

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 4TH MARCH, 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

56 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals.

57 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There was no exempt information.

58 Late Items

There were no late items.

59 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests. Councillor Shemilt informed the Panel that although she was a Member of Rawdon Parish Council she had not been involved in their objection to Agenda Item 10 – Micklefield House, New Road Side Rawdon and neither did the application site fall within her Ward. She would treat the application with an open mind and without pre-determination.

60 Minutes - 28 January 2021

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2021 be confirmed as a correct record.

61 Application 17/06933/FU - Sugar Hill Close, Oulton Drive, Wordsworth Drive, Oulton, Leeds, LS26 8EP - Appeal Decision

The report of the Chief Planning Officer summarised the appeal decisions following the public inquiry with regards to Application 17/06933/FU, Sugar Hill Close, Oulton Drive, Wordsworth Drive, Oulton Leeds.

The appeal against the decision of the Council to refuse planning permission was allowed and planning permission granted. A further appeal was made against the Council for costs and this was refused.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

62 Application 20/06034/FU – 49 Colwyn Road, Beeston, Leeds, LS11 6LQ.

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the retention of a single storey extension to the rear at 49 Colwyn Road, Beeston, Leeds.

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

The following was highlighted:

- The extension was on the Tempest Road side of the property. The property was originally two back to backs that had been knocked through to form one.
- The extension was sited on top of what was a parking space.
- Images of the extension were shown. It was currently unfinished and it was proposed to be rendered.
- The application had been referred to Panel at the request of a local Ward Councillor.
- There were other similar but temporary structures in the area and examples of these were shown.
- The application was retrospective and it was recommended that it should be refused.

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

- The extension went up to the edge of the pavement.
- The siting of the extension and its positioning in the street scene was the main issue. Rendering of the extension would be an improvement but would not overcome other concerns.
- The application had been submitted in response to enforcement action. The other similar structures in the surrounding area were unlikely to have had planning approval but this would not justify the approval of this application.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused in line with the officer recommendation.

63 Application 20/08124/OT – Oldfield Lane, Upper Wortley

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for housing development (up to 61 units) including adopted highway access and associated external works at Oldfield Lane, Upper Wortley.

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

The following was highlighted:

- Members were asked to consider the principle of development at this site and access. All other matters reserved for a future application.
- It was proposed to deliver 100% affordable housing on site.
- Pedestrian connections to the site.
- The site was allocated for housing and there were no planning reasons not to give approval.
- Vehicular access had been assessed by highways and there had not been any objections.
- There had been an objection from Sport England. The site had not been formally used for sports in the past ten years.
- There had been a significant level of objection regarding the principle of development even though the site was allocated for housing in the Site Allocation Plan.
- It was considered that there was sufficient existing education provision for the extra school places that would be required from this development.
- Further objections had been made by Ward Councillors.
- Objections included lack of school places, lack of green space, highways concerns, levels of anti-social behaviour in the locality and the siting of a gas pipe.
- There were no covenants on the land to retain sports pitches or open spaces.
- Members were reminded that the application was to consider the use of the land for residential purposes.

A local resident addressed the Panel with concerns and objections to the application. These included the following:

- There was a deficiency of land for sports provision in the area.
- The land had previously been bought by the people of Leeds for sporting use. It would be unethical to use it for development.
- The land was currently in daily use and evidence could be provided for this.
- The local community had been consulted and had said no to the development. They should be listened to.
- In response to questions, the following was discussed:
 - The community had taken this site back into a usable site and had been used for informal sports provision.
 - The site had previously housed a good quality football pitch and netball courts.
 - Neighbouring areas were also deficient in grounds for sports provision.
 - It was agreed that there was a need for more council housing but this should not be at the loss of pitches for sports provision.

A representative of the Council Housing Growth Team addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- The land had been identified for housing. There would be provision of on-site greenspace and improved access along with enhancements to greenspace and sports facilities elsewhere within the ward.
- The proposed houses would be high quality and energy efficient.
- Where were no other council owned sites for this kind of development in this part of the city.
- There had been extensive pre-planning consultation and there had been some support for the scheme.
- There would be improvement to greenspace and access. Other existing facilities would be improved.

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

- Detailed arrangements for future greenspace provision had not been made.
- There was a commitment to engage with local residents and other stakeholders.
- Ward Members had objected to the proposed use of the land for housing during the Site Allocation process.
- Sport England had acknowledged that they were not a statutory consultee as the site hadn't been formally used for sports for a period of over 10 years. They did however refer to recent use by the community.
- There was a lack of greenspace in this and other areas but there was also a duty to provide housing.
- It was not yet known what the commuted sums for the provision of off-site contributions would be.
- The site had been used for sporting activities, just not on an official basis.
- The need to balance the weight of the Site Allocation Plan against that of the needs of the local community and the loss of greenspace against the provision of much needed affordable housing.
- The concerns and efforts of the local community were acknowledged but there were no planning reasons to refuse permission.
- There was a recognised need for council housing but this should not be at the loss of greenspace.

RESOLVED – That approval be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer – subject first to referral to Secretary of State following a request from the public and subject to the conditions outlined in the report (and any others which might be considered to be appropriate).

64 Applications 20/01306/FU & 20/01307/LI – Micklefield House, New Road Side, Rawdon

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented applications for the change of use and alteration of a former council building to form eight flats with parking at Micklefield House, New Road Side, Rawdon.

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

The following was highlighted:

- The building was previously used for office accommodation.
- All the apartments would be two bed apart from one three bed.
- The building was surrounded by parkland and parking to the front.
- The flat roofed part of the building would be extended with an additional floor on top.
- The ramp to the front of the building would be removed.
- Changes to windows and doorways.
- The UPVC porched area would be removed.
- The stained glass window would be restored as part of the scheme.
- There would be 16 parking spaces in total for the 8 apartments.
- CGI images of the proposed extension was shown. Materials were still to be decided.
- Some internal changes to the building were still to be decided.
- Residential conversion of the building was the only viable option and would secure the long term future of the building.
- All the parking spaces would be served by electric charging points and there would also be cycle storage.
- There would be a number of additional conditions including attic layout, revised roof plans and samples of stones to be used for infill. It was proposed to amend the recommendation to defer and delegate for further negotiation on the conditions.

An objector to the application addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- The adjacent stables had been redeveloped without extension.
- The re-purposing of Micklefield House was supported. The primary objection was the addition of a second floor to the existing extension.
- There had not been any letters of support for the application and objections had come from Leeds Civic Trust, Airebrough Neighbourhood Forum, Rawdon Parish Council and the Victorian Society.
- The proposed extension would overlook a children's play area and be damaging to amenity.
- The proposed extension would contravene the emerging neighbourhood plan and would not be compliant with policy and guidelines.
- It was urged that the application be deferred for negotiation to remove the proposed extension.
- The proposals would be damaging to the conservation area.

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

- More weight could be given to an emerging Neighbourhood Plan following the carrying out of a referendum.
- The application had been referred to Panel at the request of a Ward Councillor.
- The proposed extension would not be dominant. There was a need for further discussion with the applicant particular in relation to materials.
- The proposed extension was not in keeping with the rest of the building.
- It was suggested that the application be deferred for further discussion regarding materials.
- The extension did not need to replicate the existing building.
- The proposed extension needed making softer and could be improved.
- Members queried whether there was a need for an additional room/extension.

In summary it was felt that Members were accepting of some form of extension at first floor. It was suggested that the application be deferred to discuss the design of this element and materials in further detail with the applicant. The applicant had submitted some better images of the proposals which had not formed part of the presentation because of their very late submission.

A motion for deferral was moved and seconded and voted on.

RESOLVED – That the applications be deferred for further discussion with regard to the design and materials for the first floor extension and to provide more detail on the conditions.

65 Application 20/08541/FU – Kirkstall Forge, Abbey Road, Kirkstall

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the variation of conditions 12 (completion of eastern and western accesses) and 13 (provision of bus route) of approval 15/04824/FU to amend wording of conditions at Kirkstall Forge, Abbey Road, Kirkstall.

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

The following was highlighted:

- Key routes through the site also included the River Aire, railway and Leeds Liverpool Canal
- Development already undertaken in the Kirkstall Forge site.
- Western access and the following route through the site.
- Forthcoming developments within the site and how these would link with access to the site.
- The junctions to the access roads and approach from A65.
- Construction access.
- Previous alterations to the conditions.

- Details of the conditions that were now recommended.
- Additional conditions to secure highways improvements.
- Pedestrian facilities and links from the A65.
- Provisions for emergency access.
- It was recommended to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer.

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

- The need to get development completed to draw down funding for the access roads.
- Previous changes to the conditions and the impact on development.
- The wording of the conditions would allow that when the buildings reach 90% occupancy then the necessary access arrangements would follow prior to full occupancy.
- Cycle access – if there was access for emergency vehicles at the eastern access could provision be made for cycle access. It was reported that there was some initial funding to develop a cycle link from Kirkstall Abbey to the eastern side of Kirkstall Forge.
- Pedestrian routes and signage for these.
- Further discussion would be undertaken with the application with regards to cycle access.

RESOLVED – That approval be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to vary conditions 12 and 13 as detailed in the report with the imposition of an additional condition, also outlined in the report and subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 Agreement.

66 Chair's Closing Remarks

The Chair announced that it would be Andy Thickett's last meeting prior to his retirement. The Chair thanked Andy for all his contributions to Panel and wished him all the best for the future.

67 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday, 1 April 2021 at 1.30 p.m.