

PLANNING GROUP
5th November 2008 (9:00 – 10:00)
Civic Hall

MINUTES

Present:	Cllr P Ewens (Chair)	Hyde Park and Woodhouse
	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
Officer(s) in Attendance	Jade Corcoran	Community Planner

	Action
<p>1. Apologies & Minutes (Including Matters Arising)</p> <p>1.1. Apologies from Cllr Monaghan</p> <p>1.2. Item 3.3 – KT commented that all S106 monies should be for the local community. DH added that there should be a schedule of projects funded through S106s. JC commented that S106s must be based relevant to the particular application and respond to an established need. Cllr Bentley voiced concern that councillors are not actively engaged within process of formulating S106s. The group resolved for a letter to written to Phil Crabtree regarding the community being involved with how S106s are formulated and how the monies are finally spent.</p>	JC
<p>2. Neighbourhood Design Statements update</p> <p>2.1. KT - Kirkstall Vision Group were holding several workshops with the aim of gathering information on how the community would like to see Kirkstall develop in the short, medium, and long term.</p> <p>2.2. FM - Little Woodhouse Neighbours Association would be holding a Christmas Fare on the 29th November 2008, where the draft format of their NDS would be attending.</p> <p>2.3. RT - the scoping report is being finalised. The contents of the document are currently being drafted.</p>	
<p>3. LDF / National Policy Update</p> <p>3.1. JC reported that the Affordable Housing SPD was within the final weeks of the consultation period. Cllr Ewens asked if she could submit her comments over the coming weekend. This was acceptable.</p> <p>3.2. JC briefly updated the group on the recent changes to the Permitted Development rights for householders. It was agreed that a summery document of the alterations would be circulated to</p>	JC

the group before the next Planning Group.

4. Significant Applications/Appeals

4.1. Leeds Girls High School Update

The PPG17 Assessment is not sufficiently robust with discrepancies throughout the report that lead to unfounded conclusions. In addition, Sport England is not satisfied that any of the exceptions of their Playing Field Policy have been demonstrated. The most recent assessment that has been received discusses the potential of the playing fields to serve as open space. This report does not respond to the concerns of the previous assessment, and is not particularly relevant and in depth with regards to green space.

The Local Planning Authority has raised several concerns with regards to the proposal in terms of conservation, design, and landscape. English Heritage have also objected to the scheme due to proposed layout and insensitive extension proposed to Rose Court.

Highways have requested further information, and have objected to the proposed vehicular access onto Headingley Lane. Yorkshire Water have raised objection to the development as two of the proposed units will be located over the line of sewers, which could jeopardise their ability to maintain the sewerage Network.

Jl commented that the Primary Health Care Trust should be consulted due to the health implications over the loss of the playing pitches. JC is to raise the matter with the case officer.

4.2. Tetley Hall Update

Concern has been expressed regarding both schemes (08/04049/FU & 08/04024/FU) in terms of design, materials, and the quality of the green space. The layout of the proposal is considered to feature car dominated cutilages of the proposed buildings due to the quantum of the new development. The revised drawing that have been received a addressed a number of concerns regarding the detailing. However, the scale and massing has not really altered. The amended scheme has not yet been reviewed by the design team.

The viability study has now been assessed , and it is the opinion of the Senior Development Surveyor that when the correct purchase price is used within the appraisal the development is unviable. However, she does note that at the price the applicant has valued the land scheme is viable. The conclusions drawn, are that the developer bought this site at considerable risk when they knew the requirements for affordable housing beforehand and other section 106 contributions.

The highways team have not objected to the scheme in principle.

Several recommendations have been made.

4.3. *The Wise Owl, Otley Old Road (Medical Centre)*

The site is located on the corner of Iveson Approach and Otley Old Road, and is currently occupied by a two storey brick public house with a hipped roof and slate tiles. The proposal is a health centre to replace Tinshill Lane Surgery 'that is no longer fit for purpose' [D&A Statement]. The proposal has been designed as two wings with a glazed atrium. The wing fronting Otley Old Road is proposed at two storey with a single storey pharmacy attached, and the wing set along Iveson Approach is single storey. The pharmacy is proposed to be accessed from within the health centre and externally. The design is a modern approach that includes a variety of materials – glass, render, aluminium, and brick. JC provided the group with a set of plans and conceptual drawings to look over during the meeting.

Jl stated that he had a conflict of interest. SB raised concern regarding the economic impact of the proposed pharmacy on an established pharmacy a short distance from the site.

4.4. *Glassworks Appeal*

RT reported back to the group regarding appeal. Martin Carter (LCC QC) put forward a good case with an excellent closing summary. Parklane have an extant permission as a fall back option. RT commented that if the appeal was to be dismissed this case could be marked as a president. JC commented that RT did very well when giving evidence, and remained clear, calm, and credible though a gruelling cross examination by the appellants QC.

4.5. *Cliff Lawn Hotel*

Three, four bedroom terrace, houses and new ramp to hotel. The proposal is contained within the site of the Cliff Lawn Hotel, which is an ornate gothic Victorian Brick building within the Conservation Area.

Each dwelling is to have an enclosed front and rear garden with two parking spaces. Access is to be gained from Montpelier Terrace with the Hotel access remaining the same. Permission has been given to remove several trees by SDU, and according to the design and access statement permission is not required to remove any more. The building height and volume has been substantial reduced from the previous application. The proposed terrace is to be set within a defined space, set back from the frontage of the hotel and down by approximately 1.8m due to the gradient of the site. The proposal has been designed simply to complement the hotel and is to be constructed from brick with stone dressing and slate tiles. The hotel car park is proposed to extended slightly but the informal nature will be maintained.

<p>The proposal was bought before the group at pre-application stage. FM stated that the group advised them to speak with the local community. Concern was voiced that this has not occurred.</p> <p>4.6. Headingley Stadium The stadium is undergoing repairs.</p>	
<p>5. AOB</p> <p>5.1. The Crypt's move to St Michael's – FM commented that those that neighbour the site should make their own views known, so she did not make representation on behalf of the neighbourhood association. Concern was raised by FM relating to the accuracy of the leaflets that have been circulated regarding the proposed temporary move by a number of the residents. Considering there is a police station next door some of the fear of the local residents should be allayed. The DPPO for the Little Woodhouse area will commence from January.</p> <p>5.2. FM would like deserted sites to be a future agenda item.</p> <p>5.3. DH raised interest in the transport improvements to the A660. Gwyn Owen to be invited to a future meeting.</p>	JC
<p>6. Key Message for Area Committee</p> <p>6.1. For Action – The Planning Group requests that Area Committee considers the benefits of commissioning an Area Action Plan.</p> <p>6.2. For Action – The Planning Group asks for that the process of decision making, priority ordering, and community involvement in relation to S106s is reviewed.</p>	
<p>7. Date & Time of Next Meeting</p> <p>7.1. Wednesday 10th December 2008 – 9:00 (Civic Hall)</p>	