

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 28TH JANUARY, 2021

PRESENT: Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, K Brooks,
C Campbell, S Hamilton, J Heselwood,
D Ragan, J Shemilt, P Wray and
R Finnigan

47 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals.

48 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There was no exempt information.

49 Late Items

There were no late items.

50 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations.

51 Minutes - 10 December 2020

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2020 be confirmed as a correct record.

52 Application 20/05885/FU – Phase 2 of the Kirkstall Forge Development (Plots E and F), Kirkstall Forge, Abbey Road

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a reserved matters application for 213 houses and apartments (Use Class C3), up to 2,076 square metres of commercial space (Use Classes A1, and/or A2, and/or A3, and/or A4, and/or A5, and/or B1, and/or D1, and/or D2), amenity space and a new public square for phase 2 of the Kirkstall Forge Development (Plots E and F), Kirkstall Forge, Abbey Road, Leeds.

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:

- There had been two previously approved applications for these plots in 2017 and 2018.
- The commercial floor space provision was up to 2,076 square metres and not 2,400 metres as detailed in the report.
- Access arrangements to and within the site.
- The application site was set between the new internal road and the A65 with an established line of Woodland on the side of the A65.
- Creation of the 'stitch' which would be a public realm and pedestrian access area.
- The plots were situated above the already developed office block which was situated between the plots and the rail station.
- The proposals were very similar to the previously approved applications. Details of the previously approved applications were displayed and changes to the applications explained. Main alterations included changes to the blocks E2 and E3 at either side of the pavilion building and the stitch. Comparison images were displayed.
- Car parking – reference was made to parking and travel arrangements. It was proposed that there be a further condition to the application for a Travel Plan and Parking Strategy.
- Floor layouts for the apartments were displayed.
- Design detail to reflect the history of Kirkstall Forge.
- CGI images of how the proposals would look when completed were displayed.
- It was recommended that the application be approved with the additional condition for a travel plan.

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

- It had not been necessary to carry out any projected wind modelling on the proposals.
- Recreation - there would be opportunities within the pocket park for children's play area and opportunity for woodland and canal side walks.
- Design of the apartments. Apartments would be larger than the national space standard requirement.
- There would be secure long term storage for 229 bicycles with an additional 31 short stay spaces. Electric bicycle charging could be considered in the scheme.
- Balconies to apartments would be large enough to accommodate a table and chairs and provide a suitable amenity space.
- Car parking – residents would be aware of whether they had facility for parking before taking on their accommodation. The rental market showed a lower demand for parking spaces. Should there be additional demand for parking, the travel plan would include arrangements for additional provision. The main aim was to promote and encourage sustainable travel.
- With regard to Policy EN1, reference was made to the requirement to carry out a sustainability appraisal. An energy statement had been provided which gave ideas as to how this policy would be met. There

would be a range of measures and there was confidence that policy requirements would be met by condition.

- It was felt that the housing mix was policy compliant and with this revision of the scheme there had been a move to introduce more 3 bedroom apartments.
- There would be the required amount of disabled parking spaces and these would be located in accessible positions.
- The children's play area would be located in the pocket park. The pocket park would also have landscaped walks.
- Bicycle charging points would be available within the storage areas and in the stitch square.
- With regards to Policy EN1 and EN2 the scheme preceded the Core Strategy. Information was shown to demonstrate the targets to reduce carbon emissions through the use of renewable energy and would be in excess of policy requirements. The energy strategy for the scheme and sustainability statement submitted also addressed policy requirements.
- The provision of traditional style play equipment for the children's play area could be considered.
- Design of the buildings and materials used.
- Members broadly supported the application although some concern was expressed about policy compliance in relation to Policies EN1 and EN2 and the housing mix.
- Members were reminded that permission had previously been approved for a very similar scheme and that the reserved matters would be dealing with siting of the buildings, design and development, external appearance of buildings and landscaping.

RESOLVED - That Reserved Matters approval be granted (the details relating to the siting, design, external appearance and landscaping of the development) subject to the conditions set out in the report and a condition to cover the following matter:

- The submission and approval of a Travel Plan and Parking Management Strategy.

53 Update on Application 17/06933/FU and Application 18/00846/FU

The Panel was given verbal updates on the following applications:

Application 17/06933/FU – Land at Sugar Hill Close, Oulton Drive, Wordsworth Drive, Oulton, Leeds, LS26 8EP

Following an appeal, the decision of the Inspector overturned the decision of the Panel to refuse the application. A revised plan had been submitted by the appellant that addressed one of the reasons for refusal which related to garden size. Planning permission was subsequently granted and the appeal against the Council for costs was dismissed. Eleven affordable units would be included within the development and a further eleven units would be made

available to existing tenants of the site who had regulated assured tenancies. A full report would be brought to a future meeting of the Plans Panel.

Application 18/00846/FU – Former site of Benyon Centre, Ring Road, Middleton, Leeds

The Panel granted permission in 2019 for a retail unit on the former site of the Benyon Centre. This was against officer recommendation. This decision was challenged by Asda by judicial review where the Panel decision was upheld and then subsequently appealed to the Court of Appeal when the appeal was dismissed.

54 Position Statement - Application 19/01670/FU – Land off Cockshott Lane, Armley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application (position statement) for the development of eleven houses, one block of four bungalows with staff facilities and one block of thirteen houses with one staff accommodation unit at land off Cockshott Lane, Armley, Leeds.

Members were asked to note the content of the report on the proposal and to provide views in relation to questions posed to aid the progression of the application.

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

The following was highlighted:

- The application was for a hybrid development with 11 private dwellings and a block of four bungalows with staff facilities and a block of thirteen flats with one staff accommodation unit.
- There would be creation of a landscaped area in the existing greenspace on site.
- The site previously housed a 1930s public house building which was demolished in 2004. The site had since become overgrown with self-seeded vegetation.
- Some of the trees on the site benefit from Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) that were made in 2004.
- The site had been used for fly tipping and temporary fencing had been erected to prevent further unauthorised access.
- There was a public right of way through the site.
- Access arrangements to the site.
- Details of the proposed site plan with new access road.
- Details of house types and internal layouts.
- Details of the supported living accommodation proposed for the site.

- It was expected that a registered social landlord with experience of providing supported living services would manage the supported living accommodation.
- Positioning of protected trees within the site and how they would be affected by the proposals. There would be continued discussion with the applicant with regards to this.
- The greenspace had become overgrown and it was aimed to reinvigorate the area with access for all. There would also be additional tree planting as part of the biodiversity gain.
- There was an emerging energy statement which would address policy requirements and this made reference to materials to be used and energy usage.

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

- It was requested that detailed information demonstrating that the proposals would meet Policies EN1 and EN2 be submitted along with the application.
- Public rights of way across the site – there were established routes across the site though now partly overgrown and blocked off. These would be resurfaced and reintroduced as part of the proposals.
- Not all trees on the site were covered by TPOs. Some of the older trees were covered by the TPOs and it was believed that two of these had been lost before the applicant took control of the site. There were good quality trees to be retained on the south and west boundaries to the site. It was difficult to gauge how many protected trees would be lost due to the overgrowth on the site. Further discussion with regard to trees included the different categories of the protected trees; which trees would be affected by the proposals and the types of trees that could be planted as part of the landscape plan.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- There had been a lot of discussion with Planning and there had been many amendments to address concerns.
- There was a fine balance in providing the private housing alongside the supported living housing while keeping important elements of the landscape and trees.
- Further amendments could be considered to retain trees.
- Planting of heavy duty trees rather than feathered trees would be considered.

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

- Social spaces within the supported living housing. All the apartments would be designed for accessibility and lifetime living and there would be opportunities for communal areas both externally and internally.

There would be some additional space for the bungalows but was more likely to be used for staff purposes.

- There was concern expressed that there should be more communal spaces to tackle isolation.
- In response to questions that were outlined in the report to seek the views of the Panel, the following was highlighted:
 - Further to questions regarding the landscape plan, layout and arboricultural plan, Members raised concerns about the potential loss of protected trees and requested that the layout be revisited to retain trees, and in particular trees T3 and T6. Members noted that this may require a re-configuration of the layout or a less intensive scheme. Members also requested that substantial tree planting be included as part of the scheme. Members noted officer concerns in respect of the proposed landscaping for the area of public open space and requested that heavy standard trees should form part of the landscaping scheme.
 - Members requested that further information be presented to Panel evidence the net gain in bio-diversity and how that would be achieved. It was considered that the points raised in response to earlier questions should help in increasing the bio-diversity offer.
 - Some Members raised concerns about the external appearance of the dwellings. To highlight the point it was considered that the architectural treatment, and detailing, be revisited with a view to breaking up the visual mass of some elevations. It was also requested that more information be provided to aid the understanding of the design and how it responds to its local context. Attention was drawn to the architecture of the building that previously existed on the site. It was requested that further information be provided to help inform the Panel's understanding of the design approach and this should include the use computer generated imagery.
 - The Panel considered that the design of the scheme should be discussed with Ward Members and the Chair, and their views taken into account, prior to reporting the application back to Panel for a decision.

RESOLVED – That the report and discussion be noted.

55 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday, 4 March 2021 at 1.30 p.m.