

PLANS PANEL (WEST)

THURSDAY, 12TH JANUARY, 2012

PRESENT: Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, B Chastney,
M Coulson, K Groves, J Hardy, J Harper,
T Leadley, J Matthews, P Wadsworth and
R Wood

93 Declarations of Interest

Councillors B Chastney, J Matthews and J Akhtar declared personal interests in Agenda Item 8, Leeds Girls High School, 31 Headingley Lane, Headingley due to their membership of the North West Inner Area Committee and previous discussions regarding this site.

94 Minutes - 8 December 2011

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2011, be approved as a correct record subject to the following amendments.

Minute 86 – Applications 11/03820/FU, 11/03826/FU and 11/03828/LI – Stonebridge Mills, Stonebridge Lane, Wortley, LS12

Bullet Point 6 – Remove the words ‘where possible’.

Minute 87 – Applications 11/04253/FU and 11/04253 – Commercial Road/Kirkstall Lane, Kirkstall Hill, Kirkstall

To include reference to Members concerns regarding linkages to the rest of the S2 centre.

95 Application 11/03417/FU - Springfield Mill, Stanningley Road, Stanningley, Pudsey, LS13 3LY

The report of the Chief Planning Officer informed Members of an application for a proposal to construct a detached retail food store with 90 parking spaces and associated hard and soft landscaping. The application had been made following pre-application meetings and discussions with the Local Planning Authority and following a public exhibition and community consultation over the past year. It had been brought to Plans Panel due to the level of local representation and because the proposal did not constitute out of centre retail development.

Members were shown site plans and photographs of the site and had visited the site prior to the meeting.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The store would create between 30 and 40 jobs, with approximately 100 jobs during construction.
- The store would be surrounded on all four sides by housing.
- Until 2007 the site was a complex of industrial units. These had become disused and derelict and had since been demolished.
- Members were shown photographs of the site where access from Stanningley Road would be.
- The existing stone wall at the site would be lowered and partially retained.
- A Section 106 agreement had been secured with the developers.
- A public meeting had been held on 30 March 2011 and 91 local residents had attended. 105 letters of support, which had been developed by ALDI, had been received along with a further 6 letters of support and a letter of objection.
- There had not been an objection by Highways and the proposals were supported by a transport assessment and travel assessment.
- The Section 106 agreement would include a public transport contribution of £52,903

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- The proposed condition to restrict deliveries between 9.00 p.m. and 7.00 a.m. was the same as other store in a similar position. There would be acoustic barriers around the delivery area and this was adjacent to the gable end of existing properties.
- It was suggested that a condition be included for bollards to restrict access to the car park when the store was closed.
- Distribution of transport funds under the Section 106 agreement. It was reported that this would go into a larger pot and be used on the corridor in which the proposed store was.
- Suggestion to use the remaining stone from the existing stone wall to erect a wall on Ashby Avenue.
- The store would be a discount food retail unit. They were unable to sell certain goods including newspapers and tobacco.
- It was not possible to impose a condition regarding the upgrading of bus stops but this would be discussed with Ward Members.

RESOLVED – That approval be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement within three months from the date of the resolution to ensure the following:

- Travel Plan, Travel Plan Co-ordinator and monitoring fee of £2,500;
- Store to be a discount supermarket only;
- Local employment initiatives; and
- Public Transport Contribution of £52,903

And subject to conditions outlined in the report with additional requirements to consult Ward Members before a decision is made with regards to the suitability of upgrading 2 existing bus stops on Stanningley Road and could stone from the tall wall be used to provide a stone boundary wall to Ashby Avenue.

96 Pre-application presentation - PREAPP/11/01241 - Leeds Girls High School, 31 Headingley Lane, Headingley, LS6 1BN

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced a pre-application presentation by the Morley House Trust for residential development, conservation area consent for demolition, change of use of Rose Court to flats and listed building application for alterations to Rose Court at Leeds Girls High School.

The Panel was asked to note the report and comments were invited on the following issues:

- Highways proposals
- Masterplan layout and effects on listed building and conservation area
- Impact on trees
- Residential amenity, in particular garden sizes
- Level of detail required when planning applications are submitted

It was reported that the pre-application presentation would give the developer an opportunity to show the position since the previous application had been to appeal. The appeal had resulted in approval for the conversion of Rose Court but had refused new building and conversion and extension of the main school building. The Inspector had also expressed concern regarding the loss of trees.

Members were shown site plans and photographs of the site and had made a site visit prior to the meeting.

The following issues were highlighted:

- Concern regarding access to the north west of the site to Headingley Lane.
- Proposals to move blocks 17, 18 and 19 so that Rose Court was not obscured.
- Concern regarding the narrow private drive to the west of the site and its unsuitability for service vehicles. Upgrading of this would have a detrimental impact on trees.
- Proposed car parking provision for the site had been accepted by Highways and the Inspector.
- The Inspector had not raised objections to the close proximity of blocks 14 and 11 or to the removal of trees in the north east corner to re-position block 19.
- There had not been objection to the small gardens proposed due to the amount of public open space on the site.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following issues were discussed:

- The developer was happy to close the access to Headingley Road and use the private road for all 11 properties on the west side of the site.
- Issues surrounding refuse collection.

- The north west access point could still be used by emergency service vehicles.
- Issues relating to the proposal to move block 19 and the proximity to the sunken garden. It was reported that there would have to be further discussions with conservation and tree officers regarding this.
- Blocks 11 and 12 could be moved slightly south to prevent a detrimental impact on trees.
- Concern regarding sight lines on blocks 10 and 15 – block 15 could be re-sized or rotated, block 10 would be difficult to move and had not received an objection from the inspector.

Members were asked to comment on the following issues:

- The principle of retaining an access for vehicles from Headingley Lane – Members considered safety issues for keeping the access to Headingley Lane open to access 5 properties. Members voted in favour of allowing these 5 properties to retain vehicular access to Headingley Lane.
- The proposal to serve 7 dwellings off a private drive off Victoria Road - Members considered various consequences including the lack of a turning head for refuse vehicle, surfacing, impact on trees, safety and practicality of vehicles having to reverse down the drive, safety for pedestrians and the relationship between some of the residential blocks and the drive. Members voted in favour of allowing 7 dwellings to be served off a private drive subject to details of road construction for drainage, lighting, turning circle being acceptable in relation to the trees.
- Parking provision across the site – Members accepted that the level of car parking was acceptable.
- Whether the development is appropriate in siting of block 18 relative to the setting of the listed Rose Court building – The building was considered to be an improvement from the previous scheme but there were concerns about the size and also the size of block 17 across the access road. Members supported the idea of creating a gate house feature with the two blocks but felt they needed to be reduced in scale because of the impacts on views to Rose Court and Block 17's proximity to the access and a tree to its rear.
- Whether block 14 had an acceptable relationship with the adjoining dwelling in block 11 in terms of achieving satisfactory residential amenity – it was considered that block 14 was likely to harm the living conditions of neighbours and should be removed.
- The principle of the siting of block 17 and its relationship to the access road – It was felt that the distance between block 17 and 18 was too short for amenity considerations. In principle the siting of blocks 17 and 18 was accepted but there was concern with scale and massing. Concerns were also raised regarding the gardens of block 17 that would be overshadowed by a retained tree.
- The siting of Block 19 in relation to Rose Court – The principle of this block was broadly accepted subject to scale, massing and high quality

design been demonstrated through the application. Additional replacement tree planting elsewhere on the site would be needed to compensate for the loss of trees.

- The impact of the proposed blocks 9, 10 and 14 upon the existing trees - Block 9: Members noted the importance of retaining the mature Lime Tree (T12) but thought that subject to ensuring this tree was unharmed by the size, siting and construction of block 9 that this block was acceptable. Block 10: Members were concerned that this block would likely put pressure on the existing trees that were in close proximity and may result in pressure by the future occupiers for the trees to be felled. The developer was keen to say the inspector did not refuse the appeal on this issue but acknowledged the Inspector had serious concerns about this relationship. Block 14: Members thought this block would also likely impact on the trees and given other amenity concerns should be removed from the scheme.
- Members views were sought on the small gardens proposed - Members were broadly accepting of the small garden sizes of the townhouses given the availability of open space within the site. They did however say that small gardens largely or wholly covered by retained trees were not acceptable and these units would need to be removed. As such blocks 10 and 14 should be removed completely and individual units within blocks 17, 18, 2 and 3 will need to be omitted.
- Views on the public open space provision – The amount of open space was considered to be acceptable.
- Views on the the housing mix as proposed – Members considered this to be acceptable.
- Members views on the level of detail they would wish to see as part of the revised application - Members accepted that an outline application with a good level of detail would be acceptable. They wanted to see good scale and massing plans to ensure they could assess the heights of buildings. The developer offered to provide these along with a detailed design code and indicative elevations.

(Councillor Coulson requested that it be recorded that he did not take part in any of the votes taken on this item).

97 Date and Time of Next Meeting
Thursday, 2nd February 2012 at 1.30 p.m.