

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 17TH JANUARY, 2019

PRESENT: Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, K Brooks,
C Campbell, M Gibson, S Hamilton,
J Heselwood, A Hutchison, D Ragan,
J Shemilt and P Wray

A Member's site visit was held in connection with the following applications:
Application No. 18/06203/FU - Demolition of existing main school and erection of two new three storey school buildings, relocation of hard courts; reconfiguration and increase in parking provision and associated landscaping at Guiseley school, Fieldhead Road, Guiseley and Application 18/02152/FU – Construction of 143 apartments with car parking and landscaping to land at former Burley Community Sports and Social Club, Burley Road, Burley, Leeds and was attended by the following Councillors: C Gruen, S Hamilton, D Ragan, B Anderson and C Campbell

50 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against the refusal of inspection of documents.

51 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no items identified where it was considered necessary to exclude the press or public from the meeting due to the confidential nature of the business to be transacted.

52 Late Items

The Chair accepted the inclusion of an additional item onto the agenda, "Minutes of the previous meeting held on 20th December 2018" (Minute No. 55 referred). It was reported that these minutes were not circulated with the main agenda and it was in the best interests of the Council and other parties concerned that they be considered without delay.

53 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of any disclosable pecuniary interests.

54 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

55 Minutes - 20 December 2018

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 20th December 2018 were submitted for comment / approval.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 20th December 2018 be accepted as a true and correct record.

56 Application 18/06203/FU - Guiseley School, Fieldhead Road, Guiseley, Leeds, LS20 8DT

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of an application which sought the demolition of the existing main school and erection of two, three storey school buildings, relocation of hard courts; reconfiguration and increase in car parking provision and associated landscaping at Guiseley School, Fieldhead Road, Guiseley, Leeds, LS20 8DT.

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

Planning Officers addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- Site/ location/ context
- The proposal was to demolish the majority of the existing school buildings and replace with two, three storey blocks
- Provision of new hard-court play areas
- The site changes in levels (Step down)
- Existing car park to be extended by 51 car parking spaces
- Changes to existing loop system
- New pedestrian access
- Landscaping and tree planting to provide screening
- The proposal exceeds the separation requirement (Spatial standards) to nearby housing
- No over-shadowing or dominance to nearby properties
- Construction arrangements to be accessed off Back Lane
- The majority of representations received consider the proposed development to be positive transforming a visually poor site into a modern community asset. There was some concerns from local residents about the potential impact the development would have upon their living conditions due the massing of the development, overlooking issues and the landscaping proposals reduce light to their properties.

The Panel then heard from a local resident who was objecting to the proposal.

It was stated that although she was not objecting to the proposal to build a new school, her and many of her neighbours on Back Lane were concerned that the new development was over dominant and there was a loss of outlook together with a loss of privacy. Referring to the Household Design Guide the resident said new development should not be over dominant on existing

properties and should not be overlooked. It was her opinion and that of her neighbours that the current proposals should be resisted, there was scope to do more about the design of this development.

The Panel then heard from another local resident also objecting to the proposal.

He said he was also not opposed to the principle of the development his concerns were about the loss of light to his property and the impact it would have on his garden. He suggested that careful consideration should be given to the landscape proposals to ensure the appropriate species of trees and hedges were planted to not make the garden areas along Back Lane be too dark. It was also understood that there may be asbestos on the site with potential for health and safety concerns during the demolition phase of the development.

The Panel then heard from a third local resident also objecting to the proposal.

He said he was not opposed to the development his concerns were also about the landscaping and screening proposals for the scheme. The resident suggested that a hard line of trees and hedges would prevent sunlight penetrating into his and his neighbours rear gardens. He suggested that the species of trees/ hedges and there location required careful consideration to avoid creating a dense canopy.

Members raised the following questions:

- Clarification was sought from the speakers that there was no objection to the rebuilding of the school, and that the concerns were mainly about the landscape and screening proposals
- Given there's a distance of 50m between the school and nearby properties, do you considered this to be a significant over-looking issue, how could the resident's concerns be addressed

In responding to the issues raised:-

- Members were informed that the majority of the concerns raised by local residents were not about the rebuilding of the school, it was about the proposals for landscaping and screening and that residents should be consulted on those proposals
- Members were informed that frosted / opaque glazing on some of the upper level could address resident's concerns about overlooking

Commenting on the concerns of overlooking, the Planning Case Officer suggested the separation distance between the school and nearby residential properties was generous (and in excessive of the spatial needs requirements) and it was considered that frosted/ opaque glazing would not be appropriate. Referring to the landscaping concerns and the suggestions put forward by objectors to avoid creating a dense canopy, the Officer accepted the

suggestions were positive and proposed that any new planting would be done in a way to interact with the native planting, Mountain Ash and Hornbeam were suggested as the species of tree to be used. Responding to the concerns about asbestos the Planning Case Officer confirmed that an asbestos identification survey would be conducted with any removal being carefully controlled.

The Panel then heard from, Head teacher of Guiseley School and the Planning Consultant who spoke in support of the application.

Members were informed that the school was built in 1962 with a capacity of 600 pupils, the current capacity of the school was now 1400 pupils. The school was currently in a poor state of disrepair with approximately £2.7m required to address the worst areas of the school building. Following extensive engagement with the Education Funding Authority the necessary funding had been obtained to seek redevelopment of the school, including the demolition of existing school buildings and the erection of two three storey school buildings, relocation of hard courts, reconfiguration and increase in car parking provision and associate landscaping. It was understood that the existing school would continue to operate while the new school buildings were being built. Members were informed that the proposal had received overwhelming support from both staff and students.

Commenting on the concerns raised by local residents, the Planning consultant said there was ample separation distance between the school and nearby residential properties (50m) and the landscaping concerns raised by residents on Back Lane had been addressed.

Members raised the following questions:

- At the site visit this morning, the pick-up and drop off area appeared to be constrained by parked cars, would this issue be addressed in the new proposal

In responding to the issues raised, the applicant's representative said:

- Members were informed that the area referred to was currently a parking area not a drop-off zone. Under the new proposals the area would be redesigned to create a drop-off loop.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- Members were generally supportive of the application suggesting that it was a good scheme
- One Member said that the suggestion of using frosted/ opaque glazing to avoid over- looking to nearby properties was unacceptable given a separation distance of 50m
- Further consultation should take place with local residents concerned at the landscaping proposals
- Could further consideration be given to the new building design

In summing up the Chair thanked all parties for their attendance and contributions suggesting Members appeared to be supportive of the application. There were concerns about the landscaping proposals but it was envisaged these could be overcome with further consultation with local residents.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved subject to the conditions specified in the submitted report with an amendment to Condition No. 8 requiring residents on Back lane to be consulted on the proposed landscaping arrangements to the rear of their properties. That two further conditions be added requiring the submission of window details to fully understand recess and design and the inclusion of an Employment of a Skills Strategy.

57 Application 18/02152/FU - Land at former Burley Community Sports and Social Club, Burley Road, Burley, Leeds - POSITION STATEMENT

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which provided a Position Statement in respect of an application for the construction of 143 apartments with associated car parking, ancillary spaces and landscaping to land at Former Burley Community Sports and Social Club at Burley Road, Burley, Leeds.

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

Planning Officers addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- Site/ location/ context
- The proposal was for the construction of 143 apartments (1,2 and 3 bedroom apartments) built in two blocks, each block 6 storeys in height.
- The buildings would be formed as two interlocking “L” shaped buildings.
- There would be modest amenity and circulation space separating the 2 buildings
- Materials – Brick finish
- Greenspace and car parking provision
- It was proposed to extend the site into the Greenspace to accommodate further car parking provision
- Further consideration was required on the adequacy of the on-site open space provision for future residents and the proposed provision of Greenspace through a financial contribution to upgrade existing Greenspace elsewhere
- 7% affordable housing provision
- The scheme would be marketed as Private Rented Sector development (PRS)

- It was reported that local residents had expressed concern at the proposed access arrangements. Councillor J Illingworth had commented that he considered the site to be not suitable for housing, the sports pitches on site had in the past been frequently used

The Chair invited the applicant's architect to speak in support of the application

Councillor Campbell reminded Panel that the report before Members was a Position Statement and suggested that under the existing protocol representations should not be permitted. The Lead Planning Officer to the Panel confirmed the Council's speaking protocol provided for speaking rights in relation to Position Statements. Councillor Campbell suggested that the Protocol be further considered by the Joint Plans Panel for a review.

The Chair suggested that the architect may be able to provide information which was not included in the report and which may be beneficial to Panel in progressing the application

The Chair called upon architect to address the Panel

The architect informed Members that the proposal had received full support from Local Ward Members and LCC Design Officers, he was not aware of any objections to the proposal. Members were informed that 35% of the site would be used for car parking provision. Members were also made aware that some land had been sacrificed to provide road junction improvements. Commenting on the Greenspace provision the architect said that any agreement would be subject to condition. In terms of distance from nearby properties Members were informed that the nearest dwellings were located at a distance of 30m away from the development

Members raised the following questions:

- What would be the planning benefits and would there be any benefits to the local community
- The proposal only provides for 10% of the units to be 3 bedroom accommodation, this is below the Council's Policy, could consideration be given to increasing the number of 3 bedroom apartments
- There appears to be a significant amount of car parking proposed given the site was located in close proximity to good bus and rail provision. Was the amount of car parking proposed really necessary
- The financial contribution to upgrade existing Greenspace elsewhere, where was it envisaged these monies would be used

In responding to the issues raised, the applicant's representative and council officers said:

- Some land from the site would be sacrificed to allow junction improvements works to be undertaken, and development of the area would prevent unauthorised occupation of the site from recurring.

There was a housing benefit need in the area. The scheme was targeted at young professionals who would be able to walk into the city centre from the site. Other similar schemes were less generous with Greenspace provision

- The housing mix (Adopted Policy H4) required a minimum of 20% of 3 bed houses but the local needs suggest smaller units are required, the scheme is targeted at young professionals and marketed at the Private Rented Sector
- It was confirmed that the level of car parking was generous but this was at the request of LCC Highways. The Highways officer in attendance confirmed that the level of parking was within parking guidance; 1 space for each of the 1 and 2 bedroom apartments. The intention was not to create overspill parking onto nearby streets
- Further discussions would be required with Ward Members and the Parks and Countryside Service to identify where upgrades to existing Greenspace was required

In offering comments the following views were expressed:

- This was a small site surrounded by low key housing, something more in keeping with the area was required
- The proposed housing mix was contrary to adopted Policy H4
- Extending into the protected Greenspace designation for further parking provision was not acceptable to the majority of Members
- The amount of car parking was generous but it was in keeping with policy
- Given the issues raised by Members, the scheme may not be feasible

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion Members provided the following feedback;

- Members expressed the view that there was no reason for the application to be extended onto an area of protected Greenspace. A number of Members considered that they had fought long and hard to retain that provision through Development Plans Panel and Site Allocations Plan. Other Members stated that they would want this removing from the application and consequently the scale and massing and footprint needed to be reduced as did parking areas. It was the view of Members that they would require significant justification to even consider the use of the area of Greenspace proposed.
- Members considered the Amenity Greenspace provision was inadequate. There was some support for a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision, but surety was required that the proposed sum was calculated correctly, the applicant would accept it and precisely where it could be spent.
- Members expressed the view that the building was too tall and required reducing by one storey. The massing was over dominant and not appropriate for area in terms of scale. Members were disappointed at the design, the footprint was too large, there was not enough amenity

space around the base and there was too much parking provided in a sustainable location. It was suggested that by taking out The Greenspace area out of the application the applicant would have to significantly revise the scheme and the aforementioned concerns may be overcome as a consequence.

- Members were not supportive of the proposed housing mix comprising 10% provision of 3 bedroom units, they required the site to be Policy compliant providing more 3 bed units.

In summing up the Chair thanked all parties for their attendance and contributions suggesting that there were a number of significant issues which required further consideration.

RESOLVED –

- (i) To note the details contained in the Position Statement
- (ii) That the developers be thanked for their attendance and contribution

58 Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED – To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 21st February 2019 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.