

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 20TH OCTOBER, 2016

PRESENT: Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, B Anderson,
C Campbell, D Congreve, M Coulson,
R Finnigan, E Nash, A Smart, C Towler and
R Wood

30 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests. Councillor Nash informed the Panel that she knew the applicant for Application 16/04153/FU – Spenfield, 182 Otley Road, Headingley, Leeds and would withdraw from the meeting during the discussion for this application.

31 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were sent on behalf of Councillor J Bentley. Councillor C Campbell was in attendance as substitute.

32 Minutes - 22 September 2016

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2016 be confirmed as a correct record subject to the following amendment

- Minute No. 28 – Application 16/03861/FU – Land to west of Towcester Avenue, Middleton – Amendment to read '*Councillor Nash requested that her abstention to this application be recorded due to an objection to the inclusion of properties with adjacent front doors within the development.*

33 Applications 16/04093/FU & 16/05247/LI - Masonic Hall, Castle Grove Drive, Leeds, LS6 4BP

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented and application and listed building application for an extension to form furniture storeroom to Masonic Hall at Castle Grove Masonic Hall, Castle Grove Drive, Leeds.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

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

- There would be an additional condition to remove the shed and storage container in the grounds of the building.
- There had been a reduction in the height of the proposed extension from the original design.
- With regard to heritage, the proposal for a stone built extension was felt appropriate.

A neighbouring resident addressed the Panel with objections to the application. These included the following:

- The shed and container had been sited in the grounds of the lodge without planning permission.
- There had been no attempt to contact neighbouring properties.
- The impact on the view having a plain stone building adjacent to gardens.
- Tree planting – this would further block light to gardens. The applicant had previously allowed a leylandii hedge to grow out of control.
- The plans would have a detrimental effect on property values.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel. Issues highlighted included the following:

- The hall was a popular venue and used for a variety of events most days of the week. This provided an income which allowed the maintenance of the listed building.
- The proposals would generate more ground storage space and allow the applicant to remove the existing shed and container.
- A landscaped area would be included.
- There had been consideration given to neighbouring properties by reducing the height, length and width of the original proposals. The applicant felt that amenity would be enhanced with a permanent building and landscaped areas.

In response to questions and comments from Members, the following was discussed:

- It was suggested that a further condition could be included regarding landscaping.
- The existing storage shed had received retrospective planning application in 2009. There had not been permission for the container which had been on site for approximately 25 years.
- The extension was required to be built in the proposed location as it was the only suitable location to allow for ground level access for storage and moving of furniture.
- Planning Officers had met with Ward Councillors and local residents and this had led to the reduction in size of the original plans.
- A suggestion that windows be included to break up the plain wall of the extension facing residential properties.

- The proposed extension would meet design guide distance requirements.

RESOLVED –

- (1) That application 16/04093/FU be deferred and delegated for approval subject to receipt of revised plans incorporating windows or faux windows in the flank wall facing the listed building and subject to additional conditions regarding:
 - Submission of a landscaping scheme to the landscaped area adjacent to the boundary wall (Species of a type not to exceed the height of the adjacent boundary wall).
 - Existing shed and container to be removed from the site prior to the new extension being brought into use.
- (2) That application 16/05247/LI be deferred and delegated for approval subject to receipt of revised plans incorporating windows or faux windows in the flank wall facing the listed building.

34 Application 16/04771/FU - 11 St Ann's Lane, Burley, Leeds, LS4 2SE

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of approval 15/04158/FU for minor material amendment to allow for minor alterations, including two dormer windows to unit 4 at 11 St Ann's Lane, Burley, Leeds.

Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

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

- Members were reminded of the previous approved application for two semi-detached properties on the site. The amendment was for the inclusion of two dormer windows.
- Representations had been made regarding the loss of privacy and that the dormers would overlook existing residential properties.
- The dormers were at the rear of the property and would not affect the streetscene.
- Distance to the nearest residential property fell within neighbourhoods for living guidelines.
- It was not felt that the dormers would create any additional overlooking of other properties and it was recommended that the application be approved.

Objectors to the application addressed the Panel. Issues highlighted included the following:

- This was a constrained site close to other residential properties and there was not sufficient space for further development.

- The original plans had been moved forward which made the proposals more overbearing and the addition of dormers was felt to be more than a minor material amendment.
- The inclusion of dormers would be a dangerous precedent for the area and would cause other residential properties to be overlooked.

The applicant's representative addressed the panel. Issues highlighted included the following:

- Design proposals had been drastically reduced to address residents' concerns.
- The existing proposals would not allow enough natural light into the properties.
- The applicant had received complimentary comments regarding the proposals and re-use of the site and existing properties.
- The proposed dormers met guidelines with regard to distance from the nearest properties.
- All attempts had been made to consult and negotiate with residents of neighbouring properties.

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

- There was already a dormer on the Coach House building.
- Why the dormers did not come as part of the original application.

RESOLVED – That the application be granted as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report.

35 Application 16/04153/FU - Spenfield, 182 Otley Road, Headingley, Leeds, LS16 5AD

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the part demolition and conversion of Spenfield to create six apartments and studio flat, construction of seven terraced dwellings on the car park to the rear with associated boundary treatments, landscaping and car parking at Spenfield, 182 Otley Road, Headingley, Leeds LS16 5AD.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on the application. A display model of the proposed development was also presented along with samples of materials to be used.

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

- Reference was made to a previous application that had been refused following an appeal.
- The Panel was shown which parts of the Spenfield would be retained. It was reported that there was little of historic interest on the first floor of the property.

- The new building would be situated further away from Spenfield than the previously rejected application.
- The row of terraced dwellings would be stepped across rising from 2 storeys to 3 storeys. A comparison was shown against that of the refused application.
- Due to the extent of deterioration of the Spenfield building, a new beneficial use was required to bring the maintenance up to date.
- The site was in the Weetwood Conservation Area and it was felt that the proposals were more suitable to this than the previous scheme.
- There had not been any objections from Heritage England, Environmental Health or Highways. It was recommended to approve the application.

A local resident addressed the Panel with objections to the application. These included the following:

- There was disappointment at the recommendation to approve the application. The scheme was only been minimally different in mass, floor size and appearance from the one refused at appeal.
- The reported reduction in the height from the previous scheme was inaccurate.
- The scheme was obtrusive and not in keeping with the area.
- The report refers to similarities to the terraced block in the new scheme and should therefore be rejected.
- The developer claimed the new building was required to support the renovation of Spenfield but would be making £2million profit.

The applicant's agent and architect addressed the Panel. The following issues were highlighted:

- Key points of the inspector's reason for refusal of the previous scheme had been addressed including an increased distance between the terraced dwellings and the host building.
- The stepped roofline of the terrace reduced visual impact and there would be 25% less silhouetting as the previous scheme.
- If the scheme was approved, development would begin as soon as possible.

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

- Detailed costs in relation to profit margins could not be given but the materials used for the quality of the development would not be inexpensive.
- Following the appeal decision it had been concluded that there was still scope for development. The new proposals were further away from the listed building and were smaller in scale and mass.
- The siting of a modern designed building in relation to the listed building.

- It was suggested that the condition for commencement be changed to 2 years.

RESOLVED –

- (1) That Application 16/04153/FU be deferred and delegated for officer approval as per the officer recommendation but subject to a variation in the standard time limit for the commencement condition to 2 years.
- (2) That application 16/04154/LI be granted listed building consent subject to a variation in the standard time limit for the commencement condition to 2 years.

36 Application 16/03678/FU - 14 Meynell Avenue, Rothwell Leeds, LS26 0NY

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a retrospective application for the change of use of a former storage unit to a martial arts academy at 14 Meynell Avenue, Rothwell, Leeds.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

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

- The building fell within the Rothwell Conservation Area.
- The Martial Arts Academy had been operating since June 2015 and opened on Saturday mornings and Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday till approximately 9.00 p.m. for a maximum of 15 students.
- The application had been referred to the Panel at the request of a local Ward Councillor. Two letters of objection had been received from local residents with concerns regarding parking in the area. There had also been two letters of support for the application.
- Residents of Meynell Avenue also had rear access to their properties.
- Highways had monitored parking in the area and there had not been any sign of problems.
- It was recommended that the application be approved.

RESOLVED – That the application be granted as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report.