

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

MINUTES

Present:	Cllr J Monaghan (Chair)	Headingley
	Cllr S Bentley	Weetwood
	Cllr J Illingworth	Kirkstall
	Freda Matthews	Hyde Park and Woodhouse Resident Rep.
	Richard Tyler	Headingley Resident Rep.
	David Hall	Far Headingley Resident Representative
	Ken Torode	Kirkstall Resident Representative
	Annie Faulder	LGHS Action Group Representative
Officer(s) in Attendance	Andrew Crates	Community Planner

Action

1. Minutes and Matters Arising

- 1.1. Item 1 – apologises from Ken Torode
- 1.2. Item 2.2 – Write to Leeds Metropolitan University re Civic Quarter
- 1.3. Item 4 – Update re Letting Boards for next meeting and respond directly to RT.
- 1.4. Item 6.2 – Clear Springs haven't bought the properties yet. FM was expressing concern.
- 1.5. Item 6.3 – refused!

JC/JM

2. Neighbourhood Design Statement (NDS)

2.1. Headingley and Hyde Park

- 2.1.1. Being drafted.
- 2.1.2. AF raised an interest in submitting a further piece of work regarding the history of a particular area of Hyde Park to be included in the NDS.

2.2. Little Woodhouse

- 2.2.1. Being drafted.
- 2.2.2. Proposing two exhibitions in addition to 'piggy backing' onto other events. 22nd November 2008 – Swarthmore Centre. 29th November 2008 – Burley Lodge (to be confirmed).
- 2.2.3. The Group have taken on 3½ additional character areas. JM to speak with Shelia Fletcher regarding the additional cost implication of this and the possibility of additional funding.
- 2.2.4. FM reminded the group of Heritage Week (11th – 14th September 2008), and mentioned that she is doing a tour of Little Woodhouse.

JM

2.3. Far Headingley

- 2.3.1. Within the NDS a Conservation Area appraisal was recommended. This is now going forward after a re-consultation event that is to be held on the 20th September 2008 at St Chads Parish Church.

3. Leeds Girls High School (LGHS) update

- 3.1. JC reported that the Case Officer is currently proposing to take a position statement regarding the LGHS applications to Plans Panel. The purpose of this is to inform members of the project (including consultation responses and feedback from the local community), and ask for a steer on how to proceed.
- 3.2. Sports England has objected to the proposal based on the original PPG17 statement. JC asked the group to note that this opinion was based on the fact the applicant did not adequately establish that the pitches were surplus to requirements, so this view could alter when the revised PPG17 statement is submitted.
- 3.3. JC was asked to confirm with Sport England as to whether they have received the Community Planning Brief and other letters of comment. **JC**
- 3.4. AF asked JC to confirm the no. of local responses received by LCC to LGHS applications and provide the Conservation Officer, English Heritage, and Sport England consultation responses to the group and PB. DH requested JC confirm with the case officer that they will summarise consultation responses and local comments within the position statement. **JC**
- 3.5. The group agreed that a meeting between Sport England, JM, JC, and a member of the LGHS action group should be arranged.. **JC**
- 3.6. Concern was expressed by SB regarding the lack of early consultation with SDU. JC explained that all relevant consultees are notified of an application and asked to comment at the validation stage. Delays can be experienced as SDU have a large responsibility and a limited number of staff. The group resolved that JM should write to the Chief Planner expressing their concern. **JC/JM**

4. Article 4 Direction

- 4.1. JC explained that an Article 4 direction permits a Local Authority (LA) to remove PD from a specific area. Article 4 (2) allows a LA to remove PD from conservation areas.
- 4.2. The current negative of using this direction is that an applicant can apply for compensation, if an application is refused by a LA where the work would normally have been PD.
- 4.3. AF asked if JC could circulate the full details of an Article 4 Direction. **JC**

5. Significant Applications/Appeals

- 5.1. Tetley Hall – 08/04049/FU & 08/04024/FU
- 5.1.1. The amended proposal is very similar to the previous submission. The applicant has made minor changes to the design and scale of the retirement block. In terms of contributions, the applicant is arguing that the affordable housing contribution would render the scheme unviable.
- 5.1.2. The group expressed concerns regarding green space and the impact upon the conservation area and the highway.
- 5.1.3. JC reported that the application for student accommodation (08/04024/FU) is slightly poorer in terms of design, as the applicant

is not proposing to invest to the same extent in the existing buildings. The amount of contributions the applicant will have to make for this proposal is less than for the family housing scheme.

5.2. The Lounge (08/04482/FU)

5.2.1. The main differences between the current application and the previous proposal that was withdrawn, is the retention of the cinema's façades and a reduction in the gross floor space of the proposed restaurant. The previously approved scheme (26/457/05/FU) contained offices instead of a smoking shelter and was granted planning permission subject to a condition preventing a restaurant use.

5.3. Appeal: The Glassworks

5.3.1. The appeal is scheduled for the 8th October and is expected to last 3 days.

5.3.2. The witness for the LA regarding H15 and green space is Tim Poupard, and Andrew Graham is giving evidence relating to design. RM is presented evidence for the HMO lobby.

5.4. Sites Under Demolition/Construction

5.4.1. FM raised concern over developers stopping work due to the credit crunch and leaving the site in a poor condition. The Westfield Road site has been left for months with the road blocked. JC to investigate what the LA can do to restore a site to a satisfactory condition and re-open roads while construction works have been halted. **JC**

5.5. Empty Housing Strategy

5.5.1. SB expressed concern regarding the number of properties that are becoming empty. JC was asked to look into what the LA's powers are in this regard and the scope for enforcing sale or buying back properties. **JC**

5.5.2. AF commented that the old children's home on North Hill Road is being used by children, which is a health and safety concern.

5.6. A65 Quality Bus Route

5.6.1. JI commented that planning permission should have been sought instead conducting the works under PD rights. The proposed works will have an implication on the green corridor and amenity of nearby residents.

5.7. Flood Alleviation Scheme

5.7.1. JI raised the issue that the majority of the proposed alleviation works are focussed on the City Centre, which is considered to be unnecessary due to the low flood risk within the area in comparison to other parts of the flood plain. JI felt this should be discussed at Area Committee. **JM**

5.8. St Anns Mills

5.8.1. JI expressed concern regarding the sale of this site without a brief detailing the constraints of the site – flooding, otters.

5.9. Kirkstall Valley Park

5.9.1. JI noted that the document has now been produced.

5.10. Hyde Park Corner

5.10.1. AF raised concern regarding planning permission being granted for another two letting agents. JC has been asked to look into why this occurred. **JC**

5.10.2. Cliff Lawn Hotel, Cliff Lane, what is the update on this?

5.10.3. AF commented that the Grosvenor Road development will be occupied by students regardless of the S106.

6. Key Message

6.1. For Action – The Planning Group requests support from the Area Committee in objecting to the applications relating to the to the LGHS sites. **JC/JM**

7. Date & Time of Next Meeting

7.1. Wednesday 1st October 2008 – 9:00 (Civic Hall)

**PLANNING GROUP
1st October 2008 (9:00 – 10:00)
Civic Hall**

MINUTES

Present:	Cllr J Monaghan (Chair)	Headingley
	Cllr J Illingworth	Kirkstall
	Freda Matthews	Hyde Park and Woodhouse Resident
	Richard Tyler	Rep.
		Headingley Resident Rep.
Officer(s) in Attendance	Jade Corcoran	Community Planner

Action

8. Apologies & Minutes (Including Matters Arising)

8.1. Apologies from David Hall

8.2. Item 1.4 – Cllr Ewens undertook an audit of the bail hostels.

9. Butcher Hill

9.1. Powerleague submitted a pre-application enquiry in January 2008 regarding developing Butcher Hill commercially. The site is partly owned by Abbey Grange and partly by Leeds City Council. Officer response to the proposal has been negative to date.

9.2. JI is of the opinion that long term measures are required to protect this land, develop non-commercial local sports facilities, and help the school to integrate better with the community.

9.3. JI is concerned about the impact the uncertainty of this enquiry is having on the community, and would like the matter to be brought to a conclusion.

9.4. The group supported the decision of Area Committee to write to the Diocese of Ripon requesting that they do not sell the playing pitches and work with the community to retain the fields.

10. Kirkstall Forge/BHS Site

10.1. The S106

monies relating to the Kirkstall Forge application are currently partly associated with Highway works for the Horsforth roundabout.

- 10.2. There is a lack of footpaths and cycle routes associated with the scheme. **JC**
- 10.3. The group resolved to write to Phil Crabtree and request that the monies from the S106 agreement is concentrated on provision for Kirkstall.
- 10.4. JI commented that the BHS scheme is unsustainable and there is missed opportunities to secure footpaths and cycle routes through the site.

11. Kirkstall District Centre Planning Appeal

- 11.1. The appeal has been withdrawn by the appellant.
- 11.2. The developer is currently negotiating the sale of the site with Tesco.
- 11.3. JI commented that the traffic scheme proposed under this application would not have worked, and the massing of the proposal was 'back to front'.

12. A65 Quality Bus Scheme

- 12.1. JI advised the group that there is pinch point between Woodside View and the Railway Viaduct, which is the most congested section of the route.
- 12.2. JI voiced concern regarding the environmental impact of the proposal due to the quality of the road finishes. The proposed anti-skid surfacing would introduce harm in terms of noise to residential amenity.
- 12.3. JI commented that more work is required relating to the timing of the traffic signals, and the scheme should incorporate more pedestrian crossings at bus stops.
- 12.4. The Goit side Area should be enhanced with the footpath and cycle provision improved. This should be a quiet area to escape the traffic. JI raised concern that the environmental improvements will be lost if the scheme goes over budget. **JC**
- 12.5. JC mentioned that a Highways Officer is due to discuss the A65 Quality Bus Scheme with Area Committee in November. JM would like a Highways Officer to brief Members at Area Committee over the Quality Bus Scheme and should be prepared to answer questions regarding key arterial routes.

13. Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme

- 13.1. Public consultation regarding the flood alleviation proposals is to commence in December.
- 13.2. JI commented that the flood risk within the city centre is relatively small and so building barriers abutting the river edge is unnecessary and will encourage unsympathetic development.
- 13.3. JI mentioned that more work should be done to increase the storage capacity of the

upper Aire and its tributaries. Utilising the tributaries could reduce the peak of a flood by spreading out the flood water.

13.4. Defences are planned between Leeds Station and Burley Mills, and adjacent to St Anns Mills and Morrisons.

13.5. JI explained to the group that the flood plain in Armley has been land filled and made much higher than the river. Therefore, any flood water will not be easily accommodated.

14. St Anns Mills

14.1. JI outlined that an otter “resting place” (protected species) has been identified within the St Anns Mills site. In addition to this, the site has many other restraints (flooding, contamination, etc) and for this reason JI is of the opinion that a Planning Brief should be made available before the sale of the site. The group resolved to write to Jean Dent requesting that a planning brief is written for the site before it is disposed of. **JC**

14.2. JI commented that the area marked for development is on the wrong side of the flood barrier, and that an application for listing St Ann’s Mills has been made.

14.3. JI discussed that the most appropriate form of development would be for the Mill to be refurbished for local artisans (silversmith / painter / potter etc), with the lower deck being utilised by a local club (canoeists) as it is the most likely floor to be flooded.

15. Kirkstall Valley Park

15.1. JI informed the group that a BMX track has been constructed by a group of residents within Batcliffe Wood. This has caused concern locally as the group do not have planning permission, and the track is having an impact upon the trees and cuts across a footpath.

15.2. JI has discussed an alternative site with the group, and has suggested they should base the track near the former waste tip on Kirkstall Road, which is underlain by a weak Victorian sewer and so has limited development value. JI is of the opinion that the BMX track in this location would not introduce harm to amenity and the trees. If this proposal is to go forward, JC advised that the group may have to undertake a planning application and they should seek advice on this matter.

15.3. The Leeds Met feasibility study for the Kirkstall Valley Park has been put on the website.

16. Key Message for Area Committee

16.1. For Action – The Planning Group requests that Area Committee considers the benefits of commissioning an Area Action Plan.

17. Date & Time of Next Meeting

17.1. Wednesday 5th November 2008 – 9:00 (Civic Hall)