

**NORTH WEST MANAGEMENT
TEAM (INNER AREA)**

**PLANNING GROUP
14th May 2008 (9:00 – 10:00)
Civic Hall**

MINUTES

Present: Cllr S Bentley (Chair) Weetwood
Cllr J Illingworth Kirkstall
Richard Tyler Headingley Resident Rep.

Officer(s) in Attendance Andrew Crates Community Planner

ACTION

1.0 APOLOGIES

- 1.1 Cllr M Hamilton – Headingley
David Hall - Far Headingley Resident Rep.
Freda Matthews - Hyde Park and Woodhouse Resident Rep.

2.0 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

- 2.1 Agreed

3.0 NEIGHBOURHOOD DESIGN STATEMENTS UPDATE

- 3.1 RT reported that the Headingley and Hyde Park NDS character area appraisals were nearly complete. The steering group are holding a public exhibition at St Columba's Church on 14th June, between 11am and 2pm.

4.0 ST MARGARET OF ANTIOCH CHURCH, CARDIGAN ROAD

- 4.1 AC presented the sketch scheme of the proposals being drawn up for the church. It is intended to re-model and extend the front portion of the building. The building is intended to continue in its use as a place of worship, but allow possibilities for conference / meeting space and an attached café area. The building is Grade II* Listed.
- 4.2 All noted the significance of the building and the support for doing something positive with the space. However, concern was raised about the re-developed scheme competing with other local providers and projects – HEART, Cardigan Centre etc. All stressed that the café element must be ancillary to the primary use and must not be available to wider public use. Concern was raised about the erosion of greenspace in front of the building

and the issue of how to deal with car parking. The group understood that no discussion has taken place with other groups and it would be useful to have dialogue with South Headingley Community Association and the Cardigan Centre. JI suggested that the building may be useful for television studio space.

5.0 WEST PARK FIELDS, BUTCHER HILL

5.1 JI noted that Abbey Grange CofE High School has undertaken a consultation on the future development of its playing fields for more intensive sports use. However, JI has concerns about how the consultation has been done.

5.2 JI noted that the school will need to apply to the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCFS) in order to get permission to build on school land (separate from any planning permission). The DCFS criteria are set out in a statutory instrument and are different from material planning considerations. AC noted that pre-application advice had been given to the school, advising that the proposals were unacceptable in planning terms. All agreed a Key Message relaying the groups concerns about development of the site.

6.0 KIRKSTALL DISTRICT CENTRE / BHS

6.1 JI expressed concern that the appeal allowing the proposed development of the BHS site will have a greater highway impact than that forecast, thereby impacting upon the potential re-development of Kirkstall District Centre. The problem was that the developers paid too much for the site and the costs of re-development are exacerbated by the need for Affordable Housing and a suitable highways scheme. JI felt that the traffic counts for the BHS site did not properly take into account the future development of Kirkstall District Centre, therefore resulting in severe transport difficulties. Concern was expressed that the developer of the District Centre site would have to pay for all of the engineering works required to create a satisfactory solution. JI considered that the scheme was poor and required a radical re-think. In design terms, JI felt that the scheme should make better use of the slope. All agreed a Key Message to express the groups concerns.

6.2 AC noted that the emerging Kirkstall Vision document may contain actions on how the community would like to see the District Centre site developed. RT noted the need for an Area Action Plan for inner north west, which may be able to help address the issues raised. JI also raised concern about lorry movements through the area from quarries etc. and asked if there were any planning powers the Council could pursue. AC to investigate and report back.

AC

7.0 LDF / NATIONAL POLICY UPDATE

7.1 JI noted that the Council has employed a consultancy to undertake a PPG17 assessment for the city. JI will ask for the matter to be looked at by the scrutiny board and for a report to be brought to Area Committee. In particular, concern was raised about the size of sample groups.

AC

8.0 SIGNIFICANT APPLICATIONS / APPEALS

- 8.1 AC noted that the application for the re-development of the Tetley Hall site had been refused. AC agreed to circulate the full reasons for refusal. **AC**
- 8.2 The group noted that a fresh application has been made to re-develop 45 St Michael's Lane for purpose built student accommodation. The previously approved scheme was allowed on appeal and the new proposals vary from the original scheme.

9.0 KEY MESSAGES

- 9.1 For Action – The Planning Group requests support from the Area Committee in objecting to the proposed development of purpose built student flats at 45 St Michael's Lane. The scheme has previously been allowed on appeal, but the new proposals are for a different layout of studio flats. **AC**
- 9.2 For information – The Planning Group is concerned about the proposed development at West Park Fields which would result in an over-intensive use of the site for sports use, having a detrimental impact upon highway safety, lessening the ability of the public to access the open spaces and impact upon the open aspect of this part of the Green Belt. **AC**
- 9.3 For information - The Planning Group is concerned for the future of the Kirkstall District Centre site. It is feared that the recent appeal allowing development on the BHS site may have implications for the scope of development on the District Centre site. Concern relates specifically to the degree of highway works that may be required. **AC**

10.0 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

- 10.1 11th June 2008 – 9:00 (Civic Hall)