

PLANS PANEL (WEST)

THURSDAY, 14TH JUNE, 2012

PRESENT: Councillor Taggart in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, M Coulson, J Hardy,
T Leadley, P Wadsworth, C Gruen, Towler,
J Walker, J Bentley, G Latty and N Taggart

12 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Hardy declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 8, Cookridge Hospital due to being a patient of the hospital. He withdrew from the meeting during the discussion on this item.

Councillor Wadsworth declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 11, Leeds Bradford International Airport due to previous involvement in consultation.

Councillor J Bentley declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10, Silk Mill Gardens due to previous involvement with objectors to the application.

Councillor J Akhtar declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 9, Leeds Girls High School due to previous discussions he had been involved in at The North West Inner Area Committee.

13 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors J Harper and R Wood. Councillors N Taggart and G Latty were in attendance as substitutes.

14 Minutes

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 May 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

15 Application 12/02071/OT - University of Leeds Bodington Hall Otley Road Adel LS16

The report of the Chief Planning officer introduced an outline application for residential development including means of access and demolition of existing buildings at the University of Leeds, Bodington Hall, Otley Road, Adel.

The application had been brought to the Plans Panel due to the local interest in the scheme and the scale of the proposed development. Members were also informed of further representations that had been made regarding the application.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed.

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

- Access to the site
- Retention of woodland and TPO trees.
- Objections regarding the use of Adel Lane – it was reported that a traffic calming scheme would be provided.
- All section 106 obligations had been met and would be dealt with at reserved matters.
- Negotiations to include a pedestrian crossing by the school.

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

- Retention of the playing fields on the site.
- There was an intention to mix the affordable housing provision throughout the site.
- Traffic calming – this would reduce the need for improved visibility splays. It was reported that when the previous application was refused, there was a lack of information from the applicant regarding the proposals for the junction with Adel Lane.
- It was indicated that there would be approximately 160 dwellings on site. Transport assessments had been made on a base of 180 dwellings.
- Indicative layout and design – it was reported that the developer wished to maintain access through the site. Further discussion was to be held regarding design of properties.
- Conditions relating to repairs/maintenance of the development and ecological/conservation issues.
- Bus services – possibility of using the a loop road in the development as a turning point.
- There were currently approximately 1,000 bedspaces in the development.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to conditions as outlined in the report.

Councillors G Latty and P Wadsworth requested that their votes against the recommendation on this item be recorded.

- 16 Applications 11/03324/FU, 11/03496/LI, 11/03492/LI and 11/03491/LI - former Cookridge Hospital and grounds Hospital Lane Cookridge LS16**
- The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application for planning permission and listed building consent for the development of 143 houses and 12 flats; restoration of The Lodge to form 1 house; alterations and extensions to the hospital building to form a residential care home comprising 20 apartments and 35 bedspaces (C2) use; alterations and extensions to the

former Ida Wing building to form 56 extra care housing units (C3) use at the former Cookridge Hospital and Grounds, Hospital Lane, Cookridge.

The applications had been brought to Panel due to the history associated with the site and also because of the applicant's request that the Local Planning Authority considered a revised Section 106 package for the Planning Applications. This was previously discussed at the last meeting of Plans Panel West and the proposed Section 106 package was outlined in the report.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed.

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

- There would be no through route of the site.
- The Ida building would utilise a private drive
- Current car parking spaces would be allocated to residents and visitors of the Ida building.
- Houses on the development would have natural slate roofs and timber framed doors and windows.
- Conversion of the main hospital building to a nursing home.
- Proposed extension to the Ida building.

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

- Section 106 monies for play provision would be in the vicinity/ward of the development.
- Use of the Arlington building.
- Conditions regarding the use of materials.

RESOLVED – That the applications be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to conditions specified in the report.

17 Application 12/01236/FU - Leeds Girls High School Headingley Lane LS6 - Position statement

The report of the Chief Planning Officer provided the Panel with a position statement on the outline application including layout, scale and means of access for 53 dwellings and full application for conversion and extension of the main school building and stable block to form 36 dwellings at the former Leeds Girls High School, Headingley Lane, Headingley, Leeds.

Members had attended a site visit prior to the meeting and photographs and plans of the site were displayed.

The Panel was reminded of the planning history at the site and the Inspector's recommendations following a public inquiry. Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- Road access on the western side of the site. Tests had been done to show tree roots would not be significantly damaged and that the road could be brought up to an adoptable standard. This could enable the Headingley Lane access to be closed.
- There was still to be further consultation regarding the design code as there was not enough detail at this stage.
- Section 106 agreement for affordable housing – Members had previously indicated a preference towards the purchase of HMOs in the area.
- Reference was made to an additional representation made by Councillor J Illingworth regarding the use of sports pitches and facilities at the site and the related health issues and the health responsibilities of the Council. This had been previously debated in full by Plans Panel and at the Public Inquiry and this argument had been rejected by the Inspector as they had only previously been available for private use.

Members were asked to comment on questions outlined in the report, the following issues were discussed:

- Block 10 – it was felt that this was too close to trees and it was queried whether this would cause damage to trees, particularly if the western access road was brought up to adoptable standards.
- Affordable housing – some felt that this should be provided on site and not be allocated for the re-use of HMOs. Changes to the amount of affordable housing that needed to be provided would affect what could be achieved and it was suggested to discuss this later.
- Boundaries to the site – it was felt that this should be railings and not fencing.
- It was felt that proposals for lodges/gate houses at blocks 17 and 18 should be scaled down and that 6 properties would be too much and would not allow for suitable garden provision.
- Members felt that there was not enough detail on the proposed block 19 and that it may need to be reduced in size. There was also an issue regarding the proximity of trees.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

- 18 Application 12/01295/FU - Garages to rear of 19 Silk Mill Gardens LS16**
The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application to erect a detached building forming a pair of garages.

The application had been referred to Panel at the request of a Ward Councillor and due to a significant level of public interest.

Members were shown photographs and plans of the site.

The following issues were highlighted in relation to the application:

- The site was previously part of the garden of 15 Silk Mill Gardens.
- The land adjacent which provided access to the site was owned by Leeds West North West Homes.
- Objections had been received regarding the potential use of the proposed garages.
- Leeds West North West Homes had expressed doubt as to whether access would be given to the plot.

The current owner of 15 Silk Mill Gardens addressed the Panel with objections and concern to the application. The following issues were raised:

- The applicant was the previous owner of 15 Silk Mill Gardens and lived 3 miles away.
- The proposed buildings would be of an industrial size.
- It was proposed for them to be let on a commercial basis and would increase traffic on a residential street where there was currently a lack of parking.
- Concern regarding what the garages would be used for.

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

- The land was currently unused and unkempt.
- The use of the garages would still be classed as domestic if let to other individuals.
- Issues of access and whether this would be granted. It was suggested that this be clarified before a decision could be taken.
- The applicant already had a container present adjacent to the site.

RESOLVED – That the application be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to determine whether the applicant would wish to withdraw the application should access be refused.

19 Application 11/03934/COND - Leeds Bradford International Airport

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced an application regarding the Forecourt Management Plan (Condition 14 of Planning Approval 08/06944/FU) for Terminal Extension at Leeds Bradford International Airport, Whitehouse Lane, Yeadon.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site photographs and plans were displayed.

It was reported that the initial application came to Plans Panel in 2008 and had since been to Plans Panel on a further 5 occasions. This application was in respect of the final condition to discharge and the deadline for this was December 2012.

Issues related highlighted in relation to the application and the condition included the following:

- Short stay car parking costs for picking up and drop off at the airport.
- Forecourt arrangements for public transport, contracted private hire vehicles and dropping passengers off.
- LBIA had made no provision for hackney carriages within the forecourt.
- The current private hire contract ran until 2014.
- There was no dedicated route for a proposed drop off point.
- The Voyager Area which was available to all private hire and hackney carriage drivers for an annual fee.
- Signage
- Pedestrian access
- Representations made by local Ward Members
- Shuttle bus facilities

A representative of the hackney carriage trade addressed the meeting with objections to the application. It was felt that the proposals were against local people and providers of public transport and there had not been sufficient consultation regarding the public transport system. He also informed of difficulties for transporting disabled passengers as they had to be dropped a significant distance away from the terminal building. In response to Members questions, it was not felt that the Voyager Area offered a satisfactory solution to hackney carriage operators and was still some distance away from the terminal for disabled passengers.

A representative of LBIA addressed the meeting. He highlighted the following issues:

- LBIA was highly regulated by the Health and Safety Executive, Civil Aviation Authority and Department of Transport.
- There had been over £2 million invested on the terminal forecourt.
- New exit and entrance barriers had been installed to speed up through traffic.
- There had been an 18% increase in bus patronage.
- LBIA had provided subsidies of £230k towards buses.
- LBIA were prepared to subsidise traffic enforcement measures on Whitehouse Lane.

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

- Location of the 1 hour free waiting area. Members asked if other areas could be used for this.
- Viability of having a free drop off point – charging was part of the economics of the airport.
- Problems and potential danger with passengers being dropped off on Whitehouse Lane.
- Members concluded that the main issue of concern was dropping off of passengers, particularly on Whitehouse Lane.

Members voted against the recommendation in the report and it was suggested that further negotiation take place between officers and LBIA for improved drop off and pick up proposals.

RESOLVED – That the item be deferred for officers to negotiate improved drop off and pick up proposals.

20 **Date and Time of Next Meeting**
Thursday, 26 July 2012 at 4.00 p.m.