objections relating to drainage and flood risk submitted in relation to Phase 1 proposals previously. The proposals would be similar to those at Phase 1 and the measures had worked successfully on that phase.
- There would be a mix of detached and semi-detached properties with one block of three.
- There would be 21 affordable housing units.
- Additional representations had been received but had been covered in previous representations.
- Principle of development of the site had been established through the Site Allocation Plan and the proposals would contribute to delivery of the housing supply.
- The developer had held consultations with the local community.
- There was no planning policy requirement for a second vehicular access.
- There would be improved bus stops and a sustainable travel contribution
- The affordable housing offer met policy requirements.
- House and garden sizes were policy compliant
- There would be a loss of 3 trees but 47 new trees would be planted
- The development would be compliant with Policies EN1 and EN2
- There was an acceptable drainage solution
- The application was recommended for approval.

Application 19/02598/FU

- The proposal for a second vehicular access would mean the loss of woodland.

- The loss of woodland and wildlife habitat outweighed the need for a second vehicular access.
- The application was recommended for refusal.

A local Ward Councillor addressed the Panel with concerns and objections to the application. These included the following:

- It was acknowledge that there was a good working relationship with the developer.
- Reassurance as sought that there would be hedging/fencing to the pathway at the back of Cookridge Drive.
- Was there enough tree planting.
- Concern regarding the proposed park and ride facility for the parkway station. Should there be limitations on parking?
- Road surface on Moseley Wood Gardens – This would not be resurfaced till works were completed. The developer had offered to contribute towards to repairs prior to this.
- A request for Ward Councillors to be involved in the development of the construction management plan.
- In response to questions, the following was discussed:
  - Ward Councillors had already had discussions with the developer regarding involvement in the construction management plan and would like this to be a condition to the application.
  - The proposals for flood management were felt to be suitable.

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

- The second access was not supported by the developer.
- There was an adequate walking/cycle connection.
- There would be a considerable Community Infrastructure Levy contribution.
- In response to questions, the following was highlighted:
  - There would be hedging/fencing to the walkway and would be happy for this to be a condition of the application.
  - Tree planting – this was addressed by landscaping conditions.
  - The developer had no objection to repairs to Moseley Wood gardens but would require an updated survey of the road condition.
  - Ward Councillors would be invited for future discussion on the construction management plan proposals.
  - The house types would maintain the blend from Phase One of the development.

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

- The proposed Parkway Station was at a very early stage and the pedestrian route was not specific. There were no proposals regarding the management of parking at this stage and it would be unreasonable to impose a condition on the developer with regard to this.
- Concern regarding the layout and distribution of affordable housing units – it was felt that an appropriate balance had been made and further amendments to the layout could have an impact on other issues including garden sizes.
- Members broadly welcomed the scheme and the fact that it met policy requirements and also agreed with the refusal of a second access.

## **RESOLVED –**

### **(1) Application 19/026597/FU**

That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions outlined in the report and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to cover:

- 1) Affordable housing provision – 8 intermediate and 13 social rented houses
- 2) Management and future maintenance of green space areas
- 3) Travel plan and management fee (£3,000)
- 4) Bus stop contribution of £10,000 towards bus stop 11740
- 5) Sustainable travel contribution of £30,530.30
- 6) Additional measures to Biodiversity Enhancement Management Plan for woodland area to the north
- 7) Local employment during the construction phase

### **(2) Application 19/02598/FU**

That the application be refused in accordance with the officer recommendation.

## **70 Preapp/19/00257 - Carlton Hill, Sheepscar, Leeds, LS7 1JA**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a pre-application for a new 604 bed purpose built student accommodation and associated external works and landscaping at Carlton Hill.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the presentation.

The following was highlighted:

- The proposals were for replacement of the existing student accommodation at the site.
- The proposals would provide affordable quality accommodation for students and had the full support of the University of Leeds.

- The whole site would be redeveloped and existing buildings would be replaced.
- The proposed new building would be 15 storeys at the south of the site and 6 storeys at the north.
- Vehicular access would be from Carlton Hill.
- There would be courtyard areas and roof top terraces.
- Existing pedestrian access would be retained.
- There had been significant negotiations between planning officers and the developer. The original scheme had presented a 23 storey building.

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

- It was hoped to have the development ready for the beginning of the 2022/23 academic year.
- The proposals had been designed with the interests of student wellbeing.
- There had been negotiation with planning officers regarding the positioning of the proposed buildings within the site and the relationship with the adjacent primary school.
- Wind and shading analysis work had been carried out.
- There were unique design elements which included a fully landscaped courtyard and sky gardens.
- There were sustainable features – the building was fully powered by electric and there would be use of photovoltaics.
- Bedrooms would be oversized at 20% over the minimum standards.
- The applicant had worked closely with the University of Leeds during the development of the proposals.
- The applicant provided accommodation for over 3,000 students in Leeds.
- The accommodation was intended for undergraduate students.
- There would be no onsite parking other than disabled spaces and it would be a pedestrian site.

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

- Social spaces would include a large foyer, lounges, kitchens and sky gardens. There would be space for social events.
- Kitchens would have washing facilities. There would not be a specific laundry.
- Other communal facilities would include a small gym and event spaces.
- The site would remain open and be used as a thoroughfare.
- The shading analysis had shown that there would be no overshadowing during the summer months and during the winter there would only be shading of the bottom half of the school playing fields.
- The site would be covered by a monitored CCTV system and there would be a 24 hour security presence.

- Building materials – it was intended to use reconstituted stone with glazing and panels to give a sophisticated but simple effect.
- There would be pick up and drop off points within the site and managed arrangements would be in place for arrivals and departures at the beginning and end of term.
- There were no plans for any blue infrastructure within the landscaping.
- In response to questions outlined in the report, the following was discussed:
  - Members considered the proposed use of the site for student accommodation as acceptable.
  - Members agreed that the living conditions within the student accommodation would be acceptable.
  - Members considered that the proposed mass and form of the development and its relationship with the surrounding area was acceptable. It was expressed that shadowing should be minimal.
  - It was considered that the development should deliver improvements to the pedestrian environment in the area beyond the immediate periphery of the site and that there should be improvements to the pedestrian crossing on the ring road.

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

**71 Preapp 19/00645 - Land North of Clay Pit Lane, Sheepscar, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a pre-application presentation for a residential development at land north of Clay Pit Lane, Sheepscar, Leeds.

The site was currently subject to an appeal against the non-determination of a previous application that had been considered by the Panel in December 2019 when there were concerns regarding the loss of the mound of , over dominant out of character development, extensive tree loss and the build to rent model.

The pre-application to be presented was the result of further negotiations with the applicant and response to previous concerns of the Panel.

Members were informed of the following amendments to the report:

- Space standards – the applicant confirmed that minimum standard requirements would be met.
- The affordable housing requirement would be 7% or 20% at discount market rent value.
- The applicant had confirmed that there would be 12.5% affordable housing.
- The Section 106 agreement would be a minimum of 12.5% affordable with 20% for the first two years rising to 50% if market conditions permitted subject to viability.

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

- The footprint of the proposed building on the site had been reduced by 36%. This would enable a 50% retention of the bund and reduced tree loss. There would also be an enhanced green buffer to Clay Pit Lane.
- The scale and massing of the proposals were in comparison to nearby buildings.
- All units would meet minimum space standards.
- Wind tunnel testing had been carried out.
- Affordable housing would be provided through a registered social landlord.
- It was hoped to start any development in August 2020 with completion in 2022.

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

- The proposals were an improvement on the previous presentation.
- Semi-mature trees would be preferred for replacement tree planting.
- Concern regarding the design - it was reported that there was still further work to do on the design and the final design would be as high quality as possible.
- Concern that the building was still too large.
- There would be public consultation.
- In response to questions outlined in the report, the following was discussed:
  - Concerns about the design, height and relationship to other properties.
  - Members were comfortable with the affordable housing offer.
  - Concern remained with loss of trees and partial loss of the bund.
  - More information was requested regarding sustainability with regard to climate change and social-economic benefits.

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

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

Thursday, 19 March 2020 at 1.30 p.m.