

Plans Panel (East)

Thursday, 8th April, 2010

PRESENT: Councillor G Latty in the Chair

Councillors D Congreve, R Finnigan,
P Gruen, M Lyons, J Marjoram, K Parker,
A Taylor, P Wadsworth and D Wilson

209 Chair's opening remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting

210 Late Items

There were no formal late items, however Panel Members were in receipt of the following additional information to be considered at the meeting:

Application 09/05162/OT – South Point House, South Accommodation Road LS10 – written information and letters of support submitted by the applicant's agent

Application 10/00773/FU – White Rose Centre – a letter from Councillor Leadley sent to Panel Members

211 Declarations of Interest

The following Members declared personal/prejudicial interests for the purposes of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct:

Application 10/00773/FU – White Rose Shopping Centre – Councillor Finnigan declared a personal interest as a member of Morley Town Council which had objected to the application (minute 220 refers)

Applications 09/05411/FU and 10/00378/CA – Buslingthorpe Tannery Education Road LS7, - Councillors Congreve, Lyons and Wadsworth declared personal interests through being members of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as Metro had commented on the proposals (minute 222 refers)

212 Minutes

RESOLVED - That the minutes of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 11th March 2010 be approved

213 Matters arising from the minutes

With reference to minute 198 – Applications 09/05215/FU and 09/05216/CA – 2 North Lane Oulton LS26 and minute 200 – Applications 09/005500/FU and 09/00501/CA – rear of 134-140 High Street Boston Spa LS23, the Head of Planning Services stated that appeals had been lodged against the Panel's decisions to refuse these applications

With reference to minute 164 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 11th February 2010 where Panel received a report on a recent appeal decision in respect of 16a Church Lane Bardsey (Application 09/01678/OT), Members were informed that the costs of the one day hearing which had been awarded against the Council had been resolved; these being £11,825, which was 21% less than had been originally submitted

With reference to the Plans Panel East meeting held on 11th March 2010, minute 196 – Application 09/04871/FU – 36 West Park Avenue LS8 and minute 199 - Application 09/03138/FU – 10 Elmete Avenue LS15, Councillor Gruen raised concerns that in both of these cases the applicants had lodged appeals against non-determination. Officers were asked that in cases where the Panel was minded to refuse an application against Officers' advice, then timescales should be made clear to Members, particularly if the target date was likely to be exceeded by the time a report setting out detailed reasons for refusal was submitted to the following meeting, in order that the Panel did not miss out on taking the decision

The Chair agreed with the comments made

214 Request to withdraw an item from the agenda

The Panel's Lead Officer requested that the report relating to application 09/05463/FU – 1 New Farmers Hill Woodlesford LS26 – be withdrawn from the agenda as it had come to light that not all parties had been notified that the matter was to be considered at this meeting. Members were informed that the report would be brought back to the next Panel meeting

Members requested details of the timescale for the application and discussed the possibility of dealing with the application under delegated powers to avoid further delay

Officers stated that the application was already beyond the target date and that the applicants could lodge an appeal against non-determination if they wished. Whilst noting the suggestion that the matter be delegated to Officers, the fact that there had been a request from two Ward Members for the Panel to determine the application and that objections had been made, Members were informed that it was important, for fairness, that the report be dealt with by Panel

RESOLVED - That the report be withdrawn from the agenda and resubmitted to the meeting to be held on 13th May 2010

215 Application 09/05603/FU - Change of use involving alterations of Chapel, to form 4 one bedroom and 4 two bedroom flats with eight car parking spaces at 'The Chapel' Calverley Road, Oulton, Leeds 26

Plans and drawings were displayed at the meeting

The Panel's Lead Officer presented the report which sought permission for alterations to a chapel to form 8 flats with 8 parking spaces at Calverley Road Oulton which was situated in the Oulton Conservation Area

Members were informed that a previous application for a larger scheme which had been refused by Panel had been allowed on appeal. The applicants were now seeking a revised, smaller scheme which would also see the removal of the modern single storey extension and hipped roof extension which would be replaced by a walled garden which would also include a bin store and cycle parking

To allow additional light into the ground floor rooms it was proposed to lower the windows on the chapel and a condition relating to materials for this work was proposed

The Panel's Lead Officer stated that the principle of development had been established at appeal; that there were no major changes in circumstances and that the vehicular access was considered to be acceptable. If minded to approve the application, two further conditions were requested

Members were informed of a further representation from the Oulton Society
Members discussed the following matters:

- the car parking spaces; that these were to be unallocated and because of this, the possibility of these being used by the public
- that the reduced scheme was more appropriate but that concerns remained in respect of the parking arrangements
- that two business premises were located adjacent to the site which would add to the parking difficulties

Officers provided the following responses:

- that the intention of providing unallocated car parking was because not all the residents of the flats would have cars, therefore the limited parking spaces could be shared between the residents. This approach was in line with Government guidance and had been incorporated into the Council's Street Design Guide
- that an additional condition could be included which would require the applicants to put forward a car parking management plan for approval

RESOLVED - That the application be granted subject to the conditions in the submitted report plus the following additional conditions:

- development in accordance with approved plans
- parking spaces to be laid out prior to occupation of building
- submission of a car parking management plan for approval
- details of scheme for demarcation of parking spaces to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority

216 Application 09/05162/OT - Outline application to erect 14 storey block comprising 150 bed hotel with 2 floors of B1 offices and basement car parking at South Point House, South Accommodation Road, Hunslet, Leeds 10

Plans, photographs, drawings and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought permission for a 14 storey, 150 bed hotel with offices and basement car parking on a 0.4ha site at South Point House Hunslet LS10

Members were informed that the site was within an area of Air Quality Concern due to emissions from the nearby glass works. The site was also in Flood Zones 2 and 3

The application had been brought to Panel with a recommendation for refusal with suggested reasons being included in the submitted report and outlined to Members. Following the submission of an addendum to the flood risk assessment by the applicant, the Environment Agency (EA) had removed their technical objection. Members were advised that if minded to refuse the application, then reason two should be deleted and an amended reason was read out for Panel's consideration together with minor amendments to reasons one and three

Officers reported the receipt of two further letters of representation, these being letters of support from the Royal Armouries and Alea Casino, based at Clarence Dock

The Panel heard representations from the applicant's agent who attended the meeting

Members discussed the following matters:

- that despite the Environment Agency's removal of their technical objection, there were flood risk issues associated with the scheme and a representative should have been in attendance
- that the proposals could lead to the creation of jobs and the weight this was given by Officers when considering the application
- the statement by the applicant's agent that a smaller scheme comprising an eight storey building might be acceptable

Officers provided the following responses:

- that job creation was recognised as being important, however on this site a hotel could potentially compromise other existing hotels in the area and those nearby sites which had consents for hotel use. On this matter, Officers were of the view that the applicant had not put forward a good enough case
- regarding a smaller scheme on the site, that this had not previously been mentioned and even at eight storeys the building would be considered to be too high for the surrounding area as the seven storey building occupying the site was regarded as being an anomaly

RESOLVED- That the application be refused for the following reasons:

- 1 The proposal is to locate a main town centre use in an unsustainable out of centre location. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that there are not sequentially preferable sites available and has not carried out an impact assessment as to the effects of the development on the vitality and viability of existing centres. Furthermore the site is considered to be in a relatively inaccessible location with limited public transport links in the evenings. As such it is considered that this is an unsustainable form of development that is contrary to the guidance set out in PPS1, policies EC15 and EC16 of PPS4 and policy E2 of the Regional Spatial Strategy together with policies GP5 and T2 of the UDP Review 2006
- 2 The application site lies within Flood Zone 3a defined by Planning Policy Statement 25 as having a high probability of flooding. PPS25 requires new development to apply a 'sequential test' to demonstrate that there are no other reasonably available sites which could be considered as being suitable and appropriate for the development that is proposed, where that development could then be located. The applicant has failed to apply the sequential test and the proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to guidance within PPS25 and policy N38A of the Leeds UDP Review 2006 and would result in unnecessary risk to life
- 3 The proposed development gives rise to significant potential for noise disturbance to future occupants of the building which would require

significant noise attenuation measures to overcome. Furthermore, the application has not taken account of the effect of actual emissions from surrounding uses which affect the air quality of the site. In the absence of the applicant demonstrating that United Kingdom National Air Quality Strategy (UKNAQS) objectives will not be exceeded it is considered that it has not been demonstrated that the site is suitable for the proposed use and the application is contrary to guidance within PPS23 – Planning and Pollution Control, Planning Policy Guidance Note 24 – Planning and Noise and policy GP5 of the UDP Review 2006

- 4 The proposed 14 storey building is considered to be an unacceptable scale of development, which would be out of scale with the surrounding area and would contribute to the pepperpotting of tall buildings within the city. The proposal is considered to be contrary to guidance within the Tall Buildings Design Guide as the site is outside of the identified zones of opportunity for tall buildings and is also contrary to policies N12 and BD2 of the UDP Review 2006
- 5 It is considered that the proposal for a tall building in this location would detract from the setting of both Hunslet Mills and Victoria Mills which are Grade II* and Grade II listed buildings respectively, by virtue of the development's dominance within the skyline which would compete with and detract from views of the listed buildings. As such, the proposal is contrary to guidance within PPS5 and policies GP5 and BD2 of the UDP Review 2006
- 6 The proposed development could have a detrimental effect on the adjacent viaduct as a wall is proposed and parking bays within the required easement distances from the structure. Yorkshire Water records also indicate that a water main crosses the site and the proposed location of the hotel building is sited directly over the public water main. As such, the proposed layout is considered to be unacceptable and could be detrimental to highway safety and the ability of Yorkshire Water to maintain the public water network. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policies GP5 and T2 of the UDP Review 2006

217 Application 09/05167/FU - Alterations involving re-grading of site to provide improved playing pitches, installation of multi-use games area, extended existing hard playground area and landscaping at Brodetsky Primary School, Wentworth Avenue, Alwoodley, Leeds 17

Plans and drawings were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

The North West Area Planning Manager, Mr Dunlevey, presented the report which sought permission for improvements to playing pitches; installation of multi-use games area; extension to existing playground area and landscaping at Brodetsky Primary School, Wentworth Avenue LS17. The report had been brought to Panel due to the high level of local concern the proposals had generated

Members were informed that the proposals would result in the removal of approximately one-third of the existing trees on the site although compensatory landscape planting would be provided to the boundaries; the proposed 5m high metal fence had been deleted from the proposals

There would be some community use of the playing fields and local concerns had been raised about the impact of increased car parking resulting from this. Similarly, local concerns relating to flooding had been received. Members were informed that an existing drain was blocked; that the proposals would resolve this problem; that the land would be drained; the blockage removed and that a maintenance plan would be required as part of any approval. It was confirmed that a pumping station would not be required to drain the land

Members were informed that Sport England supported the scheme and highways had raised no objections to the proposals

Officers reported the receipt of a letter from Councillor Harrand regarding car parking and three further letters of representation from local residents

Members commented on the following matters;

- the loss of trees on the site
- car parking at the school on weekends and whether problems were currently occurring
- flooding issues; whether conditions could adequately control this and that if approved, that the scheme should not add to any drainage problems
- the wording of conditions 10 and 11 in relation to drainage and concerns that these did not address the issue of how future blockages would be dealt with
- condition 14, relating to no external lighting of the pitches, that it should be made clear to the applicants that an application at a later date for floodlights or similar lighting might not be looked at favourably in the interests of residential amenity
- that the proposals were welcomed as was the work undertaken by the land drainage section

Officers provided the following responses:

- regarding the removal of trees, that a full landscaping scheme would be required to be submitted and approved
- relating to car parking at week-ends, that this could increase and that the impact of 60 cars had been considered. A car parking management plan was to be submitted and whilst the school was looking to use only one car park, it could be required to open both car parks if necessary
- that the applicant would need to supply a maintenance regime, with this being conditioned
- that any lighting of the pitches would require planning permission and that a direction could be placed on the application, in view of the concerns raised about this

RESOLVED - To approve the application subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, subject to deleting the reference to the length of drain to be cleaned in condition 11 and to add a direction that any application for the lighting of the pitches would not be looked at favourably

The Chair informed the meeting that this was Mr Dunlevey's last appearance at Panel as he was to retire on 7th May. The Chair stated that whilst Mr Dunlevey had only attended Plans Panel East for a short time he had done sterling work and had been a popular Officer. The Panel wished Mr Dunlevey well in his retirement

218 Application 09/01694/FU - Amendment to previously approved application (07/05636/FU) for alterations including new roof to existing two storey side extension, canopy and porch to front, enlarged single storey rear extension, enlarged bay window to rear and attached garage to side at 'Amaracre' Wetherby Road, Leeds 17

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had been undertaken earlier in the day which some Members had attended

The Head of Planning Services presented the report which sought approval for amendments to a previously approved application for alterations to a residential property known as 'Amaracre', which was situated on Wetherby Road, in the green belt and was the last house on the urban edge of the north side of the city

Members were informed that the previous application which was approved in 2007 was for a large side and rear extension. However, what was approved was not what was subsequently built and as well as enlarged extensions, the former brick built property had now also been stone-cladded. Members were informed that the case was currently with the Compliance Section within City Development

The revised proposals sought to retain the existing roof and the porch but to remove the dormers and reduce the height of the rear extension, retain another rear extension and reinstate the timber detailing to the front gable

The Head of Planning Services stated that he had spoken to the applicant about the situation and informed Members that to carry out these amendments would cost a significant sum of money. Whilst the extensions would increase the volume of the original property by over 50%, these had been built and in this case it was a matter of judgement as to the impact of these on the openness of the green belt. Further planting was proposed to the northern boundary as requested by Thorne Parish Council. Members were informed that Councillor Castle supported the request for additional landscaping

Members commented on the following matters:

- whether an approval could be justified
- that no objections to the proposals had been listed in the report and that a compromise solution, with a time limit being imposed for the work, should be accepted
- whether a refusal could be successfully argued at appeal and concerns that the planning process was being flagrantly disregarded
- the view that by agreeing to some compromises, the Council was weakening its position at any possible appeal
- how, if the revised proposals were agreed, it could be ensured that these were carried out correctly
- that in this case it was perhaps possible to accept the situation as it was an individual house, however it could not be accepted that if by allowing the application which was far from what was originally agreed, it would set a precedent which could be used to give some comfort in an on-going enforcement case in the Crossgates and Whinmoor Ward

Officers provided the following responses

- that the application had to be assessed on its impact in the area and to consider whether planning permission would have been granted in this form from the start, with Members being informed that it possibly would not
- that the timescale attached to the Enforcement Notice for completion of the works would be nine months
- that any approval would be conditional upon the works to be carried out within 9 months
- that in this case there were particular circumstances, ie that there was a large extension on the site, but that if planning permission was approved, that comfort could not be drawn from that decision and that the message was clear that where unauthorised development was carried out, this was frowned upon; where action could be taken, it would be; that it would cost the perpetrators money and that people had to have regard to planning permissions as they were legal documents

RESOLVED - To approve the application subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report and an amendment to condition 4 to stipulate the timescale for completion of the works to be within 9 months from the date of approval

219 Application 09/04656/FU - Change of use from 2 flats to 2 town houses including external alterations, roof extensions, bay window to side with balcony over, single storey building to rear to form 3 dwellings, 2.3m high wall and 1m high glazed balustrade with altered vehicular access and parking court at 128 Wetherby Road, Leeds 17

Plans, photographs, drawings and a model of the proposals were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers presented the report which sought permission for a change of use from two flats to two town houses and the erection of three dwellings to the rear of the site, with amended vehicular access and parking court at 128 Wetherby Road Roundhay LS8, which was situated in the Roundhay Conservation Area

Members were informed that it was the view of Officers that the proposals would not have a harmful impact on the character of the area and due to the amount of screening on the site, there would not be a detrimental impact on amenity

Ten car parking spaces were proposed for the five dwellings

Officers referred to the receipt of a letter from Councillor Lobley who had withdrawn his objection to the proposals

RESOLVED - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report

220 Application 10/00773/FU - Extension to mezzanine floor and addition of new raised roof to retail units at units MSU 10 and 33 at the White Rose Shopping Centre, Dewsbury Road, Leeds 11

Plans, drawings and photographs were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought permission for a 452sqm extension to an existing mezzanine floor and the addition of a new raised roof to

retail units at MSU10 and 33 at the White Rose Shopping Centre, Dewsbury Road LS11, which were required to meet the needs of a new business in the shopping centre

Members were informed that the application raised fundamental issues in respect of retail planning policy; that the site was not an identified Town Centre and whilst such extensions were usually not accepted, there was in this case, the opportunity to regulate the possible future expansion of the White Rose Centre, so protecting the viability and vitality of the city centre and other neighbouring centres as well as restricting piecemeal expansion of the shopping centre. Additionally any future development of the White Rose Centre would be dependent upon the recommencement of the Trinity Quarter scheme in the city centre, as the applicants were partners in that scheme

Officers referred to objections raised by Morley Town Council which had raised concerns that increases in floorspace had already taken place at the centre when part of the site was remodelled. Reference was made to a letter e-mailed by Councillor Leadley directly to Panel Members ahead of the meeting. Councillor Marjoram stated that he had not seen this letter

Members were informed that the applicant had submitted advice from Leading Counsel on the creation of mezzanines of up to 200sqm retail floorspace without the need for planning permission and that it was Leading Counsel's view that this should apply to individual units in the White Rose Centre, so providing the potential for an additional 7,946sqm of additional retail floorspace without the need for planning permission. The Council's Chief Legal Officer was of the view that whilst there was no case law on this issue which would provide a definitive answer, the interpretation suggested by Leading Counsel acting on behalf of the applicant, was persuasive

The Panel was informed that the applicant proposed to submit a further application to restrict the future expansion at the centre to no more than 2,500 sqm A1 floorspace (minus the 452 sqm provided by this application) and approximately 1.850sqm of A3/A4/A5 floorspace. In terms of A1 provision this would be considerably below the floorspace which could be created without the need for planning permission and as such, Members would need to have regard to this in reaching a decision

The Panel heard representations from the applicant's agent and from Councillor Leadley who attended the meeting in his capacity as a local Ward Member

Prior to addressing the Panel, Councillor Leadley declared a personal and prejudicial interest through being the Chair of the Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Following his representations to the Panel and before the applicant's agent addressed Members, on advice from the Panel's Legal Services representative, Councillor Leadley withdrew from the meeting

Members discussed the following matters:

- the link with the recommencement of works at Trinity Quarter and what safeguards could be put in place to ensure this was not a temporary measure in order to further develop the White Rose Centre
- that more discussion was needed on the proposals with Ward Members from Morley North, Morley South and Beeston & Holbeck

RESOLVED - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate final approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, an additional condition requiring the submission of a work

programme and timetable for the recommencement of works to the Trinity Quarter (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a legal agreement within 3 months from the date of resolution unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Chief Planning Officer, for the submission of an outline application (within 6 months and subject to consultation with Ward Members from Morley North, Morley South and Beeston & Holbeck) to apply for additional floorspace at the White Rose Centre (up to 2,500 square metres of A1 floorspace and 1,800 square metres of A3/A4/A5 floorspace) which would also be accompanied by planning obligations to deal with the following matters:

- the ability to install a mezzanine floor of 200 square metres or less in each individual unit in the White Rose Centre without planning permission will be removed. This equates to potentially 7,946 square metres of mezzanine floorspace that does not currently require planning permission and this right will be removed
- the floorspace for A1 (2,500 square metres) will be reduced by the floorspace granted on Unit MSU 10(452 square metres)
- for the additional retail floorspace to relate to existing occupiers only
- for the application not to be implemented until works have recommenced on the Trinity Quarter development in the city centre

221 Application 10/00771/FU - Erection of three storey mosque (re submission of Application No. 07/05963/FU) at 4-6 Woodview Road, Beeston, Leeds 11

Further to minute 208 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 12th February 2009 where Panel approved an application for a three storey mosque at 4-6 Woodview Road LS11, Members considered a revised application

Plans, photographs, drawings and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and stated that problems in implementing the previously approved scheme had led to a revised scheme being submitted which would reorganise the internal layout of the building; would remove the on-street car parking and include an additional minaret and slightly larger dome

If minded to approve the application, Officers requested two additional conditions to be included relating to the reinstatement and formal closure of the redundant vehicular access to Woodview Road and submission of details of a sound insulation scheme. Members were informed that condition 12 as set out in the submitted report relating to submission of details of motorcycle parking should be deleted

Members were informed that the local Ward Members supported the application and Officers were of the view that that the amended application was an improvement on the previously consented scheme

RESOLVED - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate final approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report; the deletion of condition 12; the addition of a condition requiring the reinstatement and formal closure of the redundant vehicular access to Woodview Road; an extra condition requiring details of a sound insulation scheme to be submitted and approved (and any others which he might consider appropriate); the expiry of the consultation period, subject to no additional representations being received that raise new issues and the completion of a legal agreement within 3 months from the date of resolution unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Chief

Planning Officer, to include an obligation for the travel plan monitoring evaluation fee of £2,500

222 Position Statement - Applications 09/05411/FU and 10/00378/CA for redevelopment of the Buslingthorpe Tannery, Education Road, Sheepscar, Leeds 7

(Prior to consideration of this matter, Councillor Gruen left the meeting)

Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented a report setting out the current position on an application for part demolition, change of use, including five storey extension and addition of new floor to roof of former tannery to form 190 apartments and erection of multi level development up to 7 storeys in 3 blocks comprising 9 town houses and 150 apartments with retail shop, car parking and landscaping together with a related Conservation Area application at Buslingthorpe Tannery, Education Road Sheepscar LS7

Members were informed that the main tannery building would be retained for residential use, with an additional floor being added to part of the roof. Three new part 4/part 5 buildings would be erected on the site with the design of these reflecting some of the historic elements of the tannery, albeit in a modern interpretation

A landscaped boulevard through the centre of the site would provide some of the greenspace associated with the scheme. Whilst the overall amount was less than that required under policy, an off-site contribution would be sought

The proposals were for 349 flats in a mix of studio, one and two bed with nine town houses, each of the houses having a private garden. Car parking spaces would be shared amongst residents, with 237 spaces being proposed

Two feeder roads served the site and whilst initially access was to be taken from Sheepscar Road, Officers considered this was not acceptable and the applicant had been asked to remove this

The S106 obligations had yet to be resolved although the application would require contributions of approximately £850,000 plus 15% affordable housing and a financial viability assessment submitted by the applicant was currently being examined

The Panel was informed that concerns at the intensity of the development and the lack of family housing had been raised in a letter from Councillor Dowson

Members commented on the following matters:

- the level of affordable housing being sought and why this was not at a level of 25%
- concerns that the proposals were overintensive and too high
- the 'H' shape of the tannery extension and concerns this was not the most attractive design
- that insufficient family housing was being provided and concern at the high level of flats and apartments being proposed
- that the high number of flats and studio apartments could mean the development would predominantly be occupied by students and that their requirements would need to be catered for. Officers advised that the applicant had stated the development would not be for students but would be marketed towards those people who could not afford to live in the city centre

- odour issues; the fact that the site was still being used for the processing of dead skins and that the smell around the area was off-putting. Officers were unsure of the exact length of occupancy remaining for the tannery, but this was considered to be approximately 2-5 years
- the need for the site to be developed
- that the applicant would be required to provide planning contributions by way of a S106 legal agreement and concerns that the education contribution of £30,000 was insufficient
- that taking vehicular access from Sheepscar Street North was not supported
- the need to reassess the parking needs if the accommodation mix was changed

Regarding the level of affordable housing being requested on this scheme, the Head of Planning Services stated that there was not a blanket level of 25% affordable housing but a gradation of levels across the city and he agreed to check the level for inner city areas

In summing up the comments made on the position statement, the Chair stated that the view of the Panel seemed to be that the proposals as presented, were not good enough

RESOLVED – To note the report, the presentation and the comments now made

223 Date and time of next meeting

Thursday 13th May 2010 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds