

## **NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 23RD JANUARY, 2020**

**PRESENT:** Councillor K Ritchie in the Chair

Councillors D Collins, R Grahame,  
D Jenkins, E Nash, N Sharpe, M Midgley,  
T Smith and J Taylor

### **SITE VISITS**

The site visits earlier in the day were attended by Councillors Collins, Grahame, Jenkins, Nash, Ritchie, Sharpe, Midgley, Smith and Taylor.

#### **64 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

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

There were no exempt items.

#### **66 Late Items**

There were no late items.

#### **67 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

No declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests were made at the meeting.

#### **68 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from Councillor Anderson.

Councillor Taylor attended as a substitute for Councillor Anderson.

#### **69 Minutes - 28th November 2019**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held 28<sup>th</sup> November 2019, be approved as an accurate record.

### **Matters Arising**

Minute 60 – 19/00867/FU Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of four dwellings. A Member sought clarity as to whether the developer had signed up to policies EN1 and EN2, whilst acknowledging this wasn't a policy requirement. The Planning Officer confirmed this information would be provided to the Panel Member at a later date.

**70 19/05419/FU - DEMOLITION OF 16 APARTMENTS AND 6 HOUSES AND ERECTION OF 85 APARTMENTS ACROSS TWO BUILDINGS COMPRISING OF 51 SHELTERED HOUSING APARTMENTS AND 34 GENERAL NEEDS APARTMENTS WITH COMMUNAL CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer set out an application for the Demolition of 16 apartments and 6 houses and erection of 85 apartments across two buildings comprising of 51 sheltered housing apartments and 34 general needs apartments with communal car parking and landscaping on land at land off Queenshill Avenue and Queenshill View, Moortown.

The application is made by the Leeds Jewish Housing Association (LJHA).

The proposal sought to develop two apartment blocks, Block A that will run perpendicular to King Lane and will house the 51 No. proposed sheltered housing units over 4 floors and Block B will provide the 34 general needs (C3) units and will run parallel to King Lane and perpendicular to Block A.

Members had attended a site visit earlier in the day. Photographs and slides were shown throughout the presentation.

Prior to Members consideration, the Principal Planner informed the Panel that a unilateral undertaking had not yet being verified and as a result, the proposed resolution had changed to *DEFER AND DELEGATE approval to the Chief Planning Officer.*

The Panel were informed of the following key points:

- Access to the site from Queenshill Drive;
- The nature of the main accommodation would house occupiers 55+, and the general accommodation would be apartments;
- The developer is a social landlord and is offering social housing at affordable rents, making the development 100% affordable accommodation;
- 62 car parking spaces are proposed with space for 4 No. Motorcycle spaces;
- There is a connecting pedestrian link to Stonegate Building, with a No. of rooms for social activities for tenants to benefit from those facilities;
- Both blocks will be of similar design, finished in brick and render and a metal standing seam roof is proposed;
- Block B would have a break in levels, adding to the visuals along King Lane;
- There will be no greenspace provided on site, however a sum has been offered to contribute towards the improvement and maintenance of other existing open space/greenspace provision;
- A number of trees and shrubs are proposed to be removed, none of which are protected; an outstanding objection remains from Landscape. The applicants have agreed to replace those trees on land owned by them;

- None of the 84 units are compliant to meet the requirements of the M4(3) Building regulation standards. The applicant has stated there is not a demand for wheelchair accessibility, however is prepared to adapt during construction should there be a need. This is for the reasons set out in the report that the occupiers of the units are currently known to the developer being a social landlord;
- Objections had been received from residents on Stonegate Road due to Block A being proposed across the rear of their properties thus affording them views of it;
- An assessment had been carried out in regard to the cross section and distances to those residents on Stonegate Road, and the position of the elevation exceeded the minimum space standards.

A local resident attended the meeting, representing the affected properties on Stonegate Road (directly behind the proposed site). Members heard the concerns raised in regard to the height and mass of the proposed buildings, and the request as to whether parking could be re-located, should the proposed height remain as a 4 storey proposal.

A Member queried the impact the existing Stonegate Building had on the properties in close proximity. In response, the local resident explained that his neighbours felt as though there were overlooking issues, particularly on the higher levels of the existing building.

The speaker in support of the application explained he felt as though it wasn't possible to move Block A any further towards Block B without the loss of parking and greenspaces. Additionally, Members were informed that the nearest proposed block to the residents on Stonegate Road, was approximately 50 metres away, with sufficient space between the buildings.

Members wanted clarification as to why Block A couldn't be moved, and clarity as to why the parking facilities had to be to the South of the development site. In response, the vehicular access point coming into the car park off Queenshill Avenue, would be a joint car park and there would be a link corridor, which would be jeopardised should the proposed layout change. It was confirmed that by placing the car park to the rear of the development, removed green space for the occupiers. However, there would be minimal scope to move Block A, subject to the potential loss of car parking spaces.

Responding to Members questions, the Panel were informed of the following:

- A plan of the cross section was circulated, as submitted in the original application and provided information in regard to the distances of the buildings to the nearest affected property. Members were informed that the separation distance would be 52 to 55 metres, and the scheme would be in excess of the guidance;
- The positioning of the building would facilitate access to the MAS centre, and occupiers would be encouraged to use the facilities. There would be opportunities to serve food from the MAS centre, to the occupiers;

- A Member suggested that the bus shelters on King Lane be moved to a suitable location to meet the needs of the occupiers. In responding, it was mentioned that the client would be paying a contribution to upgrade real time information and the bus shelters, and that as part of the future proposed highway improvements along King Lane, the location of the bus shelters would be considered.
- There would be pre-existing on site cycle storage that is intended to be utilised;
- It was confirmed that motorcycle spaces would be limited to the staff, and provisions would be made for providing car charging points;
- The Highways Officer confirmed that with the development being in a sustainable location, the 62 car parking spaces would be sufficient for the No. of units proposed and that due to the demand for on-street parking, a condition would be implemented for the car parking spaces to be unallocated;
- An impact assessment had been undertaken in regard to noise nuisance, and it was confirmed that the sound insulation under the Building Regulations was adequate to mitigate noise disturbance from traffic;
- Members discussed tree loss mitigation and the impacts this had on the climate emergency. The Group Manager explained that in general, planning officers are working alongside colleagues and attending various working groups, to look at maximising benefits in an attempt to mitigate issues from climate. In terms of the tree replacement. In regard to the proposal, planning officers would be consulting with landscape officers in terms of mix and species;
- The contribution of greenspace would be identified by Parks and Countryside officers, and expected to be allocated in the immediate locality;
- The provision of Car Parking Spaces would meet the required number of car parking units that the policy reflected at the time that the application was submitted, however officers had also negotiated that the necessary infrastructure would also be installed that would allow for the installation of further EVCP once demand increased from the occupiers. This was considered an acceptable compromise especially given the provider is a social landlord and that the technology of EVs is largely outside of the price of its residents at present, As the cost becomes more viable of EV ownership and demand arises, then the EVCP can be installed at that time there had been a change in recent policy regarding electric charging points. EN8 had been approved as part of the Core Strategy Selective Review (CSSR) that required 100% compliance on residential sites for charging points. However given the timing of the application and the specific nature of the developer as a social landlord it was agreed it unreasonable to insist on 100% provision presently as long as the development was future proofed.

**RESOLVED** – To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the final submission of the Unilateral Undertaking signed and sealed and following verification by the Chief Legal Officer regarding its contents. Should a suitable Unilateral Undertaking not be received and

verified within a period of six months of the resolution to approve the scheme to delegate to the Chief Planning Officer the authority to determine the application as appropriate.

The Unilateral Undertaking to cover the following:

- An off-site greenspace contribution of £86,268.56;
- The provision of a commuted sum for the installation of two bus shelters in close proximity to the site at a cost of £13,000 [*figure amended at Panel due to typographical error in report*] each and real time installation displays at a cost of £10,000 each total amount being £46,000; and
- The provision of replacement tree planting to mitigate the loss of trees on site at a ratio of 3:1 on land in close proximity to the application site under the control/ownership of the applicant.

And with the addition of the following:

- To add a condition to require the parking areas to be laid with porous surfacing;
- That the Landscape Team are to be consulted in respect of the replacement tree planting with particular regard to be had to the species of trees and nursery stock specification/maturity of the trees to be planted (the girth size of the tree e.g. standard, select standard and heavy standard);
- That further discussions take place with the applicant in respect of the siting of Block A and that the objector's plan be forwarded to the applicant for consideration/comment; and
- That the rear elevation of Block A be finished in light coloured materials to make it appear less overbearing when viewed from the rear of 301 and 303 Stonegate Road.

## **71 19/01665/FU - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 153 NO. DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer set out an application for 153 dwellings and associated works at land off Beckhill Approach and Potternewton Lane, Meanwood, Leeds.

Members had attended a site visit earlier in the day. Photographs and slides were shown throughout the presentation.

The proposal was for the erection of 153 dwellings consisting of 24 apartments and 129 dwellings. All of the flats would be 2 bed with the dwellings consisting of 31 two bed, 72 three bed & 26 X four bed at a vacant site located off Beckhill Approach. The site formally contained a school and some sheltered accommodation, these had been demolished.

The Panel were informed of the following key points:

- The proposal creates a development of predominantly residential dwellings and apartments;

- The surrounding area predominantly consists of residential dwellings, with the Beckhills Estate to the South-East, and flats to the North-West along Stainbeck Road;
- Meanwood Centre is approximately 300 yards to the West; bus accessibility on Stainbeck Road;
- The proposal includes 11 affordable units;
- The development would be served by two accesses, one off Potternewton Lane and the other Beckhill Approach; the proposal would require the formation of a new junction on to Potternewton Lane as well as Beckhill Approach;
- 2 car parking spaces per dwelling were proposed for the houses and shared parking for the apartments;
- To the South of the site, work is proposed to locate a drainage attenuation tank, with the inclusion of an access point for vehicles;
- Alterations are proposed to retaining an existing wall located to the South-East of the site, and visual work would be undertaken by the local community;
- A total of 56 trees would be removed to facilitate the public open space and improve drainage; 7 of the trees being removed are TPO protected. In respect of this, 90 trees would be replaced on site;
- Two, 3 storey apartment blocks would include 12 apartments per block, being 2 bed apartments, some of which have ensuite facilities;
- The on-site greenspace would be a central feature of the development, and would include a MUGA (Multi Use Games Area) and an informal play area;
- The existing car parking area adjacent to the retaining wall would include additional planting to improve its appearance and provide additional planting;
- There would be no significant impact in regard to highways and electric charging points would be provided for each dwelling house;
- 10% EV charging spaces were proposed within the car parking area for the apartments. During the course of the planning application there had been a change in recent policy regarding electric charging points. EN8 had been approved as part of the Core Strategy Selective Review (CSSR) that required 100% compliance on residential sites for charging points. In view of the change of policy the remainder of the car parking spaces would have electricity infrastructure to allow for convenient conversion to allow for future demand and this would be secured by a suitably worded condition.
- The proposal incorporates measures to reduce the impact of non-renewable sources;
- It was highlighted that there had been no objections from local residents nor ward members;
- Following the distribution of the submitted report, Members were informed of an addition of the following conditions and amendments:
  - I. Details of scheme for delivery, and verification of delivery, of accessible housing.
  - II. Details of existing and ground levels and finished levels of new buildings to be submitted and approved.

- III. S106: Residential Travel Fund figure of £82,082 is based on old layout for 164 units. The new figure should be £76,576.50.

Members' raised the following with officers:

- Details on whether local residents would be employed for future job opportunities;
- Whether additional trees could be salvaged;
- Whether there was a loss of habitats, and if so, what measures would be put in place to encourage wildlife back to the site;
- To consider amenities in the play area for children with disabilities;
- The types of trees that would be replaced and a request that a copy of the indicative landscaping scheme is sent to a Panel Member;
- Concern that ginnels would attract levels of ASB;
- Whether the structure of the existing MUGA building, would be efficiently re-used;
- That consideration need to be given in regard to construction traffic.

Responding to Members questions, the Panel were informed of the following:

- The Section 106/S111 required the applicant to liaise with Employment Leeds, to employ locally and within the Leeds District;
- In regard to tree loss, Members heard that extensive work and negotiations had taken place to look at alternative solutions i.e. the layout of the MUGA. However, due to the different levels on site, it wasn't possible to salvage any additional trees in that particular location. It was confirmed that a remediation strategy had been undertaken;
- The development provided greenspace along the edge of the site, providing good connectivity and recreational space, meeting the aspirations of the Beckhill Framework;
- A detailed landscape plan had been created to show where the trees would be planted along the road, including shrubs and hedgerows, all of which would be beneficial for carbon capture. Further to this, a Panel Member requested that the landscape scheme be provided;
- The Ecology Plan details that the land is neutral grassland with no protected species. Members were informed that there are opportunities to improve biodiversity and there is an existing condition to protect bats and bird boxes across the site;
- In response to the siting of the apartments, the mass of the blocks are deemed appropriate in terms of the spatial separation of the houses and surrounding greenspace;
- The deliverability of the MUGA would help in terms of ASB within the locality;
- It was confirmed that there would be no public ginnels, but a route for the properties for easy bin access. It was confirmed that they would be gated and only accessible by the residents;
- Conditions 14 and 15 set out in the submitted report covered concerns raised in regard to construction. Officers further explained that there are a couple of access points, with main roads easily accessible;

- The Chair sought clarity on how local framework such as the Beckhill Neighbourhood Framework, would be produced for other communities. Officers confirmed that the document set the agenda for developers including the objectives and design criteria. The Legal Officer clarified that the framework wasn't legally binding such as a Neighbourhood Plan (NP), and set out the key principles for communities.

The Panel welcomed the engagement and community involvement that had been undertaken by the applicant, and the 3:1 off-site tree planting replacement initiative.

**RESOLVED** – To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the signing of a Section 111 agreement to cover the following:

- Affordable housing – 11 properties in total;
- Real time passenger information display at a cost of £10,000 at bus stop 10858;
- Bus shelter to be provided at a cost of £13,000 at bus stop 11123
- Travel Plan review fee £3384;
- Residential Travel Plan Fund £76,576.50 *[figure amended at Panel to reflect reduction in total number of units being provided]*;
- Commuted Sum for the Council to undertake the on-site greenspace works £475,514.39;
- Local Employment & Skills Initiative;
- Off-site tree planting, to meet the requirements of Policy LAND2, within the local area.

And with the inclusion of the following additional conditions:

- Details of scheme for delivery, and verification of delivery, of accessible housing;
- Details of existing and ground levels and finished levels of new buildings to be submitted and approved;
- Wheel washing facilities for construction traffic be implemented before construction works starts on site;
- The submitted landscaping scheme to be shared with Cllr Nash;
- To discuss the potential for the re-positioning of the apartment blocks with the applicant;
- That the relevant neighbourhood cleansing team be advised that the site needs to be cleaned in light of the amount of litter on the site.
- Provision of EVCP and electricity infrastructure scheme for the apartments

**72 19/00835/FU - ALTERATIONS INCLUDING RAISED ROOF HEIGHT TO FORM HABITABLE ROOMS; TWO STOREY PART FIRST FLOOR SIDE/REAR EXTENSION**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer provided Members with the outcome of an appeal by Mr A Jonisz of 22 Park Lane Mews, against the decision of the City Council to refuse a planning permission for raising a roof to form habitable rooms; two storey part front side/rear extension.

Following the decision at the North and East Plans Panel, to withhold planning permission, Members heard that the appeal had been dismissed as being contrary to GP5 and T2 of the Local Development Framework.

Members of the Panel highlighted the importance of carrying out site visits prior to determining an application.

**RESOLVED** – To note the appeal decision.

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

**RESOLVED** – To note the date and time of the next meeting as 27<sup>th</sup> February 2020.

(The meeting concluded at 16:35)