

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 16TH DECEMBER, 2021

PRESENT: Councillor E Taylor in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,
S Hamilton, D Ragan, P Wray, S Burke,
D Collins, D Jenkins and D Cohen

62 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals.

63 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There was no exempt information.

64 Late Items

There were no late items.

65 Declarations of Interests

Councillor Collins informed the Panel that she was a Member of Rawdon Parish Council. Rawdon Parish Council had made representations with regards to the application. Councillor Collins had not participated in any meetings where this had been discussed and would be treating the application with an open mind.

66 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors R Finnigan and T Smith.

Councillor D Cohen was in attendance as substitute for Councillor T Smith.

67 Minutes - 18 November 2021

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2021 be confirmed as a correct record.

68 Applications 20-01307-LI & 20-01306-FU - Micklefield House, New Road Side, Rawdon

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a planning application and a listed building consent application for the change of use and alterations to a former council building to form eight flats with parking at Micklefield House, New Road Side, Rawdon.

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 flats would be two bedroom with the exception of one three bedroom apartment.
- The application was deferred at the March meeting for further discussion with regard to the design and materials for the first floor extension and to provide more detail on the conditions.
- A local Ward Councillor had made an additional representation that following the further loss of visitor parking to the park, that a residents' parking scheme should be funded via condition by the applicant.
- Details of objections that had been received since the last time the application was considered by Panel. It was not felt that these raised any new issues or material considerations.
- The existing access from New Road Side would still be used.
- Grass towards the front of the building would be removed for additional car parking.
- There was only a small outdoor amenity space but this was felt to be acceptable due to the constraints of the site, and the adjacent parkland.
- The ramp to the front of the building would be removed.
- Bin storage would be to the side of the building.
- The stained-glass window at the first floor would be restored.
- The existing flat roofed extension would be extended above to incorporate a first floor. The extension would be clad in a mirrored finish.
- There would be some digging out to provide rooms for a basement flat and rooms to another flat.
- Internal floor plans were shown. The extension was needed to retain use of the tower part of the building.
- Examples of other buildings with a mirrored or highly reflective finish were displayed.
- The recommendation to approve the applications was finely balanced.
- All the apartments would be policy compliant in terms of space standards
- There would be 16 car parking spaces, with electric vehicle charging and a cycle space for each apartment.

- Parking would be less intensive than when the building was used as an office block and would not necessitate the need for permit parking for residents.
- While there had been objections to the application, these were principally about the extension and the proposed mirrored cladding. The proposal would bring a listed building back into use and maintain/restore its main features whilst providing a viable re-use. It was recommended that the applications be approved.

The Panel heard from local representatives who were speaking in objection to the applications. Issues highlighted included the following:

- There had not been any supporter of this application and over 65 objections.
- The applicant had not acted on the objections.
- A reduction to seven flats without the extension would be a solution.
- The applicant had refused to meet with the objectors.
- The proposed extension would dominate Micklefield House and the views from the park.
- Why would a first floor extension to a listed building be approved?
- There was no evidence to demonstrate that a scheme would be unviable without the extension.
- In response to queries from the Panel, the following were also raised by objectors :
 - The principal objection was to the extension. Use for residential purposes was an acceptable re-use. It was a key building and needs to be back into productive use.
 - The view from the playground area and tennis courts would be spoiled by the proposals.
 - Advice received from a consultant said the proposals were harmful to a listed building and in conflict with Listed Buildings and Conservation Act, the National Planning Policy Framework and Leeds's own guidance.
 - A local Ward Councillor had tried to arrange consultation with the developer. The developer had not made any contact with Rawdon Parish Council either.
 - The additional floor on top of the existing extension was the main concern and not the materials. Those in objection wished to see the floor plan to stay as it was now. A first floor extension would obscure views of the tower.
 - There was no objection to extending into the basement.

The applicant addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- It was aimed to deliver a high-quality scheme that supported the re-use and retention of the building.
- Due to the costs involved the optimum design required the proposed number of apartments.

- The proposals would deliver a higher level of restoration and retention than any other scheme and it was felt that this outweighed any concerns regarding design.
- Any concerns regarding design could be considered to be personal views or taste.
- Objections had focussed on the treatment of 60's extension. It was proposed to extend this to have a first floor so as to utilise the tower part of the building and ensure the full restoration of the building.
- The mirrored finish to the existing and new extension would provide a sculptural and artistic finish.
- A social media page with regards to the application had many positive comments on the proposals.
- In response to questions from the Panel, the following was discussed:
 - There would be a small maintenance fee for residents which would go towards maintenance of the building.
 - There would be no additional windows to the extension at ground floor level. On the first floor there would be two windows to the side and double doors to the front.
 - A mirrored finish was not the cheaper option for the extension but was felt to be an appropriate design solution to ensure the extension was recessive.
 - If the tower wasn't utilised for the first floor extension there would be maintenance costs for a part of the building that was not being used. It was felt that the first floor extension gave the best form of sustainability for the tower.
 - There would be a benefit from the mirrored cladding with regard to insulating the building and using less carbon for heating.
 - Benefits of the proposals included the refurbishment of the stained glass windows, restoration of fireplaces, radiator grills, doors, skirtings and windows.
 - The access ramp at the front of the building would have to be removed to make space for car parking. It was believed original stone steps were underneath the ramp. The ramp at the rear of the building would also be removed.
 - The applicant had not been contacted with regards to a consultation meeting.

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

- With regard to earlier comments that planning laws would be breached, Members attention was brought to the paragraphs in the report which set out the relevant legislative framework. The Panel was advised on the relevant legislation and policies to be taken into account when reaching their decision.
- There was a condition for boundary treatments which would cover fencing and security. There would also be railings in front of the car park and above the retaining wall to the rear of the building.
- Use of the basement – Flat 1 would have two basement rooms.

- There was no policy requirement for a greenspace contribution as the number of dwellings is below 10 .
- The amount of traffic generated would be significantly less than when the building was used as an office.
- There was not a list of features identified in the building that had to be preserved. Any updating of the listing of the building would be by application to Historic England.
- There was no requirement to have any parking standards for the park.
- There would be four visitor parking spaces for the apartments.
- Refuse vehicles could gain access through the car park and there was sufficient space for movement with the location of bin storage which was at the side of the building adjacent to the car park.
- It was considered that the conversion to residential use would provide the optimum viable use of the building.
- There would be a boundary treatment to differentiate between the resident's parking and parking for visitors to the park.
- The main issue was the material to be used for the extension and whether this outweighed the benefit of the development. It was difficult to argue against the viability of the proposals.
- The building did need bringing back into use but there was sympathy for those who objected against.
- The design was subjective but a viable scheme was needed.
- An attempt to replicate the existing materials could provide an unsuitable finish.
- Any extension to a listed building could be considered to be harmful.
- There was no disagreement with the principal of use.

A motion was made to defer the application for one more cycle to request that further discussions be held with officers and the developer to consider the demolition of the existing extension and rebuild with a design which would better reflect the current listed building. This was subsequently seconded but at the vote was not carried.

Further comments were made which included the benefits of bringing the building back into use, the benefit of visiting the site and the benefits of re-using the tower rather than having it blocked off.

It was proposed to amend the officer recommendation in the report to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer to allow for submission of detailed elevation drawings for consideration and approval . A motion was made to reflect this. This was seconded and subsequently voted on.

RESOLVED – That the applications be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the submission of detailed elevation drawings with regard to the first floor extension and cladding to lower floor.

69 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday, 20 January 2022 at 1.30 p.m.