

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 12TH APRIL, 2018**

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

Councillors B Anderson, S Arif,  
D Blackburn, D Congreve, M Coulson,  
R Finnigan, P Gruen, D Ragan, C Towler  
and R Wood

### **95 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The Panel was advised that Agenda Item 7 – Application 17/05126/OT – Land off Fall Lane and Meadowside Road, East Ardsley had an appendix which contained information relating to financial matters and was considered to be exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4 (3)

### **96 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest.

Councillor C Gruen informed the Panel that she had been involved in discussions with regard to Agenda Item 9, Application 17/08056/FU – Land and premises opposite to 60 to 68 Half Mile Lane and would not take part in the discussion or voting on this application. Due to this a nomination was sought for a Member to Chair the Panel for the duration of that item.

**RESOLVED** – That Councillor P Gruen take the Chair for Agenda Item 9, Application 17/08056/FU – Land and premises opposite 60 to 68 Half Mile Lane.

### **97 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors J Bentley and P Davey.

Councillor D Blackburn and Councillor P Gruen were in attendance as substitutes.

### **98 Minutes - 15 March 2018**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 March 2018 be confirmed as a correct record.

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

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

Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

The following was highlighted in relation to the application:

- The proposals had been presented to Panel at the meeting held in February 2018. Members had not been supportive of the application and had expressed concerns regarding the housing mix, design and layout, lack of amenity space and lack of contribution for affordable housing/greenspace. There had been some small amendments to the proposals since.
- The site is situated between two larger developments and has remained undeveloped despite having previous planning approvals.
- There had been 10 letters of objection for the proposals and 2 letters of support. It was largely felt that this area of wasteland needed redevelopment.
- It was recommended that the application be refused. The design was not considered up to more modern standards but could be considered reflective of the wider estate and previous developments.

The applicant addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- A mixed residential scheme had been approved for the site in 2008. This did not happen due to the economic downturn and a new developer had been sought ever since.
- This scheme had been developed following consultation with the local community. There had been an expressed desire for a new health centre and chemists provision.
- The proposals had been supported by planning officers and was due to be delegated for approval until it was informed that due to viability issues it would be referred to Panel.
- There were case law examples of other schemes with similar viability and the District Valuer had confirmed that the scheme was not viable with contributions for greenspace and affordable housing contributions.
- A payment of £95,000 towards off site greenspace provision had been made in 2008 with regard to the previous application. Correspondence from a planning officer at that time indicated there had been an over provision of greenspace provision and it was felt no further provision was acceptable.
- Had the plans been approved in December as was initially indicated, work would already have commenced on the site. A chemist was in place to move on the site as soon as ready and negotiations had taken place with a health provider.
- Adjacent schemes had 3 and 4 storey properties on site and the views that the housing mix was not appropriate was untenable.

- Further to questions from the Panel, the applicant indicated that the £95,000 contribution made in 2008 for a children's play area had not been spent. He also confirmed that he had received correspondence regarding the over provision of greenspace and a contribution towards education. It was further mentioned that the applicant would be willing for further negotiation with regard to areas of concern, but other options included appeal if the scheme be refused or the removal of the health centre provision and chemist for more housing provision and this would not reflect the desires of the local community.

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

- There was concern that the Panel had not seen the correspondence referred to.
- With regard to this application there had not been any payments towards public assets. The scheme would normally be liable to greenspace and affordable housing contributions but the District Valuer had confirmed that this would not be viable.
- The scheme was liable for a Community Infrastructure Levy contribution in the region of £100,000
- There would be no financial obligations from the development of the health centre. It was clear that there was a local need for this provision.
- With regards to design, what had previously been approved in 2008 was not necessarily acceptable now and changes to the layout could improve this.
- The previously approved scheme was similar in layout and provision of health centre and chemist provision.
- It was suggested that the application be deferred to allow the Panel to receive further clarity on the correspondence that had been referred to. It was reported that there were other concerns that had led to the recommendation for refusal. A deferral would be more appropriate if the applicant was committed to further negotiation regarding the layout and design.
- Concern that there had not been any significant change following the views expressed when consideration was given to the position statement at the February meeting.
- Further clarification was sought regarding the occupation of the health centre.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred for officers to provide clarity on the context of letters referred to with regard to over provision of greenspace etc. To explore further with the applicant what had been agreed with regard to the occupation of the commercial units. To engage further with the applicant with regard to revisions to the housing mix and layout. The application to be re-advertised with particular regard to the housing to the East.

**100 Application 17/08353/FU - Site of former Merry Monk Public House, Kirkstall Hill**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the development of twelve dwellings with access and parking at the former Merry Monk Public House site at Kirkstall Hill.

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

- The proposal was for twelve houses which would be 2 bedroom quarter houses in three blocks.
- Objections had been received from a local Ward Councillor and local residents. These objections included the small garden sizes, highway safety and public rights of way.
- The site was a brownfield site and surrounded by housing at all sides.
- The house sizes all exceeded minimum standards. Half of the gardens would meet or exceed size standards.
- The scheme had been amended to give one more parking space. This would allow 1.33 spaces per property.
- There had not been any objections from highways.
- The site was in a sustainable location with good public transport links.
- The application was recommended for approval.

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

- Internal soundproofing would be covered under building regulations.
- Quarter houses had shown to be popular in other areas and there was a demand due to affordability.
- It was felt that the proposed development was n fitting with the area.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved subject to conditions specified in the report and also the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the following obligations:

Offsite greenspace contribution in the sum of £44,842.98. Scheme to be identified.

In the circumstances where the Section 106 has not been completed within 3 months of the Panel resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.

*Councillor P Gruen took over as Chair of the meeting.*

**101 Application 17/08056/FU - Land and premises opposite 60 to 68 Half Mile Lane.**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the variation of Condition 12 (stone sample panel) of approval 13/03007/FU to vary the walling material in relation to the development of six pairs of semi-detached two storey dwellings on land and premises opposite to 60 to 68 Half Mile Lane.

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

Further issues highlighted included the following:

- The application was originally approved in 2014.
- The applicant wants to amend the condition relating to the material for the external walls of the houses.
- The condition for stone walls was imposed by Panel.
- Members were shown samples of stone and artificial stone at the site visit.
- The officer view was that the condition be amended to allow artificial stone and that the application be approved.

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

- Members were asked to agree on the principle of artificial stone and for this to be reflected in the variation to the condition.
- The Panel was advised that the quality of artificial stone had improved since the original decision and it was suggested that Ward Members be consulted regarding the materials to be used.
- Members were broadly supportive of samples of artificial that had been seen.

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

Stone/artificial stone sample to be discharged in discussion with Ward Members.

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

Thursday, 17 May 2018 at 1.30 p.m.