

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 7TH JULY, 2022

PRESENT: Councillor E Taylor in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,
S Hamilton, D Ragan, T Smith, J Bowden,
J Garvani and N Walshaw

OPENING REMARKS

The Chair welcomed new Panel Members and thanked former Councillor Collins and Councillors Burke, Wray, and Jenkins for the work they have done on the Panel.

14 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

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

15 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no exempt items.

16 Late Items

There were no formal late items.

17 Declarations of Interests

No interests were raised by Panel Members. However, in relation to Agenda Item 8. PREAPP/22/00050 - Cottingley Playing Fields, A6110 Ring Road, Beeston, LS11 (site 1) and Cottingley Vale, Cottingley Drive, Cottingley, LS11 (site 2) The Legal Adviser to the Panel reported that she knew applicant professionally and therefore recused herself from this matter. The Panel were supported with a Legal Adviser during this item.

18 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Cllr R Finnigan and Cllr J Heselwood.

19 Minutes - Thursday 9 June 22

RESOLVED – That subject to a typo being amended in relation to Minute No. 8 on page 10, the minutes of the meeting held Thursday, 9th June 22 be approved as an accurate record.

20 21/03303/FU - Albert House, 3 Monk Bridge Road, Meanwood, Leeds, LS6 4DX

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for four dwellings to the rear and amendment to site access in relation to Albert House, 3 Monk Bridge Road, Meanwood, Leeds, LS6 4DX.

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

The Planning Officer presented the application and provided Panel Members with the following information:

- The application is brought to Panel due to the potential impact the development will have on the Far Headingley Conservation Area and the level of local concern.
- The proposal includes the construction of two 3 bedroom and two 2-bedroom terrace properties located to the rear of Albert House.
- The front garden comprises several mature trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order.
- The surrounding area is predominantly residential.
- Photographs of the existing site and proposals were provided.
- The garden space for Albert House will be retained, as well as the mature hedging.
- Car parking will be provided for the new properties and each property will include large usable gardens to the rear.
- The distance of the proposal to neighbourhood properties is in line with the Neighbourhoods for Living Guidance and is considered being acceptable impact amenity on neighbouring properties.
- The developer has provided similar properties in a nearby development, as viewed by members on the site visit.

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

- Concerns regarding overdevelopment of the proposals and, the disproportionality to the rear of Albert House.
- Reference to the recent planning application for a swimming pool at Albert House.
- Loss of greenspace in a dense part of Leeds, consequently resulting in a loss of wildlife.
- Concerns relating to the entrance of the proposals and safety of pedestrians / motorists. There will also be increased traffic with bin collections, visitors, and construction workers.
- There are strong views from the local MP and his objections remain outstanding.
- Absence of information relating to biodiversity net gains.
- The comments relayed from the conservation team suggest a different design in terms of depth and height could preserve the conservation area.

The applicant addressed the Panel. Issues raised highlighted the following:

- The site had previous approval for 9 units resulting in a loss in parking and trees, and the current proposals provide a more considered

approach to the site that do not require removal of trees, nor change in frontage to Albert House.

- Albert House will be retained as 1 unit and the application is considered proportionate in scale for the site.
- The application responds to the climate crisis by using air source heat pumps.
- Happy to incorporate a condition that restricts the use of gas on-site.
- The application site is located near local amenities for residents to access within proximity, with an aim to reduce overall car usage. The application also meets the Neighbourhood for Living guidance, as well as design guidance.
- Local developers will be used for the construction of the development.

In responding to a question from a member regarding the offer of the condition restricting gas on-site, it was confirmed that the applicant is happy to accept this as a condition. The applicant explained that the proposed application site has a high EPC rating with the proposals as set out.

In response to questions, officers confirmed the following:

- There is a live planning permission that relates to a swimming pool on the proposed site. However, this does not affect the proposal put before members and is expected to lapse in the next year.
- The neighbourhood plan talks about far Headingley conservation appraisal and the importance of greenspaces and the design to respect the local character.

Comments from members included:

- Members are happy with the entrance and trees being retained.
- The development is well considered and in line with design guidance. The proposals fit well within the area.
- The approach to mitigate carbon and use of air source heat pumps. Happy with the applicant agreeing to not use gas on-site.

Following a vote on the recommendation, it was moved and seconded:

RESOLVED – That approval be granted, subject to the incorporation of the conditions as outlined in the submitted report, as well as a condition being added relating to air source heat pumps and no gas on-site.

21 PREAPP/22/00050 - Cottingley Playing Fields, A6110 Ring Road, Beeston, LS11 (site 1) and Cottingley Vale, Cottingley Drive, Cottingley, LS11 (site 2)

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a Pre-Application Presentation for relocation of Cottingley GP Surgery into a purpose-built medical facility (with ancillary services) at Cottingley Playing Fields, A6110 Ring Road, Beeston, LS11 (site 1) and Cottingley Vale, Cottingley Drive, Cottingley, LS11 (site 2)

The presentation informed Members of a major health / medical proposal for the area of Cottingley with feedback sought from the Panel as to two principal sites (2 of 6 put forward for initial consideration).

Members had attended a site visit and were shown slides and photographs throughout the officer presentation.

The Planning Officer presented the application, providing the following information:

- 2 sites have been put forward for consideration, to replace the existing GP surgery at Cottingley that is deemed no longer fit for purpose by Care Quality Commission (CQC). The new proposals will provide approximately 2400m² enhanced / accessible local health care provision.
- Further residents from the South Leeds community are also expected to benefit from the services. The centre will also provide an outpatient facility, community services, physio sessions, café, and potentially also a pharmacy (for site 1).
- In relation to site no. 2 the pharmacy is hoped / expected to remain in the existing precinct opposite the application site.
- The centre will also provide rooms for other bodies, stakeholders, and charities to provide financial and support services.
- Site option 1 is located adjacent to the A6110 Ring Road, facing toward the Drysalters Public House and a Kia Car Showroom. The site / land is set slightly higher than the adjacent Ring Road from which access would be taken from. The Ring Road features a planned upgrading of the wider highway network to provide enhanced bus and cycle provision.
- Site option 2 involves a segment of land set between the existing Cottingley Vale shopping precinct and a Sheltered Housing Complex. Ongoing discussions are required regarding parking demands and site layout issues.
- There are different material considerations for both sites. Site 1 – issues in terms of the healthcare facility being accessible by foot and public transport and the link to existing shopping and highway considerations. Site 2 – issues in terms of possibly identifying additional parking.
- Amenity considerations on both sites. Site 1 – issues around noise and part of the development being a multiuse games area may be better placed elsewhere due to the nearby crematorium. Site 2 – located near residential homes.
- There are mature trees on both sites.
- Flood risk associated with site 1.
- Highways have commented on site 2 regarding parking demand and the need for detailed parking surveys. The developer will need to pay for traffic regulation orders if it is deemed additional parking is required, as well as alterations to existing bus stops.

- Consultation with Yorkshire Water is expected in relation to development around the existing sewer network and in respect of flood risk management.
- Site 2 includes existing trees and parking facilities and there is an opportunity to explore ways to regenerate the existing shopping precinct.

The applicant and architect were in attendance, and provided the following information:

- In 2018 the CQC found several parts of the existing healthcare facility non-compliant and requires improvements as a matter of urgency. The practice is considered unsafe for the provision of healthcare.
- The current site lacks facilities, there are no clean utility rooms and poor accessibility in terms of there being no disabled parking on-site. Therefore, residents in the area do not use this centre and travel further afield.
- The proposed re-location strategy is to provide a one-stop medical facility to improve the range of services, whilst integrating aspects of the hospital, as well as support services.
- A number of sites have been considered, and the 2 proposed before Panel Members are those deemed most acceptable by the Planning Officer.
- An overview was provided in relation to both site 1 and site 2. It was noted that there will be an opportunity with site 2 to re-develop the shopping precinct, and possibly create a village square.

In response to questions from Members, the following was confirmed:

- The structure on the existing site where the GP surgery currently is, cannot be extended due to the church above and the proximity to Cottingley Drive. The existing building is owned by a charity, and it is intended that the building will be used for peer support groups for the local community.
- Site 1 was initially supported due to its visibility however there are reservations with greenspace loss.
- Whilst it was acknowledged that there will be added benefits of re-developing the shopping precinct in relation to site 2, parking issues were also noted.

A local ward Councillor (Scopes) addressed the Panel, and provided the following comments:

- There is a need for GP access in Cottingley for the health and wellbeing of residents.
- Cottingley acts like an island surrounded by transport infrastructure (rail, motorway and main roads) and with low car ownership, residents suffer from accessibility issues
- The deprived nature of the area was acknowledged, and it was agreed that access to services such as debt advice options and support will be a good opportunity for the area.

- The existing surgery does not meet standards, and many residents do not use the surgery.
- The preference on locations, is site 2. It is in the middle of Cottingley and there is already an existing pharmacy. There is also an opportunity to re-develop the shopping precinct and the location will also benefit those in the nearby Dulverton Court Sheltered Accommodation.
- Whilst it was recognised that there will be a loss of greenspace with site 2, the importance of having a GP surgery outweighs that loss.
- Asked the committee to support the development and find pragmatic solutions in terms of parking.

In response to a question regarding the development of the existing site, the local ward Councillor explained he was in favour of additional greenspace in the area. There have been anti-social behaviour related issues with the shopping precinct relating to site 2 and improvements to this site are welcomed. It was believed that none of the residents have commented they wish for the existing surgery to be retained. There are opportunities to expand the centre and provide additional services.

Responding to questions from Members, officers informed the Panel with the following information:

- The shopping precinct is not part of a designated centre. Subject to further considerations and moving on with site 2, policy officers will likely look to re-designate as a Local Centre in the Local Plan subject to delivery of this scheme. Officers are working with Commercial Asset Management to look at refurbishing and how units are showcased.
- In relation to site 1, Highways colleagues have reservations due to there being no visibility on the junction and the junction will also interfere with the existing high frequency bus stop. Highways preferred option is site 2.

Members were broadly in favour of site 2 and agreed site 1 will not be considered an acceptable development.

Members relayed comments to the officers key issues set out in the submitted report in relation to site 2:

1. Location / land use designation including the juxtaposition with adjoining land uses. Site 2 provides the best location in terms of accessibility and local amenities.
2. Potential / suggested additional improvements offered namely as part of any development i) greenspace provisions (MUGA, outside gym and junior playing pitch) (to site 1) ii) built environment – i.e., neighbouring Sphinx shopping precinct (to site 2) members were keen to explore how the development can improve existing shopping facilities and form part of a combined development but also highlighted the importance that GP provision in the area should not be delayed.
3. Highway safety / efficiency of design in relation to sustainable transport choices and emerging parking arrangements. It was noted that further

considerations need to be taken in terms of parking, and the impact this has on the local community.

4. Emerging landscaping arrangements to both existing and proposed settings. Members requested that ideally no trees are removed on site and broadly accepted the loss of greenspace on-site subject to additional parking that may be required.

Members accepted the need for healthcare provision in the local area and urged officers to undertake further discussions with local ward members, LCC Asset Management, Housing colleagues, residents, and the applicants in relation to site 2. Whilst Members were keen to see a scheme that improves the existing shopping centre, it was acknowledged that this may delay and impact on funding / delivery of site 2. It was noted that the applicant was not intending to become a landlord for the existing shopping units.

RESOLVED – To note the content of the report on the proposal and to provide views in relation to the questions posed in the submitted report to aid the progression of the application and to allow for further conversations.

22 22/01376/FU - former South Leeds Golf Course, Gipsy Lane, Beeston

The report of the Chief Planning Officer set out a Position Statement in relation to a proposed new 3G pitch and tennis courts and associated fencing up to 4.5m high at former South Leeds Golf Course, Gipsy Lane, Beeston.

Members had attended a site visit and were shown slides and photographs throughout the officer presentation.

It was noted that representations have been received from Friends of Middleton Park and a local resident who runs a hedgehog facility, releasing wildlife on the proposed application site.

The Planning Officer presented the application, providing the following information:

- The site involves a parcel of land forming part of the former South Leeds Golf Course situated to the immediate south of Cockburn Academy. The site incorporates a section of Leeds Public Footpath which runs in an east / west direction. The footpath connects Gipsy Lane to the west where residential properties and a boarding kennels and cattery are located.
- The proposals will be used by students from Cockburn Academy and will be available for community use out of school hours.
- The school fronts onto Gipsy Lane and consists of a large two storey structure which serves the main school building with 3 storey elements to the rear. It was noted that the school has a 35.5% deficit for soft outdoor PE space.
- The western side of the site is more elevated than the east. Maps were shown to show an outline of the cutting required / land made up. The soil will not be removed from the site and is a sustainable solution.

- There will be a 4.5m fence around the courts and 2.4m meshed fence along the boundary to provide some security for the school.
- The diverted footpath will wrap around the proposed facility and connect to Gipsy Lane.
- An overview of the materials that will be used for the proposals.
- 38 mature trees will need to be removed. The applicant is proposing off-site planting which amounts to 130 heavy standing mature trees. A considerable amount of shrub planting is proposed and achieves more than 10% of that required.
- The site will be gated, and the footpath will be closed.
- Ensuring the proposal doesn't injure the openness of the greenbelt.
- Representation seeking robust means assessment on the need for a Golf Course.
- The applicant has carried out a full tree survey and ecological assessment. 3:1 planting proposed to take place off-site. It was noted that the trees lost will be category B and the value of trees against the climate emergency should be recognised in relation to carbon capture. Additionally, the biodiversity metric has been re-visited and re-calculated, and the nature conservation area has been re-consulted with no change on the survey findings. A response is awaited.

A representative from Friends of Middleton Park attended the meeting, and provided the Panel with the following information:

- Friends of Middleton Park strongly object to the proposals and there is a small return / benefit for the community and the park. It was confirmed that the existing space is well utilised by the local community.
- Concerns around re-modelling the land.
- Felling mature trees to re-model the land cannot be justified.
- Implications of potential flooding and being exacerbated by the schools existing pitch. Micro plastics may be washed into the local water course and harm wildlife.
- Concerns about loss of existing cobbled right of way which has been in use since 1852. The proposed replacement right of way causes significant added distance and elevation and does not connect with existing rights of way.
- Subject to proposals for flood lighting, this will cause harm to the woodland.
- There has been minimal consultation from the school.
- The proposals impact on access to greenspace for the local community.
- Challenges in relation to the schools existing pitch should be rectified before putting in additional pitches.

The applicant provided the following information:

- The school has a 1.2k capacity and has taken in additional children. The school has an outdoor play provision deficit of 35% and the proposed facilities increase capacity for rugby and tennis.
- The school has been rated outstanding by Ofsted.

- The school currently has a reduced sports offer.
- The proposed development can also be made available for community use.
- The former Golf Course was a privately owned business, that was subject to a decline in memberships and anti-social behaviour.
- The proposed removal of trees is not covered by Tree Protection Orders (TPO) and there will be a 3:1 replacement, equating to 130 new trees being planted. It was confirmed none of the trees provided will be sampling size.
- With the extensive shrub planting, there will be a biodiversity net gain of 21.95%, significantly above the required 10%.
- Temporary loss of existing pitches and car parking.
- To place the proposals on the schools existing pitches will not rectify the issues the school faces in terms of its deficit. The existing sports pitches are also located nearby residential homes.

In response to questions from Panel Members, the following was confirmed:

- The school has a tennis court in the multi-use games area.
- All the existing outdoor facilities are used by the school and local communities. The facilities are used by the community in line with LCC lettings policy and charged in accordance with the LCC schedule. It was suggested that a new community agreement specifically for this proposal can be considered.
- In terms of the water logging, the school have looked at rectifying issues. It was confirmed that the existing facilities are particularly difficult to use in the winter months but are still considered usable. The development proposed will not fit on the existing facilities. Even if the existing facilities are improved, the school will still have a deficit of 35% for soft outdoor PE space.
- The 3G pitch provides the school with the option to provides multiple sports and is more durable. Members commented that a grass pitch can also be used during winter and a 3G pitch may destroy wildlife.
- The existing sports facilities in the school are available to the community.
- Clarity was provided on the number of car parking spaces provided, and it was confirmed there are 47 dedicated spaces for the pitches and an additional 60 spaces for staff. In response to this, Members raised concern regarding use of the schools parking facilities by the local community out of school hours.
- There are no additional facilities for changing, and this will be located inside of the school.
- The application doesn't include flood lighting at this stage, due to the proximity to the ancient woodland. Flood lighting will be subject to planning permission in the future if applied for.
- The diverted footpath is due to safeguarding reasons and the fencing around the pitches provides a secure boundary during school hours and lessons. It was confirmed that the footpath and gate during school hours will be closed and restricted for public use. The community use of facilities will be out of school hours. In addition to this, queried why

the footpath will be closed for use of the local community out of school hours.

- The applicant is proposing a 3:1 tree replacement with heaving standing trees and is exceeding the minimum requirement. Furthermore, there will be a 21.95% biodiversity net gain, again exceeding the minimum requirement.

Further to questions from Panel Members, officers confirmed the following information:

- Clarity on the Executive Board decision relating to the application in June 2020. The decision related to pitch provision with a caveat subject to planning permission.
- The tree loss is significant and retaining trees should be explored and examined. Carbon capture in relation to the 3:1 tree replacement should be considered.
- The pitch presented is a tier 1 level pitch and is considered super league standard. It was noted that a tier 4 pitch usable for community / club level rugby is considered acceptable and can be accessed by communities. The pitch proposed will not fit on existing facilities.
- It was confirmed that an LCC colleague from Parks and Countryside can be invited to a future meeting in determining proposals relating to this site.
- Hard play has been lost as a consequence of the schools previous extension.

Members comments included:

- The importance of sport was acknowledged in terms of the school wanting to expand on sport provision for their students.
- Alternatives can be provided on a different site / type of pitch that has been proposed. The 3G pitch is deemed damaging to the woodland and issues with the site being fenced off is considered problematic for use of the community out of school hours.
- The proposed site is a significant piece of greenbelt, used by the local community. Concern regarding the community benefit, in return for loss of greenbelt. There is an impact on local amenity.
- The applicant should rectify existing issues with facilities on-site.
- Landscaping issues.
- Public access to parking facilities is substandard and parking provision needs to be looked at in terms of people with disabilities and drop off points.
- Members required assurances that the facilities will be used by the local community.
- A robust and enforceable community use agreement needed to be produced as part of the application.
- Details of construction management plan required as part of application.

Responding to the officers questions as set out in the submitted report, Members relayed the following comments:

1. Do Members wish to comment on these Green Belts issues? Members cannot comment without being provided with further information.
2. Do Members wish to comment on the suggested very special circumstances put forward by the applicant and whether they clearly outweigh the Green Belt harm? Members cannot comment without being provided with further information.
3. Do Members support the principle of considering this application without the requirement for a need's assessment as suggest by Sport England? Members cannot comment without being provided with further information in relation to the need's assessment.
4. Do Members have any comments to make regarding tree loss and the proposed mitigation measures? Members cannot comment without being provided with further information.
5. Do Members have any concerns or comments relating to ecology matters? Members cannot comment without being provided with further information.
6. Notwithstanding the extent of tree loss, in visual and design terms, do members support the proposed layout and design solution? Members cannot comment without being provided with further information.
7. Do Members have any concerns or comments relating to the potential impact upon the local amenity? Members relayed concerns regarding the impact on local amenity.
8. Do Members have any concerns or comments relating to highway issues? Members raised concern regarding provision for disabled parking and drop off issues in proximity to the proposed site and to ensure there is adequate parking.
9. Do Members wish to raise any other matters now? No further comments at this moment.

RESOLVED - To note the content of the report on the proposal and to provide views in relation to the questions posed in the submitted report to aid the progression of the application.

23 Date and Time of the Next Meeting

The date and time of the next meeting is scheduled to take place Thursday, 4th August 22 at 1.30pm.

(The meeting concluded at 17:05)