

NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 21ST NOVEMBER, 2024

PRESENT: Councillor J Akhtar in the Chair

Councillors D Jenkins, N Lloyd,
R. Stephenson, H Bithell, E Bromley,
A Rae and S Seary

SITE VISIT

Cllrs Akhtar, Bithell and Lloyd attended the site visit earlier in the day.

10 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

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

11 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no exempt items.

12 Late Items

There were no formal late items. However, supplementary information had been circulated prior to the meeting in relation to:
Agenda Item 8 - PREAPP/23/00291 – Formation of new railway station, car parking, pedestrian access and associated works at land south of Manston Lane, Thorpe Park, LS15; and
Agenda Item 10 - 24/04058/FU – Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of previous approval 23/01597/FU (One new detached dwelling with detached garage to front and garden shed to side/rear; landscaping and pond to rear) to allow for creation of basement and rooms in roof space (including two additional bedrooms) with external alterations including rooflights and new lower ground floor doors to rear and lightwell to side; alterations to rear terrace, steps and external landscaping; relocation of shed to other side/rear at Old Parsonage, Main Street, East Keswick, Leeds, LS17 9EU.

13 Declaration of Interests

Cllr Stephenson declared an interest as one of the Ward Councillors of Harewood in relation to Agenda Item 10. He said that he had seen correspondence from his constituents and had provided advice in relation to the planning process but had not had any further involvement. As such, he was considering the matter with an open mind.

David Newbury the Area Planning Manager in relation to Agenda Item 9 made Members aware that one of the planning agents was a long-standing friend.

As such, he would vacate the meeting and Ryan Platten would take over for that item.

14 Apologies for Absence

No apologies were received.

15 Minutes - 26th September 2024

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 26th September 2024, be approved as a correct record.

16 23/00848/RM - Reserved Matters Application for matters relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the residential dwelling including the provision of 528 dwellings pursuant to outline application 20/04464/OT; on land south of York Road, Morwick Green (Middle Quadrant), East Leeds Extension, Leeds, LS15.

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a Reserved Matters Application for matters relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the residential dwelling including the provision of 528 dwellings pursuant to outline application 20/04464/OT; on land south of York Road, Morwick Green (Middle Quadrant), East Leeds Extension, Leeds, LS15.

The Panel were recommended to defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval of Reserved Matters, subject to the removal of the objection from Yorkshire Water and the conditions set out in the submitted report (including any amendment to the same or addition of others which the Chief Planning Officer considers appropriate).

Slides and photographs of the site and the proposals were presented by the Planning Officer who outlined the application as detailed in the submitted report. This application sought to address the matters remaining on the northern phase, identified as 'Reserved Matters' and which were therefore not considered under the outline application, though the point of access from ELOR and the provision of the spine road were fixed. Therefore, the matters reserved for determination and for consideration were:

- Access (save for those approved through the outline consent)
- Appearance
- Landscaping
- Layout; and
- Scale.

In relation to an objection from Yorkshire Water, consultation had taken place, but no response had been received at that time.

Mr Johnson the applicant's agent was present to answer questions.

Responses to questions from the Panel included:

- It was noted that the Section 106 Agreement had been agreed as part of the outline planning consent and controls planning obligations related to contributions towards infrastructure.
- The calculation for public green space provided through the development did not include the private amenity space for dwellings. The reference to 'Parks and Gardens' is in respect to a public greenspace typology.
- Officers would pursue opportunities with the applicant to re-locate some M4(3) wheelchair accessible dwellings closer to play facilities and greenspaces.
- The spine road is to link from the York Road (A64) ELOR junction through to Leeds Road. The spine road has been designed to accommodate bus penetration through the site. 2 Car Club spaces had been secured through the outline planning consent, with a facility provided on the spine road in this Phase of development. The suggested condition seeks to secure an additional temporary car club space within the sales area car park.

Comments from the Panel Members included:

- Trees should be small species appropriate to a residential environment.
- Real time information should be provided at both bus stops with shelters and those which are only poles.

In summing up the Area Planning Manager provided the following points:

- The only objection was from Yorkshire Water in relation to sewer easement and officers are awaiting a response to the current re-consultation. Officers would look at opportunities for the relocation of M4(3) wheelchair accessible dwellings closer to play facilities and greenspaces.

Upon voting, a motion was put forward to move the officer recommendations, as per the submitted report. This was moved and seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED – To defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval of the Reserved Matters, subject to the removal of the objection from Yorkshire Water and the conditions set out in the submitted report.

The Area Planning Manager informed the Panel that the applications received in relation to the East Leeds Extension (ELE) were proving to have an element of consistency where they are policy compliant, and officers are working with the same developers and agents who are aware of the relevant issues. It was additionally noted that the applications had also been subject to wider discussion through the ELE Consultative Forum. Therefore, it was suggested that rather than bring a position statement on every ELE application, as had been the practice until now, to only bring a position statement on those applications where particular issues arise which would benefit from a steer from Plans Panel Members. All applications would still be

brought to Panel for final determination. This approach going forward was agreed to by the Panel.

17 PREAPP/23/00291 – Formation of new railway station, car parking, pedestrian access and associated works at land south of Manston Lane, Thorpe Park, LS15

The report of the Chief Planning Officer informed Members of a pre-application presentation for the formation of new railway station, car parking, pedestrian access, and associated works at land south of Manston Lane, Thorpe Park, LS15.

Slides and photographs were shown throughout the presentation.

The work-in-progress proposals were presented by the applicant's agent to inform the Plans Panel of the emerging development, allowing Members to make comments on the evolving scheme, and highlight any issues prior to the intended submission of a full planning application.

Members were informed of the following points:

- This would be a new two-platform railway station at land south of Manston Lane, Thorpe Park. Each platform would be 150m in length, allowing for future 6-car trains.
- It would be fully accessible for all.
- 400 plus car parking spaces, with disabled parking and EV charging points.
- The station would be unstaffed, there would be waiting shelters, ticket machines and CCTV.
- Discussions were on going with train operators as to the frequency of services and routes.
- At this stage, no details of the design of the station had been provided however, Network Rail had indicated that the design would be similar to those recently constructed at Low Moor (Bradford) and Kirkstall Forge.

Members questions and comments included:

- It was noted that there would not be reductions to services at other stations, but this would depend on further studies to be undertaken.
- The design was standard across the country but options to change the design could be considered, especially in consideration to listed buildings and historic references to the area.
- There was limited parking and there were further investigations taking place to look to 'future proof' the car park to allow for a decked solution in the future.
- Members commented that a parking management plan may be needed to prevent parking at The Springs for the station
- Members requested that consideration be given to the colour of the footbridge and that glass was not used in the design as this could be

subject to vandalism. There was a suggestion of a mural like the one at Crossgates Station.

- The station needed to be well lit, but appropriate to not cause light pollution and paths should have escape routes.
- Play equipment to be provided for families travelling with children to keep them away from the platform edge.
- Options to be considered to reduce noise levels whilst ballast cleaning is taking place.
- The need for better park and ride facilities for the East of the City.
- Tracks on stairways to assist cyclists.
- Consultation with community groups to ensure the station would be inclusive, safe and accessible for all.

Members had been requested to answer 3 questions within the submitted report. However, the Area Planning Manager recapped on the matters raised by Members in relation to design, incorporating local history, lighting and safety, interactive areas for children, parking facilities and minimum disturbance whilst ballast cleaning. It was the view that all the comments made by the Panel had answered the questions.

RESOLVED – That the submitted report and discussions be noted.

18 PREAPP/24/00357 – Proposed mixed-use development at former Arcadia site, Burton Business Park, Torre Road, Burmantofts, Leeds LS9 7DN

The Area Planning Manager vacated the seat at the table for item 9. The Area Planning Manager (North East) Ryan Platten took up the seat vacated.

The report of the Chief Planning Officer set out a pre-application for a mixed-use development at the former Arcadia site, Burton Business Park, Torre Road, Burmantofts, Leeds, LS9 7DN.

The applicant's agent presented the proposed application with slides and photographs shown throughout.

The agent highlighted the following points:

- The identified site relates to the former Burton's site and is allocated in the SAP for mixed use of employment and residential development.
- Members were asked to consider the options for access along Trent Road and wider connectivity to the site.
- It was noted that the proposal involves retention of the main factory building façade to highlight the heritage of the site.
- Woodland within the site would be enhanced, and the developers were keen to put green space at the heart of the development layout.

Members questions and comments included:

- It was the view that this site should be appropriate for future plans for the mass transit scheme. The routes to and through the site should link into existing routes.

- The site will be dealt with as separate proposals due to the complexity and size of the site. The proposal before Members was for a mixed-use development relating to the central Burton's building, while separate buildings that are currently occupied by tenants and designated heritage assets will be considered as part of separate proposal(s).
- It was noted that there are opportunities to be considered for older people's properties and for social renting model. It was the proposal that the development would be multi-generational.
- The applicant had worked on the Majestic Building in the city centre and was confident that the façade of the Burton's factory could be saved and incorporated into the design utilising a similar methodology / approach to the Majestic Building
- Trent Road is an existing industrial road with a narrow footpath. It was the proposal to bring this up to a policy compliant standard, with wider footpaths and cycle routes, with better surveillance for those using the footpaths and linking to the green space.
- The trees and hedges along Trent Road would be maintained as they had been when the site was previously operational.
- It was recognised that the number of houses proposed would impact on the schools in the area. The Panel were advised that 2 new schools had recently been constructed in the area (within the SAP allocation) and this has been taken into account in the future development of the application site.

The Panel responded to questions posed in the submitted report as follows:

1. Members were of the view that the original percentage of proposed residential and employment be maintained across the wider site as defined in the report.
2. Members liked the proposals for the site.
3. There was support for the retention of the façade and the green space proposed. It was an opportunity to create something different with a unique identity.
4. There were no comments in relation to transport and connectivity.
5. It was the view that the cycle and footpath provision along Trent Road could be physically separate from the highway (to the other side of the trees adjacent to the existing highway) but that the footpath and cycle route should be clearly defined to avoid conflicts. It was noted that the removal of the understorey of tree canopies to facilitate greater visibility between the highway and the footway/cycle route was not a concern.
6. There were no further matters that Members wished to raise.

RESOLVED – That the submitted report and discussions be noted.

Cllr Lloyd had left the meeting at 2:55 during this item.

The Area Planning Manager resumed his seat at the table at the conclusion of this item.

19 24/04058/FU – Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of previous approval 23/01597/FU (One new detached dwelling with detached garage to front and garden shed to side/rear; landscaping and pond to rear) to allow for creation of basement and rooms in roof space (including two additional bedrooms) with external alterations including rooflights and new lower ground floor doors to rear and lightwell to side; alterations to rear terrace, steps and external landscaping; relocation of shed to other side/rear at Old Parsonage, Main Street, East Keswick, Leeds, LS17 9EU.

The report of the Chief Planning Officer set out an application for a variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of previous approval 23/01597/FU for one new detached dwelling with detached garage to front and garden shed to side/rear; landscaping and pond to rear to allow for creation of basement and rooms in roof space (including two additional bedrooms) with external alterations, including rooflights and new lower ground floor doors to rear and lightwell to side; alterations to rear terrace, steps and external landscaping; relocation of shed to other side/rear at Old Parsonage, Main Street, East Keswick, Leeds, LS17 9EU.

The report recommended to Panel that the variation be granted planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report (with amendments or addition to the same as deemed appropriate).

Slides and photographs of the site and proposals were presented by the Planning Officer who outlined the application as detailed in the submitted report. It was noted that the report had been listed as being in the Wetherby Ward however, the application site was listed in the Harewood Ward. It was also noted that the report was dated wrongly, and that the 'target determination' date shown did not reflect the fact that an extension of time had been agreed with the applicant to accommodate the date of the Panel meeting. Finally, it was confirmed that publication of the application had been by way of Site Notice.

The application was presented to the Panel at the request of Cllr Firth and his reasons were set out in the submitted report at Paragraphs 1 and 2.

Objectors to the application attended the meeting and addressed the Panel. Following this the objectors provided responses to the questions raised by Members, which in summary, related to the following:

- The proposed position of the gate would limit access to the site. Lumby Lane was already a busy road with roads merging onto it and it was already difficult to negotiate. The applicant has said that they would maintain the visibility splays however, the residents were unsure how these would be maintained.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Panel. Following this, Mr Flatman provided responses to the questions raised by Panel Members, which in summary, related to:

- Clarification on the disputed piece of land which had been submitted under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- The depth of the excavations required for the basement room and the method of disposal for soil.
- Removal of the hedgerows and planting of trees.

Questions and comments from the Panel then followed, with officers responding to the questions raised, which included the following:

- The matter of the removal of soil during excavations for the new basement area meant it was sensible that additional measures were put in place to control these works, and these could be incorporated into the proposed condition for a Construction Management Plan.
- The development generated a car parking demand of 3 cars with the garage and driveway areas proposed were capable of accommodating 5 cars. As such the proposal was highways compliant for the size of the proposed dwelling.
- The proposed boundary treatment had been amended from the previous proposal to be sited alongside the area of land to which ownership was disputed.
- The Legal Officer provided advice in relation to the certificate of land ownership submitted with the application, as well as clarifying that the existing dispute regarding land ownership for a small parcel of land remains a private law matter to be resolved between the relevant parties.
- The final finished levels would be addressed via a condition which could also control the siting of the proposed gate to the front of the site (which would allow vehicles to enter the site without waiting on the highway).
- There were still some concerns in relation to the disputed piece of land, which would make for a difficult decision.

The Area Planning Manager in summing up noted that the land ownership dispute related to a matter of process rather than speaking to the planning merits of the scheme. It was recognised there was a dispute over land and by the serving of a notice, which was to alert others of the applicant's intentions, the applicant had complied with the correct process. However, there were no grounds to refuse the proposal on the basis of the land ownership issues raised or as a result of the way the redline was drawn. It was acknowledged that this was a difficult position for the parties involved, but it was difficult to refuse the planning application on that basis.

Upon voting, a motion was put forward to move the officer recommendations, as per the submitted report. This was moved and seconded, and it was:

RESOLVED – That planning permission be granted as per the officer recommendation set out in the submitted report, with an amendment to Condition 13 for a Construction Management Plan to also address the need to control soil removal and related excavation works, and to note that Condition 4 would seek to control matters related to the positioning of an entrance gate, boundary treatments and site levels.

Councillors Ryan Stephenson and Simon Seary wished it to be noted that they had abstained during the vote.

20 Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED – To note there would be no meeting of the North and East Plans Panel in December 2024. The next meeting is scheduled for 30th January 2025.

The Chair wished the Panel a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

The meeting concluded at 16:30.