

## **Plans Panel (East)**

**Thursday, 6th October, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Councillor D Congreve in the Chair

Councillors C Campbell, R Finnigan,  
R Grahame, J Hardy, G Latty, M Lyons,  
C Macniven, K Parker, J Procter and  
D Wilson

### **78 Chair's opening remarks**

The Chair referred to an e-mail which had been sent by a member of the public regarding a Plans Panel Member and one of the applications to be considered at the meeting. He stated that Members sat on Plans Panels as individual members of Council and not as members of their respective parties. He explained that there was no Whip in place on any Member on any Panel and that Members were aware that if they expressed a strong view on an application it could prejudice their right to speak and vote on that application if it was presented to Panel

The Chair then asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves for the benefit of the public attending the meeting

### **79 Late Items**

There were no formal late items although the Panel was in receipt of the following information to be considered at the meeting:

Application 11/03316/FU – Little Acres Linton Lane LS22 – Plans and drawings circulated by an objector (minute 89 refers)

Application 11/03413/FU – 42 Victoria Street LS7 – Photographs tabled by the applicant's agent (minute 90 refers)

Application 10/04762/OT – Land adjoining 7 Waterwood Close West Ardsley WF3 – written representations and statistical information tabled by an objector. The Chair also referred to an e-mail which had been sent to Panel Members from an objector which included photographs of the site from her property (minute 98 refers)

### **80 Update from the Panel's Lead Officer**

The Panel's Lead Officer advised Members that Application 11/00601/FU – Old Village Hall Eccup LS16 would not be considered as the applicant had withdrawn the application

In respect of applications 11/00318/FU and 11/00319/FU – land off Coal Road and Seacroft Ring Road LS14, Members were informed that the concerns raised by Councillor Gruen as a Ward Member had been addressed and that Panel might wish to defer and delegate approval of these applications to the Chief Planning Officer. Members were informed that an objection had been raised by the owner of the adjoining site which related to highways issues but that the comments made could be dealt with in the consultation process on the proposed TRO

The Panel agreed to proceed in this way on these applications

## **81 Declarations of Interest**

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

Application 10/05711/FU – 11 Old Park Road – Councillor McNiven declared personal and prejudicial interests through being a local resident and neighbour and prior to being elected to the Council, having spoken out about the development (minute 85 refers)

Application 11/02315/RM – Reserved Matters application – residential development Manston Lane – Councillor Lyons declared a personal interest as a member of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as Metro had commented on the application at outline stage (minute 87 refers)

Application 11/02315/RM – Reserved Matters application – residential development Manston Lane – Councillor Grahame declared a personal interest due to his wife, Councillor Pauleen Grahame's previous involvement in the application as a Ward Member (minute 87 refers)

Application 11/02744/FU – Middleton Arms LS10 – Councillor Lyons declared a personal interest as a member of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as Metro had been consulted on the proposals (minute 88 refers)

Application 11/01244/OT – Land on Gelderd Road and Ring Road Beeston – Councillor Lyons declared a personal interest as a member of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as Metro had commented on the application (minute 92 refers)

Applications 11/00318/FU and 11/00319/FU – Land off Coal Road and Seacroft Ring Road LS14 – Councillor Grahame declared personal interests through his wife, Councillor Pauleen Grahame's involvement in these applications as a Ward Member (minutes 95 and 96 refer)

## **82 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Gruen and Councillor Pryke who were substituted for by Councillors Hardy and Campbell respectively

The Chair asked the Panel's Legal adviser for advice regarding these Members voting on matters which had been discussed previously

Ms Allen, the Head of Development and Regulatory advised that as several items on the agenda had been debated previously by Panel, Members who had not been a party to those discussions should not take part in the decision or vote on those applications if they considered that they did not have the full information before them

## **83 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2011 be approved

**84 Application 10/02834/FU - Appeal against refusal of planning permission - Hollybank 5 Gledhow Lane Gledhow LS8**

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting

Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out a recent appeal decision following refusal of planning permission for alterations and extensions to form 6 flats at Hollybank, Gledhow Lane Roundhay LS8

The appeal which was dealt with by a hearing was dismissed as was the request for costs from the Council

In reaching a decision Members were informed that the Inspector had had regard to the Roundhay Conservation Area Appraisal and Roundhay Design Statement

**RESOLVED** - To note the report

**85 Application 10/05711/FU - 11 Old Park Road Gledhow LS8 - Position statement**

(Having declared personal and prejudicial interests, Councillor McNiven withdrew from the meeting) (Councillor Hardy also left the meeting at this point)

Further to minute 186 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2011 where Panel deferred consideration of an application for alterations to existing unlawful residential annexe to form 3 bedroom residential annexe, Members considered a further report

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and informed Panel that discussions had taken place with the applicant and agent on the issues identified by Panel, these being, the extent of the ground floor to be reduced further and the side wall of the building to be sited to allow for a substantial hedge to be planted. The Panel was informed that there had not been any alterations to the scheme to reduce its size

In respect of the hedge, a request had been made to the adjacent school to purchase a small area of the land to facilitate the planting of a substantial hedge, however the Governors had refused this request

Members were informed that earlier in the week revisions to the scheme had been submitted for preliminary discussions only and that it had been stressed that these revisions should not form the basis of any determination by Panel

Officers highlighted the Inspector's comments on the enforcement appeal which was heard at a Public Inquiry in July 2010. The Officer presenting the application stated that in the light of all the information, including the Officers' and the Inspector's comments, Members might consider that there were sufficient grounds to refuse the application and reminded Members of the recommended reasons for refusal, set out in the report to Panel in May 2011

Officers reported additional representations which had been received, these being 9 further objections and additional comments from the Roundhay Conservation Society. Members were informed that an additional representation from the applicant in the form of an e-mail to the Chief Planning Officer had been received making reference to the report as a position statement and seeking assurances that the application would not be determined. On this matter the Chief Planning Officer who attended the meeting informed Panel that he had responded to that e-mail stating he was not able to give the assurances the applicant had been seeking

Concerns were raised by Panel at the amount of Officer time which had been spent in dealing with this application

Further advice was sought on whether it was possible to determine the application which was described in the report as a position statement

The Panel's Legal adviser confirmed that all the information had been presented to Panel on which to make a decision and therefore Panel was able to take a decision on this occasion

The Chief Planning Officer explained that where a position statement was being presented which preceded an Officer's report and recommendation, it would not be appropriate to determine the application but that was not the situation before Panel

In response to a question, the Chief Planning Officer stated that he had received the e-mail from the applicant at 4.20pm on Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> October and had replied to that message at 8.15am on 6<sup>th</sup> October and had explained that Members might consider it appropriate to determine the application on the basis of information before them and that no further response had been received from the applicant

The Panel considered how to proceed

The Chair stated that the Panel and Officers had been patient and had asked for the applicant to revisit the application but that had not happened

A proposal to refuse the application on the grounds set out in the report to Panel of 19<sup>th</sup> May 2011 was made and seconded

**RESOLVED** - To refuse the application as presented to Panel on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2011 on the grounds of the size of the building, the impact of the tree to the rear of the site and the lack of information to demonstrate that a hedge could be planted along the north western boundary to screen the building and for the specific reasons set out in the report submitted to Panel on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2011

(Following consideration of this matter, Councillor McNiven rejoined the meeting as did Councillor Hardy)

#### **86 Manston Lane Cross Gates LS15 - Position statement regarding proposed and future development in the vicinity of Manston Lane and Cross Gates LS15t**

Further to minute 71 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2011 where Panel requested further information on proposed and future development around Manston Lane, the Panel considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out the context of approved, proposed and future development in that area and its relationship with the Manston Lane Link Road (MLLR). Reference was also made to a briefing meeting which had taken place between Plans Panel East Members and the Director of Development and Acting Chief Asset Management Officer on this matter

**RESOLVED** – To note the report

#### **87 Application 11/02315/RM - Reserved Matters application for 132 houses and 19 flats at Manston Lane Cross Gates LS15 (Discharge of condition 1 only of outline planning permission 08/034401/OT)**

Further to minute 71 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2011 where Panel resolved to defer determination of the Reserved Matters

application for a residential development at Manston Lane LS15, the Panel considered a further report

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

Officers presented the report and stated that in view of Members' comments at the previous meeting about the design of the properties, the applicant had revised these and was now proposing traditional style housing. These revisions had meant that further public consultation would be required and therefore Officers requested a change to the recommendation to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer

Regarding the siting of the affordable housing, Members were informed that this would be pepper-potted around the site

Members were informed that discussions with Ward Members had taken place on the revised proposals and the issues raised at the previous meeting

**RESOLVED** – To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, further discussions with Ward Members on outstanding issues and following expiry of the revised public consultation period and no significant new issues being raised

#### **88 Application 11/02744/FU - Demolition of public house and erection of single storey retail food store, car parking and landscaping - Middleton Arms Middleton Park Road LS10**

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which related to an application for the demolition of The Middleton Arms public house and its replacement with the retail food store

Members were informed that The Middleton Arms was built circa 1925 as a focal point for the estate and benefited from much architectural heritage which the application did not have regard to. There were also concerns about the impact of the proposals on residential amenity and for these reasons, the recommendation to Panel was to refuse the application

Officers reported the receipt of five additional letters of support and two further objections. An error at paragraph 10.35 regarding recommended hours of opening by Environmental Health was corrected. For clarification the proposed hours of opening were stated as 8am-8pm Monday to Saturday and 10am – 4pm on Sunday

The Panel heard representations from the applicant and a supporter of the proposals who attended the meeting. As the registered speaker against the application was not in attendance, the Chair on this occasion and for fairness, allowed a speaker from the public who were in attendance for this application

The Panel discussed the following matters:

- the impact of the proposals on the shops at Middleton Circus which were situated in close proximity to The Middleton Arms
- that Officers had indicated that a condition could be attached to an approval which restricted use of the site to a discount retailer. It was noted that there had been recent takeovers of some discount retailers by large supermarkets
- the impact of the proposals on the residential properties surrounding the site

The Panel considered how to proceed

The Chair proposed a site visit which the Panel accepted

**RESOLVED –**

- i) That determination of the application be deferred for a site visit and that the Chief Planning Officer be asked to submit a further report to the next meeting for Panel's determination of the application
- ii) That Officers provide Councillor Campbell with details of the wording of a condition restricting use of a site to a discount retailer

**89 Application 11/03316/FU - Detached house with garage (amendments to plot 4 of approved application 11/00343/RM) - Little Acres Linton Lane Linton LS22**

Plans and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought permission for an amendment to a previously approved scheme at Little Acres, Linton Lane LS22 which was situated in a Conservation Area. The amendment being sought was the addition of a double garage - in place of the approved open parking area - and an additional bedroom above

The Panel heard representations from Councillor Rachael Procter who was objecting to the application and from the applicant's agent who attended the meeting. Members considered the following matters:

- that the proposals represented development creep
- the problems of indicative layouts presented at outline stage as these could be misleading with a suggestion that the issue of whether outline applications should be accepted with indicative layouts could be considered by Joint Plans Panel
- the recommendation to approve the application and whether this would have been different if this was being considered as a new application rather than an amendment to a previous approval
- that having recently refused garden grabbing applications, the recommendation to approve was not in keeping with planning policy
- that the proposals represented an increase in footprint of approximately 26% which was a substantial increase

A proposal to refuse planning permission was made. In view of this, the Chair proposed a site visit which was accepted by the Panel

**RESOLVED** - That determination of the application be deferred for one cycle to enable a site visit to take place and that the Chief Planning Officer be asked to submit a further report to the next meeting

**90 Application 11/03413/FU - Amendment to previous approval 34/199/05/FU involving extension of lightwell, addition of 3 roof lights, alterations to doors and windows and conversion of car port to garage - 42 Victoria Street Chapelton LS7**

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought an amendment to a previous approval relating to a pair of semi detached dwellings at Victoria Street Chapel Allerton LS7 which formed part of the Chapel Allerton Conservation Area. The proposed amendments related to an extension of the lightwell, addition of rooflights, the conversion of the car port to a garage and amendments to the doors and windows

Members were informed that the Conservation Officer and Highways had not raised any concerns about the application and stated that a condition had been included to restrict the use of the basement to storage only

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

Members discussed the following matters:

- the length of time being taken to carry out works at the site, as raised by the objector
- the likely numbers occupying the property
- that the footpath should be reinstated in Yorkshire stone
- concerns that the property could be converted to a HMO. On this matter, the Panel's Lead Officer stated that any future conversion to flats would require planning permission and as set out in the report, this would be resisted on highway/car parking grounds

Panel considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report and two additional conditions, one relating to the reinstatement of the flags to the footway; these to be in Yorkshire stone and a condition removing permitted development rights relating to alternative uses of the property

**91 Application 11/00601/FU - Old Village Hall Village Road Eccup LS16**

Members were informed this application had been withdrawn by the applicant

**92 Application 11/01244/OT - Outline development of non-food retail units, 2 car showrooms, ancillary food kiosk and associated access roads and landscaping - Land on Gelderd Road and Ring Road Beeston**

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

Further to minute 23 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2011 where Panel considered a position statement on the development of this key site at Gelderd Road and Ring Road Beeston, Members considered the formal application Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought permission for the development of retail units together with access roads and landscaping on a cleared, brownfield site close to the city centre

Concerns had previously been expressed about the lack of landscaping to be provided and that following further work, the applicant had been able to provide additional landscaping which Officers considered to be acceptable

Indicative images depicted a glazed building which was viewed as an improvement on the previous proposals

Car parking of 333 spaces would be provided. Additional spaces for the car dealership and display spaces would also be provided

If minded to approve the application an additional condition relating to the provision of a pedestrian crossing on Gelderd Road in the vicinity of the site was requested. Amendments to conditions 5 and 7 relating to the amount of floorspace for the car showrooms and non-food retail use were outlined

In terms of the non-food retail use, it was proposed to restrict this to the sale of bulky goods

Members were informed that the site lay within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3a and that conditions had been included to address flood risk, with the Environment Agency being satisfied with the proposals. As part of the S106 Agreement, a flood warning scheme would be provided

Members commented on the following matters:

- the need to ensure no rat running occurred across the site
- that the building on the corner of the site should be a quality building to reflect its key location with a suggestion that the design of the building should have regard to the distinctive building on the opposite side of the road
- the need for local training and employment during the construction period and post construction

**RESOLVED –**

i) To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, an additional condition requiring details of a pedestrian crossing on Gelderd Road in the vicinity of the site to be submitted and approved in writing by the Council, with the construction of this crossing to be carried out prior to the occupation of the development (and any others which he might consider appropriate), amendments to condition 5 to refer to 2,601 sq m floorspace for the car showrooms and condition 7 to refer to 3,906 sq m for the net floorspace for the non-food retail units 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 deal with the following matters:

- Details of flood warning scheme
- Public transport infrastructure improvements contribution £150,400 (to be index linked)
- £30,000 Metro contribution to pay for shelter at bus stop number 12256 and new live bus information display at bus stop numbers 10103 and 12256
- Travel Plan monitoring evaluation fee (£2500) and implementation
- Landscape management plan
- Local employment and training initiatives

In the circumstances where the S106 has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer

ii) That directions be attached to the planning permission regarding the quality of design and landscaping

**93 Application 11/03032/LA - Demolition of Parklands Girls' High School and proposed Leeds East Academy - South Parkway Seacroft LS14**

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

Further to minute 75 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2011 where Panel considered a position statement for demolition of Parklands Girls' High School and the erection of Leeds East Academy, Members considered the formal application

Plans, drawings, photographs and graphics including a fly-through were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and provided further information on the design proposals which had been reviewed by CABE and the Civic Architect, Mr Thorp

Concerns had previously been raised regarding the fenestration and the amount of light available. Members were informed that revisions had been made to the 5<sup>th</sup> storey with polycarbonate glazing being proposed for most of the length of the building. In response to a query from the Panel regarding the possible build up of heat from the polycarbonate glazing, Officers stated that this could be looked at further but that all materials would need to comply with British Standards

Although sample materials had been provided, Officers had concerns about the quality of these with further discussions to take place on this matter, which would involve Ward Members

Two additional conditions were requested, these relating to submission of details of pedestrian access and approval of the materials

**RESOLVED** – That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, additional conditions relating to submission and approval of details of the pedestrian access and submission and approval of the materials (in consultation with Ward Members) together with any other conditions as deemed appropriate by the Chief Planning Officer

#### **94 Application 10/04762/OT - Outline application for residential development - Land adjoining 7 Waterwood Close West Ardsley WF3**

(Prior to consideration of this matter, Councillor Latty and Councillor Hardy left the meeting)

Further to minute 61 of the Plans Panel East meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> August 2011 where Panel deferred determination of an application for a residential development on land adjoining 7 Waterwood Close West Ardsley for further information on the Council's approach to proposals for residential development on Greenfield sites not allocated for such use, Members considered a further report

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting

The Panel's Lead Officer presented the report, referred to the indicative layout for 14 dwelling houses and stated that this was the first application to come forward for a residential scheme on a Greenfield site which was unallocated in the UDPR (2006) since the Grimes Dyke appeal decision earlier this year

Whilst acknowledging Members' concerns raised at the August meeting, the Panel's Lead Officer stated that approval of the application did not set a precedent. In all cases sites were assessed and if a site made a positive contribution to the area, development was likely to be resisted. In the case of this site, the view had been reached that it did not make a positive contribution to the overall spatial setting; it had limited public views and so did not contribute to the character of the area

Members' concerns regarding sustainability of the site had been addressed in the report and although a further representation had been submitted by the owner of 8 Waterwood Close which raised issues about the bus routes to the site, Officers considered the site was reasonably well serviced by buses and were recommending approval of the application to Panel

Members discussed the following matters:

- education provision with concerns being raised that some local schools were currently full
- that the size of the site meant that the number of dwellings being proposed was below the threshold for the provision of S106 contributions and that in these cases, where permission had been granted for small residential developments, sustainability was becoming an issue which would need to be addressed but without the benefit of any planning contributions
- that paragraph 2.2 of the submitted report relating to the Council's land supply; the Grimes Dyke appeal decision and the consequences for the Council in terms of allowing development on Greenfield (non-allocated) sites misrepresented the position of the Council and did not accurately reflect Executive Board's views on this matter
- that a recent Scrutiny Board inquiry had taken evidence from Steve Quartermain, Chief Planner, Communities and Local Government, who had not said that Leeds should begin approving developments on unallocated sites
- that if approvals for development on Greenfield sites were given, this could impact on the likelihood of achieving regeneration on brownfield sites such as EASEL or the Millennium Village in Allerton Bywater
- that other sites were available for development; that in the region of 30,000 units were to be built out and that space for an additional 8000 units had been released earlier this year
- that if refused, if the applicant chose to appeal the decision, the outcome of the appeal would be based upon the strength of the case put by Officers

A proposal to refuse the application was made

The Chief Planning Officer reminded Panel that the application before it was for 14 houses in a location with constraints

Members considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - To defer determination of the application to seek clarification from Executive Board on paragraph 2.2 of the submitted report and that the Chief Planning Officer be asked to submit a further report once this information had been received

(Following consideration of this matter, Councillor Grahame left the meeting)

**95 Application 11/00318/FU - Laying out of access road and erect private hospital and B1,B2 and B8 units - Land off Coal Road and Seacroft Ring Road LS14**

With reference to minute 80 above

**RESOLVED** - To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer as set out in the submitted report

**96 Application 11/00319/FU - Detached DIY store with associated car parking, landscaping and laying out of access road - Land off Coal Road and Seacroft Ring Road Seacroft LS14**

With reference to minute 80 above

**RESOLVED** - To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer as set out in the submitted report

### **97 Application 10/01412/OT - Queen Street Allerton Bywater LS26 - Position Statement**

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

Panel considered a position statement on a proposed outline application for residential development on land off Queen Street Allerton Bywater

Officers presented the report, outlined the topography of the site and provided information on the proposed house types, these being a mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses which would be set back into the site to create a softer appearance. The Panel was informed that whilst private gardens would be provided, some of these were not as large as specified in SPG 13 'Neighbourhoods for Living'

Members were informed that in line with Policy N24 of the UDPR(2006) a buffer was required between the site and the Green Belt abutting it. As a bund was adjacent to the country park, this could provide screening where there was insufficient space to provide this buffer, if acceptable to Panel

A Section 106 Agreement would be requested on this development with details of possible contributions being set out in the report before Members

Members commented on the following matters:

- highways issues, with concerns being raised at the approach to the site from Swillington in view of two recent fatal accidents
- the need for local employment and apprenticeships arising from the scheme, if approved
- concerns that the indicative layout seemed overcrowded at certain points on the site
- that in respect of water discharge, water tanks would be more appropriate on the site
- whether the Environment Agency had indicated their support for the proposed drainage/flooding measures
- concern that Greenfield sites would be developed before Brownfield sites
- whether in line with a Scrutiny Board recommendation, all S106 Agreements were being developed in conjunction with Ward Members
- the benefit of receiving position statements to allow the Panel to see proposals at an early stage and offer input into the scheme

The Chief Planning Officer stated that the proposed S106 Agreement provided for affordable housing, local training and employment and education contributions

In addressing the specific questions asked of Panel in the report the following responses were provided:

- no objection in principle to the development although further details regarding design and highways issues were needed
- regarding access, the concerns raised about the approach from Swillington should be taken on board
- the layout appears overcrowded and that the development should meet the requirements set out in SPG13 'Neighbourhoods for Living'.

Members required the affordable housing to be pepper-potted around the site

- in terms of landscaping structure, the N24 planting should be provided and be sited within the red line boundary
- that overall, a traditional approach to the design of the houses was favoured
- that there were concerns about the S106 package of contributions particularly in terms of education provision as many of the local schools were full and that Ward Members should be involved at an early stage about the S106 Agreement

**RESOLVED** - To note the report and the comments now made

**98 Application 11/01713/RM - Reserved matters application for 120 houses - Land south Queen Street, Woodend Allerton Bywater WF10 - Position Statement**

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

Officers presented a position statement on a Reserved Matters application for a residential development on land south of Queen Street Allerton Bywater WF10, which joined up with the site considered previously (minute 97 above refers)

Members were informed that outline planning permission had been granted on appeal earlier in the year and that a Reserved Matters application for layout, appearance, scale and landscaping had been submitted

Details of the proposed mix of houses was provided, these being 2, 3 and 4 bedroom family houses with private gardens with Officers stating that a small number of plots on the site were below the size recommended in SPG 13 'Neighbourhoods for Living'. The proposed materials would be predominantly red brick

One particular issue in relation to the proposals was around public open space as the applicant was proposing a pumping station or detention basin on part of the POS, with Officers of the view that the remaining land would be so compromised as to limit its use

In addressing the specific points raised in the report, Panel provided the following responses:

- that Panel supported Officers' views that a detention basin or pumping station on the site was not acceptable and that a tank should be provided
- that the size of the gardens should be in accordance with SPG13
- concerns were expressed at the proposed layout of the properties with a view that it was overintensive; that there needed to be a reduction in the quantum of development and that affordable housing should be pepper-potted across the site
- the layout should be amended so that the houses at the front address the road and the ones at the entrance address the road and the access into the site
- that Ward Members should be consulted on the scheme, especially the materials

- that the proposed landscaping was not acceptable and that a reasonably substantial landscaping scheme was needed to screen the site from the allotments
- no objection to the proposed design and height of the dwellings
- the need for the Section 106 Agreement to include local training and employment clauses with Ward Members being involved at an early stage on the content of this
- the need to consider this and the previous site together when determining these applications to ensure a consistent approach to the development of the wider area

**RESOLVED** - To note the report and the comments now made

**99 Date and time of next meeting**

Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2011 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds