

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 26TH AUGUST, 2021**

**PRESENT:** Councillor E Taylor in the Chair

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

### **38 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

There were no appeals.

### **39 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There was no exempt information.

### **40 Late Items**

There were no late items.

### **41 Declarations of Interests**

There were no declarations.

### **42 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor R Finnigan.

### **43 Minutes - 1 July 2021**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meetings held on 1 July 2021 be confirmed as correct records subject to the following amendment:

Minute 22 - Application 19/01670 – Land Off Cockshott Road, Armley

- To amend bullet point to – Re-use of wood from trees that have been removed to be discussed with the applicant.

### **44 Application 21-02971-FU - 3 Glebe Terrace, Headingley, LS16 5NA**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the demolition of the existing outbuilding, erection of a single storey side and rear extension at 3 Glebe Terrace, Headingley, Leeds, LS16 5NA.

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

The following was highlighted:

- Additional information relating to the parapet and skylight details had been received.
- There had been a late representation which highlighted issues relating to land levels.
- The property fell within the Far Headingley Conservation Area where the terrace was identified as a positive building.
- There were modest changes in land levels across the terrace.
- The rear elevation of the property was brick and render and was screened from wider views.
- There was no uniformity with extensions of other properties along the terrace.
- The proposed extension would not extend any further back than the existing structure but would extend to cover the full width of the property.
- There had been 31 letters of objection from 13 different households. The plans had been revised during the process of the application.
- Consideration had been given to the fact that the property fell within the conservation area and the statutory requirements to have regard to that and the National Planning Policy Framework had to be met. Although the extension had a proposed flat roof, it was not felt to be subordinate and materials matched the existing materials. There was an array of varying styles of rear extension across the terrace and these were well screened and the proposals were not considered to be incongruous within the character of the area.
- In relation to neighbouring properties, the extension would not protrude further than others. There was a slight difference in the levels of the land.
- It was recommended that the application be approved.

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

- Further consideration needed to be given to the revised proposals with regard to the finished levels of the plans. Reference was made to the difference in levels between properties. There was concern that the extension could be higher than 4 metres due to the change in levels and this needed detailing in the plans. The lack of scale on the plans made it impossible to gauge how it may impact on residential amenity.
- There would be an impact on the unique character and appearance of the conservation area. Proposals for a flat roof did not enhance or conserve the character of the area. All others had pitched slate roofs. It would not fit with the host or adjoining properties.
- It was felt that the plans lacked the necessary detail to assess the proposal and its impact on amenity within the conservation area and it was requested that accurate drawings including details of land levels and elevations be produced.

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

- The property was being refurbished for use as a family home.
- The proposals would enhance the character of the area. The existing extension was in a state of disrepair.
- The applicant had worked closely with planning and conservation officers throughout the development of the proposals.
- Materials would match those of the existing extension.
- The proposed extension would not go any further back and would not go as far back as others.
- There would be no overbearing impacts or loss of light or amenity to neighbouring properties.
- The flat roof does not detract from the character of the area.
- With regards to concerns that there could be a potential use as a HMO this was not the applicant's intention, and such a change would require planning permission.
- The application was policy compliant, and Panel was asked to approve the application in line with the planning and conservation officer's advice.
- The applicant was willing to accept a condition relating to the finished floor levels.
- In response to questions, the following was discussed:
  - The applicant had spoken to neighbouring residents with regards to the proposals and their intention to use it as a family home.
  - The plans submitted had been as detailed as necessary.
  - The flat roof had been chosen as a design feature.
  - There were no plans for air/ground sourced heating.
  - The applicant was happy for a condition with regard to floor levels. The existing outbuilding demonstrated what the levels would be like. The change in levels was quite small. The Planning Officer confirmed that the difference in levels was acceptable.
  - The extension would be higher where it joined the property that the existing extension.

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

- The conservation officer considered the proposals to be acceptable and felt that the flat roof was suitable. A pitched roof may have increased the height.
- There had been a written representation from a Ward Councillor.
- There were conditions with regards to the type materials to be used.
- The window above the existing extension was a sash window and not multi-paned as shown on the plans. A condition could be included to retain the current style of first floor windows.

- It would not be proportionate to add a condition regarding air/ground sourced heating.

The Head of Development Management gave a summary of the application following the discussion and the suggested additional conditions with regards to floor levels and to retain the existing window style at first floor level.

**RESOLVED** – That permission be granted subject to the conditions outlined in the report and also the following conditions:

- Details of finished floor levels of the new extension to be submitted and agreed
- Existing first floor windows to be retained, or repaired/replaced in the current style and materials

**45 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday, 23 September 2021 at 1.30 p.m.