

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 23RD MARCH, 2017

PRESENT: Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, B Anderson,
J Bentley, D Congreve, M Coulson,
T Leadley, E Nash, A Smart, C Towler and
R Wood

The site visits in the morning were attended by Councillors: C Gruen, Congreve, Nash, Towler, Anderson, Wood and Leadley.

69 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

Councillor B Anderson informed the Panel that he felt pre-determined in his judgement on Agenda Item 8, Application 16/06222/OT – Land to the east of Otley Road, Adel, LS16 8FE and would withdraw from the meeting during the discussion and voting on this application.

Councillor C Towler informed the Panel that although she had been involved in a discussion regarding Agenda Item 7, Application 16/05912/OT – Land at Whitehall Road, New Farnley she was not pre-determined in her judgement and would remain in the meeting and take part in the discussion and voting on this application.

David Newbury, Area Planning Manager informed the Panel that he was known to an objector to Agenda Item 9, Application 16/07825/FU – 11 Church Crescent, Horsforth and would withdraw from the meeting during the discussion and voting on this application.

70 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor R Finnigan

Councillor T Leadley was in attendance as substitute.

71 Opening Remarks

It was reported that there was a request to withdraw Agenda Item 8, Application 16/06222/OT, Land to the east of Otley Road, Adel, LS16 8FE as the proposals for the school and playing pitch and its use would be subject to change. The Panel was asked to consider the deferral of this item to a future Panel meeting.

RESOLVED – That Application 16/06222/OT, Land to the east of Otley Road, Adel be deferred to a future meeting.

72 Minutes - 16 February 2017

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 16 February 2017 be confirmed as a correct record.

73 Application 16/05912/OT - Land at Whitehall Road, New Farnley

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an outline planning application (all matters reserved except for means of access to, but not within, the site) for circa 130 dwellings to include the demolition of 632 and 634 Whitehall Road.

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

Further issues highlighted in relation the application included the following:

- Since the publication of the report there had been an additional 37 letters of objection from local residents along with objections from Ward Councillors. These had included concern regarding the capacity of local schools, unsustainability of the proposals, mine shafts in the area, protected trees, flood risk and increase in traffic.
- The proposal was for up to 130 new homes and demolition of two properties on Whitehall Road for access to the site. Members were asked to consider whether the principle of development and the means of access to the site were acceptable.
- There would need to be the removal of some trees for the site access. These were not protected and considered to be of low quality.
- The site was a Protected Area of Search (PAS) Site and safeguarded from development until 2028. However following the Secretary of State's ruling that Leeds did not have a 5 year housing supply and in relation to planning guidelines and policy it could be considered that the benefit of bringing development forward would outweigh that.
- Highways had not considered the proposals to be detrimental to the existing highways network and there was an intention to introduce a 20 MPH zone to the residential area of New Farnley which the developer would financially support.
- It was anticipated that development on the site would generate a maximum of 33 primary school places. Whilst this was not enough to generate the development of a new school, there had been discussions for temporary expansions at local schools. Income generated by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would be used to support this.
- Concerns and objections relating to sustainability and loss of privacy/amenity would be considered at the reserved matters stage of the application.
- The proposed housing did not fall within the green belt and was effectively an infill site already surrounded by housing. The rural character of the area would be largely retained. The proposals would

provide a significant contribution to the city's housing supply and also affordable housing.

- It was recommended that the application be approved subject to conditions as outlined in the report and the completion of a Section 106 agreement.

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

- There was no objection to sustainable development in New Farnley.
- It was not believed that these proposals were in fitting with the village design statement for New Farnley.
- Development on this land would be welcomed but in the envisaged timescale of 2028 with a suitable infrastructure in place.
- The proposals did not fit in with the framework of the current site allocations process.
- Concerns due to the increased carbon footprint that development would bring and lack of school places and medical facilities which added to the unsustainability of the site.
- Issues relating to the unadopted road adjacent to Whitehall Road which should be clarified prior to any development.
- Concern of Walsh Lane and Low Moorside being used as rat runs by traffic.
- Whitehall Road was gridlocked at peak traffic times. There was need for bus and cycle lanes but the road was not wide enough and did have areas without footpaths.
- In response to questions from the Panel, the following was discussed:
 - The unadopted road was maintained by residents. Although it gave an access to Walsh Lane this caused problems, particularly in the winter months and there had been a history of accidents.

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

- School places – a feasibility process had been carried out at local schools. Cobden Primary and Lawns Park Primary were both approximately one mile from the site. Cobden could manage a two year bulge in numbers with an option to make this permanent if necessary. It would be difficult for any expansion at Lawns Park.
- Bus services along Whitehall Road met accessibility standards with the number of buses that travelled to major interchanges.
- The unadopted road adjacent to Whitehall Road was under third party ownership. There would need to be clarity on this position via a condition to any application that would approve development of the site. Further to concern that the unadopted road could be used to access Walsh Lane, it was reported that the planning application would only be concerned with access to the site.

- With regard to concern regarding mine shafts on site it was reported that a geotechnical survey had already been undertaken. This would be subject to a condition requesting further intrusive searches prior to and development of the site.
- The need to release PAS sites for the development due to the lack of a 5 year housing supply. Previous appeal cases were referred to and this did not mean that the release would apply at all PAS sites but where there was no other purpose and sustainability could be achieved then unless there were other site specific circumstances such sites should be released for development.
- In response to concerns of land banking, the Panel was informed that time limits could be applied at Reserved Matters stage to prevent this.
- Concern that bus services along Whitehall Road were inadequate and did not serve local schools.
- Further concerns were raised regarding sustainability in relation to school places, transport, health provision and access to other services.
- The Panel was advised that should they wish to refuse the application there would be a need to demonstrate the significance and severity of reasons for refusal. It was suggested that the application be deferred for a further report to address concerns that had been raised.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred for a further report on education provision; access to local facilities and the range of facilities; clarification of access and public transportation.

74 Application 16/07825/FU - 11 Church Crescent, Horsforth

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the amendment of application 16/00869/FU for a single storey side extension (change a flat roof to a pitched roof) at 11 Church Crescent, Horsforth, Leeds.

Members attended a site visit 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:

- Planning permission had been granted for a side extension last year. The original application had been for the extension to have a flat roof. The height differentiation of having a pitched roof was 0.5 metres.
- There had been an objection from a neighbouring property with regard to the extension giving a terracing effect and the use of bricks that did not match the existing or other buildings.
- There was no issue of overshadowing and it was not felt that the extension gave a terracing effect or was in breach of the neighbourhood design guidelines.
- The application was recommended for approval.

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

- Impact on the visual amenity of the street.
- The extension causes a terracing effect.
- Comparisons should not be made with the neighbouring property as that was at the end of the row of houses and did not contribute to a terracing effect.
- Disagreement regarding the colour of the bricks used for the extension and that a better match could have been used.
- The retrospective nature of the application and inaccuracies in the applications.
- Concern that the application had been instigated by the action of the builder and that the application should be refused and the building returned to its original state.

The applicant addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- The changes had allowed the same ceiling height but lowered the height of the walls.
- The neighbouring property had a similar pitch roofed extension.
- The bricks used were the best match that could be found.
- Should the plans be approved the applicant would arrange for a party wall agreement at their expense.

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

- Members noted that the street had a variety of extended properties and this was not out of character with the rest of the street.
- Some concern was expressed that the issues had been caused by changing from an earlier agreed application.

RESOLVED – That the application be granted subject to the conditions specified in the report.