

NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 1ST SEPTEMBER, 2016

PRESENT: Councillor N Walshaw in the Chair

Councillors R Grahame, J Procter,
S McKenna, P Wadsworth, S Arif,
C Dobson, S Hamilton, B Flynn and
C Gruen

CHAIRS COMMENTS

The Chair welcomed all to the North and East Plans Panel inviting Members and Officers to introduce themselves.

47 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

48 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no exempt items.

49 Late Items

There were no late items.

50 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

51 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors Ritchie and Wilkinson. Councillor Flynn substituted for Councillor Wilkinson and Councillor C. Gruen substituted for Councillor Ritchie.

52 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 4th August 2016, were approved as a correct record.

53 Matters arising

Members noted a verbal update on 56 The Drive that gave assurance that this Panel would ensure that a completion certificate was obtained and that Ward Members and the Panel would be updated at such a time.

54 Application No. 16/03555/FU - The Rebuilding and Extension of Dwelling at Lofthouse Lodge, Harrogate Road, Harewood, Leeds, LS17 9LU

Prior to the meeting Members had been informed that Item 10, application 16/03555/FU – The rebuilding and extension of dwelling at Lofthouse Lodge, Harrogate Road, Harewood, Leeds, LS17 9LU would be recommended for

deferral from consideration at the 1st September 2016 meeting until the 29th September 2016 meeting.

Members had visited the site on the morning of 1st September 2016, as had been scheduled.

The deferral was sought in order to secure comments from the Garden Trust which had recently merged with the Garden History Society and Historic England.

Cllr. John Procter was in support of the proposal to defer and requested a breakdown of the volumes before demolition and of the proposed new structure to ensure that it follows policy.

RESOLVED – Members resolved to defer consideration of this report until a time when all the information is available.

55 Application No. 16/03161/FU - Detached Classroom Block at SLP College, Main Street, Garforth, Leeds 25

The report of the Chief Planning Officer sought permission to site a modular classroom building within the site of the SLP College complex. It was proposed that the classroom building would be single storey with a shallow dual pitched roof. It was proposed that the building would have a grey/ blue rendered elevation to its sides and the inward facing elevation and a red brick finish applied to the elevation facing Main Street.

This application was brought to Plans Panel at the request of Ward Members, Councillors Mark Dobson and Sarah Field for reasons relating to the college's site slow encroachment on the surrounding public amenity.

Members were informed that the proposed building stands on an area of crushed hardcore lying between two established two storey properties and adjacent to the college's existing car park. The proposed building would be set back from the site's Main Street frontage and the adjacent flanking buildings. The proposal included some tree planting to the front.

Members were informed that the classroom would accommodate an open teaching space with associated entrance lobby and storage room. The teaching space would be used to cater for academic study and acting classes to meet educational and disabled access requirements. The current space used had no disabled access.

Members noted that the applicant had obtained planning permission to re-develop this portion of the site in 2008 for a 3 storey building containing a retail unit, recording studio and a flat above. This was not implemented due to financial reasons and the permission had now lapsed.

Members also noted that the classroom would accommodate 5 classes a day with the classroom used between 08:15 -19:00hours Monday –Friday and 09:00 – 17:00hours on Saturday during college term time.

The Panel were informed that the classes would not involve music and would be tutor led catering for existing student numbers and would share the associated parking and other facilities within the college site.

Members had visited the site the morning of the meeting and were shown plans and photographs at the meeting.

The Members who had attended the site visit had asked if the windows for the building could be located on Main Street. Members noted that officers had said that this would be possible. It was also noted that a ramp would be needed to allow disabled access.

The Officer informed the Panel that the applicant had been agreeable to the temporary siting of the building for 3 years rather than the proposed 5 years set out on the report.

Ms Cliff attended the meeting to speak against the recommendation and informed the Panel the residents have had ongoing issues with the college for a number of years. She said that there had been issues with traffic in the area particularly on Chapel Lane with the amount of traffic picking up and dropping students, not enough parking bays to cater for all attending and working at the college, not enough disabled parking, blocking of driveways, and difficulty crossing the road. She said that this was worse at the weekends.

Ms Cliffe said that she had been of the view that the 2008 permission outlined at 2.3 of the submitted report had not been implemented. She said that 200 residents had objected and the residents had been informed that no further building would take place on the site.

Ms Cliffe informed the Members that her property was located central to the car parking area with residential properties surrounding it. She explained that the deliveries had always taken place at the site but the traffic had not been as bad when it was a warehouse for musical instruments.

Ms Cliffe informed the Panel that a traffic survey had been conducted on a Sunday and they had counted 15 cars accessing the site within 5 minutes.

Ms Jenkins the applicant was also in attendance at the meeting and informed the Panel that the college had been operating at Chapel Lane for 25 years. She said that the college had not been able to complete on the 2008 permission due to the recession. Ms Jenkins explained that the college was partially funded by Central Government but with this funding came higher level BA courses which had meant a move to more written exams.

Ms Jenkins informed the Members that the college had been rated by Ofsted as outstanding at the last inspection and that they were the only dance theatre college to attain this level in the North of England. She said that 130 was the maximum capacity of students and that no more students would be at the school should the building be granted.

She said that there had always been issues with traffic congestion on Chapel Lane but that most of the traffic is due to the shops and bank located on Main Street.

Ms Jenkins told the Panel that the college was open from 7:30am with classes starting at 8:30am finishing at around 9:00pm. The college only stayed open till 10:00pm when there was a show. She also explained the weekend use of the college and said that the college was only used on Sunday's during exams.

Ms Jenkins said that she had used the Hall next door but could not always get access and there was no disabled access which was needed for both staff and students.

When asked, Ms Jenkins said that it was difficult to consult with residents in the area and that she had received a number of complaints over the years relating mainly to parking. Ms Jenkins was of the view that the issues relating to parking were from the bank and the beauty parlour on Main Street.

The Panel were informed that there was no specific policy document relating to temporary buildings. The Panel also noted that there was no enforcement matters for this site.

The Highways assessment considered the fact that the proposals did not include any addition to the existing pupil and staff numbers. As a result there would be no additional demand on car parking at the site associated with the proposed development. In addition, the temporary nature of the planning permission was considered.

Members discussed the following points:

- Ramp for disabled access to be the same door other students use
- Front facing windows on to Main Street
- Sound proofing to the building
- To see if larger premises may be more suitable
- Consultation between college and residents to address issues
- Parking issues
- Landscaping to front of site
- Issues relating to whether a dance school or a college
- Operating hours of the college
- Number of students attending the college

RESOLVED – The North and East Plans Panel resolved to defer the application until clarification is sought on the following:

- Full assessment for car parking for both staff and students
- Operating hours of the college
- Potential restriction on students and hours of use
- Rotation of the building by 90 degrees to allow windows to frontage of building

- Acoustic measures to restrict noise both from inside and outside the building
- Clarify if dance school or college

56 Application No. 16/02739/FU - Demolition of an Existing Detached Dwelling and construction of a Replacement Detached Dwelling at Fulwood House, Ling Lane, Scarcroft, Leeds, LS14 3HY

The report of the Chief Planning Officer sought permission to demolish the existing residential dwelling on the site and replace it with a new residential dwelling.

This application was brought to Panel at the request of Councillor Rachael Procter who wished the Panel to consider the impact the proposal would have on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Neighbours at Foxholes and Stone Lodge and also Scarcroft Parish Council had expressed concern in respect of loss of light, impact on private amenity, overlooking, overshadowing, over dominance, noise, noxious fumes and related underground parking the impact on the integrity of the structure on neighbouring properties retaining walls, impact on trees and traffic and road safety during the development.

Amended plans had been received proposing to move the dwelling forward by approximately 1m in order to reduce the impact upon Stone Lodge. The occupants of Stone Lodge had reviewed the revised plans and still objected for the same reasons.

Members had visited the site earlier in the day and were shown plans and photographs at the meeting.

Members were informed that the proposal included an underground garage for 12 vehicles which would be accessed by a lift.

Members were informed that the building was not located in a conservation area. However, part of the garden was located within the green belt but the proposal would not present harm to the green belt.

Members attention was drawn to 10.21 and 10.22 of the submitted report regarding noise and noxious fumes. It was proposed that an extraction system would be required from the underground garage area.

Mr Munroe the neighbour from Foxholes attended the meeting and informed the Panel of his concerns regarding the underground garage saying that more

information was required in relation to how many cars would be using the space, the noise and vibration of the lift.

He also told the Panel that Linden Lodge and Pymms had been cited as similar properties but they were in fact located on larger plots.

Mr Samuel the son of the owners of Stone Lodge was also present at the meeting and spoke of his parent's concerns in relation to the car lift for reasons of fumes, noise and vibration and the close proximity to the boundary of Stone Lodge.

Mr Samuel explained the measures that his parents had gone through when they had made changes to their property.

Mr Irving the agent and Br Burgan the applicant were at the meeting and informed Members that the application was policy compliant and that it had also been the subject of a Senior Planning Officer review. Amendments had been made to the plans as per advice received from the planning officer.

Mr Burgan informed the Panel that he and his wife had lived at the property for 25 years.

Mr Burgan informed the Panel that when development took place at Stone Lodge he had objected as he had concerns about the removal of a wood and the proximity to his own property.

Mr Burgan informed Members that he was a car enthusiast and the purpose of the garage for 12 vehicles was to be a private museum for his car collection. He explained that the car he would use on a daily basis would be kept in the garage above ground and the cars in his collection would only be used occasionally. He said that he would install an extraction system and ensure that fire regulations were adhered to.

Mr Burgan was of the view that the foundations of neighbouring homes would not be affected as he would be employing the services of a structural engineer with experience of building this type of property.

Members raised their concerns in relation to the amount of green belt that the proposed building would take up. Members were shown plans which showed the boundary and how much of the new build would encroach into the green belt.

Members raised their concerns in relation to the subterranean proposals and land stability. They were informed that officers recognised the scale of the building work and that many of the concerns raised related to building control matters.

Building control regulations and the conditions set out in the submitted report were discussed at length. Some Members indicated their concerns about the suitability of the conditions outlined in the submitted report.

Cllr. Procter requested that the application be deferred for one or more cycles to gain more information in relation to the following issues:

- System for the extraction of fumes in the basement
- Clarity of green belt
- Vibration and noise of lift
- Building control regulations in relation to subterranean building work

Members were not of a mind to defer the application.

The Panel were informed that if the neighbours had concerns they could get a structural survey prior to the commencement of the works in case any issues occurred. The Panel also noted that where works were within 3 metres of a neighbouring property the Party Boundary Wall Act came into effect.

RESOLVED – That the North and East Plans Panel resolved to grant the application as set out in the submitted report with the expansion of some of the conditions to include:

- Structural survey of neighbouring properties
- System for fumes extraction
- Assessment of vibration
- Finished floor / ground levels
- Clarification that Condition No. 10 will be a full construction management plan

57 Application No. 16/01527/FU - Demolition of Bungalow and the Erection of a Block of Four, Two Bedroom Flats at 5 Crescent Gardens, Alwoodley, Leeds, LS17 8DR

The report of the Chief Planning Officer sought permission to demolish the existing dwelling that occupied the site and to construct a two storey block of four flats.

The application was brought to Panel at the request of Councillor Cohen as it was his view that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of Crescent Gardens and that the increased quantum of residential units would have a detrimental effect on highway safety and decrease accessibility for emergency vehicles. Councillor Cohen also raised matters of overdevelopment and inadequate parking provision.

The proposed two storey block of apartments would comprise of 4 x 2 bedroom units; two the ground floor and the remaining two at first floor level. Each unit would have open plan dining, kitchen and living areas. Each unit would also have a house bathroom and an en-suite. Externally there would be provision for 8 parking spaces to the front of the site and amenity space to the rear.

Members noted an alteration at 2.3 of the submitted report that access would not now be through a front lobby but by doors at the side of the flats.

Members also noted an extra condition to be added at 10.7 of the submitted report in relation to future and finish of floor levels.

Members were informed of a late objection with regard to parking on Crescent Gardens. The objector had proposed restricted permit parking for current residents of Crescent Gardens but not for residents of the proposed flats. Members were of the view that this should not be considered.

Members were informed that the applicant had agreed in principle to change the construction and materials of the bin stores so that they did not impact on neighbours.

Members were reminded of a scheme which had been granted permission close by.

The Panel were informed that there was to be significant landscaping to the car parking area at the front with semi- mature hedging to be planted this would be incorporated into the conditions. The hedge would be better for the street scene blending with neighbouring properties.

Members had been on a site visit earlier in the day and were shown plans and 3D drawings at the meeting. Members did request more detailed drawings of the internal layout.

Mr Cook the agent was at the meeting and informed the Panel that the rooms exceeded the National Space Standards with 79 square metres for the upper floors and 70 square metres for the lower floors. It was noted that the roof lights were for sole use of the upper floor flats.

Members discussed the changing demographics of the area.

Members were satisfied that any issues of noise had been addressed.

RESOLVED – That Members granted permission as set out in the submitted report and additional conditions to cover:-.

- Finished floor / ground levels
- Cycle parking provision to be lockable and secure
- Clarification that condition No. 4 is to include the planting of a semi-mature hedge at the front of the property

58 Date and Time of Next Meeting

The next meeting of North and East Plans Panel will be held on Thursday 29th September 2016 at 1:30pm