

NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 29TH JUNE, 2023

PRESENT: Councillor J Akhtar in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, J Heselwood,
D Jenkins, R Jones, J McKenna, M Millar
and N Sharpe

SITE VISITS

Councillors B Anderson, N Sharpe and J McKenna attended site visits earlier in the day.

9 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals.

10 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no exempt items.

11 Late Items

There were no formal late items.

12 Declaration of Interests

No interests were raised.

13 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Stephenson.

14 Minutes - 1st June 2023

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the previous meeting held Thursday, 1st June 2023 be approved as an accurate record.

15 22/07335/RM & 22/07336/RM – Reserved Matters applications for residential development of 294 dwellings within the Middle Quadrant (Morwick Green) of the East Leeds Extension pursuant to outline planning approval 20/04464/OT.

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented two reserved matters applications for residential development of 294 dwellings within the Middle Quadrant (Morwick Green) of the East Leeds Extension pursuant to outline planning approval 20/04464/OT.

The report has been brought to the North and East Plans Panel to seek views of Members to aid progression of the application.

Members were provided with a couple of updates since the writing of the submitted report. It was noted that:

- 6 representations (3 for each of the applications) have been received seeking the desire for Swift brick to be installed in the units. It was confirmed that at this point, it did not form part of the proposals as such details are required to be submitted for approval by a condition on the outline planning permission.
- Other representations have been received from Councillors Lennox and Gibson on the mix of use of houses, and the request that affordable houses be better represented in terms of 3 and 4 bed properties and there being no indication of socially rented properties; it was confirmed that this will be met through the 40/60 split, and through the outline planning application process.

Photographs and slides were shown throughout the officer presentation, and Panel members were provided with the following information:

- The applications cover roughly half of the Middle Quadrant and is divided up between two applicants, Taylor Wimpey and Cullen Land. The 294 dwelling total is divided into 250 units for Taylor Wimpey and 44 on the Cullen Land site.
- The spine road serves the interior of the site and is designed to accommodate bus services. The spine road will be tree lined, and the retention of the woodland area.
- A mix of housing and flats is proposed to be provided in two character areas. The southern section of the site adopts a more contemporary design approach for the housing with larger format windows with no head or sill details, including the use of brick and render splits and flat roofed canopies over front doors. The second character area in the northern section of the site is more traditional and includes the use of heads and sills, greater focus on the single use of brick, pitched roof canopies over front doors and more symmetrical window sizes.
- There are 49 affordable units proposed across the site
- The policy requirement for the number of accessible housing units has been exceeded.
- 5 units do not meet the minimum internal space standards and discussions are on-going with the applicant to meet this requirement.
- There are 8 local play areas across the site.
- The applicant has included SUDs across the site, and the intention is for them to be constantly wet so that they don't dry up in the summer months.
- A pump station is proposed adjacent to one of the SUD's feature and will be overlooked by plots 127 and 128, details of the infrastructure are awaited from the applicant as this poses visual amenity concerns.
- The provision of 'Copenhagen' style crossings is intended to be provided through the site layout to improve on pedestrian safety.

Councillor P Grahame attended the meeting and raised her concerns regarding the size of the affordable units proposed and supported comments made in Councillor Lennox's representation. Councillor Grahame also explained that she does not want the affordable units to be 'clumped' together, as you can usually identify an affordable unit.

Further to questions to Councillor Grahame regarding affordable units, it was confirmed that 2 bed units are suitable for people wishing to downsize. However, there have been a number of requests from constituents from families needing larger properties.

The applicants agent and representatives attended the meeting, and provided the following information:

- The Middle Quadrant has been the most difficult in terms of the whole of the East Leeds Extension due to the nature of the spine road and the relative narrow width of the site. It is accepted that more design elements and tweaks will need to be amended.
- The SHMA (Strategic Housing Market Assessment) identifies a need for 2 bed properties although concerns regarding affordable units have been noted and this can be re-visited.
- Minimum space standards have now been met and details on this can be provided.
- The provision of open spaces over exceeds requirements.
- A lot of work has been done on parking, and it is intended to hide the parking areas to ensure streets are not dominated by cars.
- Minor changes to landscaping in terms of the south east part of the site.
- There will be no gas on site and air source heat pumps is proposed.
- It is requested that the application be brought to a Panel meeting for consideration no later than August 2023 as the developers do not want to be delayed.

Further to questions from Panel Members, the following was confirmed:

- The proposed affordable units will be scattered rather than 'clumped'. Albeit they will be a bit closer together to ensure the housing association can better manage them. It was also confirmed there will be a 60/40 split in terms of socially rented properties. 60% of the 45 affordable units will be socially rented units. It was also confirmed that the appearance of the affordable units will be the same as the market dwellings.
- Landscaping proposals are extensive and serves the whole of the East Leeds Orbital Route as well as the Cock Beck corridor.
- There is the greatest demand for 2 bed properties as identified city-wide in the SHMA. It was confirmed that there is a penalty tax on overprovision of bedrooms. However, it was acknowledged that there is a need for additional 3 bed properties.

A member commented that further consideration needs to be taken regarding the need to improve tree lined areas. In particular, the East Leeds Orbital

Route. Officers were urged to take a look at what can be done in terms of planting additional trees in those areas.

Members comments in relation to the officers questions in the submitted report were relayed as follows:

Question 1: Do Members have any comments in respect of the layout and the appearance of the dwellings including the concept of new different character areas? Members were generally content with the approach and the 2 character areas, as well as the quality of housing. A comment sought assurances that the affordable units will not be 'clumped' together.

Question 2: Are there any comments Members would wish to make in respect of the housing mix? Further consideration to be had in terms of the balance of the units proposed and the need for a greater proportion of larger units.

Question 3: Are there any comments Members would wish to make in respect of the affordable housing provision proposed? To provide further information to demonstrate that the affordable units are pepper potted throughout the site and that more larger family units be provided as part of the mix.

Question 4: Are Members in agreement that all units should meet the minimum internal space standards? The applicant has now committed to resolve this issue.

Question 5: Do Members have any comments in respect of the landscaping proposals? Members wished to see further information regarding this.

Question 6: Are there any other matters, that relate to the scope of consideration of these applications, that Members wish to raise? Whilst it was acknowledged additional planting to the East Leeds Orbital Extension is outside of the scope of these particular planning applications, officers will seek to liaise with colleagues and bring back information at a later date. Also, a member commented on concerns regarding speeding on the East Leeds Orbital Route and suggested that a fixed camera be looked at.

In general, members supported the scheme.

RESOLVED – To note the contents of the report on the proposals and to provide views in relation to the questions posed in the submitted report to aid the progression of the application.

- 16 22/07259/FU – Alteration and extension of existing dwelling including two storey extension to front, single storey extension to side and raising of roof height to create new pitched roof with dormer to front; two storey extension to side to create new living accommodation, parking garage and roof terrace; erection of new timber boundary fence; new landscaping and parking areas including erection of parking impact barrier and creation of vehicle passing area at The Bungalow, Wharfedale Street, Meanwood, Leeds, LS7 2LF**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application regarding alteration and extension of existing dwelling including two storey extension to front, single storey extension to side and raising of roof height to create new pitched roof with dormer to front; two storey extension to side to create new living accommodation, parking garage and roof terrace; erection of new timber boundary fence; new landscaping and parking areas including erection of parking impact barrier and creation of vehicle passing area at The Bungalow, Wharfedale Street, Meanwood, Leeds, LS7 2LF.

Members of the Panel had attended a site visit earlier in the day. Slides and photographs were shown throughout the presentation.

Members were provided with the following information:

- The application has been brought to the Panel at the request of Councillor J Dowson, with expressed support from Councillor A Garthwaite due to Councillor Dowson expressing her concerns over the impact on the ward, wild green areas, and Woodhouse Ridge. Concerns also related to alleged actions of the applicant in relation to land outside of his ownership falling within designated public greenspace.
- The site is adjacent to Wharfedale Street and accessed via Ridge Road to the east. It was noted that the road is quite narrow and privately owned in part.
- The surroundings include industrial, commercial, and residential units. To the west and north of the site lies terraced properties. To the east of the site there are properties also served by the access road.
- The applicant seeks the proposals to serve his longstanding hobby of collecting and restoring vintage cars. The living accommodation will be in the form of the main dwelling and an ancillary annex with shared spaces within the building. The new parking garage and workshop area will be used by both the applicant and his son in pursuant of their hobby. It was confirmed that the applicant only intends to have a maximum of 12 cars on-site at any one time.
- The proposed roof terrace will be situated to the south of a site most recently in use as a children's nursery to the north, but the separation distance retained to that site of 6.5m is considered to be appropriate given the nature of the neighbouring land use.
- The trees and hedges in the application site are retained as part of the proposals.
- The proposals will allow for the formal and informal parking of 16 parked cars on the application site, which will allow for vehicles to manoeuvre within the site.
- Representations have been received from former Councillor Walshaw on behalf of all Headingley and Hyde Park ward members and Woodhouse Ridge Action Group, as well as 4 members of the public. There have been 2 representations submitted not referred to in the officer report – one a letter of support and a second which is neutral on the development but expressing support for the concerns raised from previous objectors.

- It is un-clear whether the passing place falls within the ownership of the applicant or the Council's Climate, Energy and Green Spaces service. This raises a number of issues in terms of identifying the ownership of the land, the likely need to serve a notice through the planning process which would delay the application for an additional 21 days, and whether the passing place could be delivered. There are currently no fundamental concerns at present, but further negotiations and discussions need to be undertaken.

In summarising the planning officer explained:

- That matters in relation to the alleged actions by the appellant outside of the site boundary were being pursued by the relevant Council service under relevant enforcement powers and were not a matter to which weight could be attached in considering the planning application.
- In addition to the above, that Plans Panel does not serve as a public forum for discussing or resolving such matters.
- The site has an arguably unkempt, un-tidy appearance.
- The applicant's hobby is long standing and the proposal will improve the living accommodation and outdoor space for the applicant to carry out his hobby.
- The proposal will assist in addressing existing noise and disturbance issues through moving activities relating to the hobby indoors
- The site will benefit from additional landscaping and improvements in biodiversity, which will also bring benefits in terms of the wider functions of the site and surrounding land.
- The site can comfortably accommodate the and it is considered that there will be no design issues, with the development site being well screened from neighbouring properties.
- The proposed planning conditions would allow for the appropriate management of issues at the site.
- The applicant has also agreed to install a parking barrier, further to concerns received from the neighbour to the north of the application site.
- Whilst it was acknowledged that the passing place will allow for vehicles to manoeuvre which would be of benefit, it is not essential within the context of the overall planning balance.
- That in light of the issues arising in respect of wider ownership matters that officers were advising that the recommendation should be amended so that the application should be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to approve the application, including to seek to secure the vehicle passing place in the first instance. However, if the vehicle passing place cannot be secured that officers would go on to approve the application under delegated powers in the absence of the passing place subject to the other conditions listed in the report.

Mr Lees attended the meeting as an objector to the application and provided the Panel with the following concerns:

- Mr Lees has been part of a local group for 15 years to revitalise Woodhouse Ridge and has undertaken task days and been involved with volunteers on the site.
- Mr Lees referred to the applicant and a number of allegations regarding activities on the site that have been referred to the Council's enforcement team and the Council's Climate, Energy and Green Spaces. The applicant hasn't received much luck in terms of receiving a response from the teams, and is unsure on the position of such allegations.
- Mr Lees was of the opinion that public amenity has not been protected.
- Further comments and allegations referred to the applicant depositing Japanese Knotweed outside of the application site from his site.

Further to concerns raised by the objector, the Panel sympathised with his concerns and explained that the allegations referred to is not a matter for the planning committee, due to the activities taking place beyond the red line boundary of the application site. The objector was encouraged to attend other forms of forums to air his views, such as an upcoming Inner North West Community Committee.

Further to questions to officers, the following was confirmed:

- Relevant officers have been made aware of the allegation regarding Japanese Knotweed. It was noted that the allegation falls outside the scope of any planning considerations. It was confirmed that the Council's Climate, Energy and Green Spaces service are not aware of any evidence relating to substantiate this allegation but that this would be a matter for that service outside of the Panel meeting.
- Officers will take back comments regarding untidiness of the site to the Planning Enforcement team on the basis that amenity is being harmed.
- Further to a suggestion that the standard time limit is decreased to 1 year, officers advised that such an approach would go against the grain of national government advice in relation to such matters and could result in difficulties in delivering the development due to the likely need to undertake preparatory works. However, officers confirmed that the applicant has shown a willingness to proceed with the proposals in a timely manner and hoped that this offered confidence that the development would be implemented in the near future.

Panel Members made the following comments:

- Whether the proposed conditions are enforceable enough long-term in terms of activities on the site and the number of cars allowed on the site at any one time.
- Concern that members wouldn't see any additional landscaping proposals made through the defer and delegate to officers process.
- Concern regarding the number of items needing to be removed from the site and its untidiness.
- Whether outside working hours can be conditioned as part of the application.

A motion was put forward to move an amendment to the officer recommendation, to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer in order to seek to secure the vehicle passing place in the first instance, but, if this proved not to be possible, to go on to approve the application subject to the other conditions listed in the officer report. This motion was moved and seconded, and therefore it was unanimously:

RESOLVED – To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions as outlined in the report, with the exception of the vehicle passing place if this could not be secured as a result of land ownership or related issues.

17 Date and Time of Next Meeting

The date and time of the next meeting is scheduled to take place on Thursday, 27th July 2023 at 1.30 p.m.

The meeting concluded at 15.10.