

---

MEETING	WEST & CITY CENTRE AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
DATE	21 JUNE 2007
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS B WATSON (CHAIR), SUE GALLOWAY (VICE-CHAIR) (not 3h & 3i), HORTON (not 3D, 3h & 3i), Galvin, GILLIES, Gunnell, JAMIESON-BALL (not 3c & 3g) and Sunderland (not 3h & 3i)
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS REID

---

## 1. INSPECTION OF SITES

The following sites were inspected before the meeting.

Site	Attended by	Reason for Visit
212 Bishopthorpe Road	Councillors B Watson, Gillies, Sunderland, Horton, Sue Galloway, Gunnell and Galvin	On the recommendation of the Assistant Director
214 Bishopthorpe Road	Councillors B Watson, Gillies, Sunderland, Horton, Sue Galloway, Gunnell and Galvin	On the recommendation of the Assistant Director
59 Temple Lane	Councillors B Watson, Gillies, Sunderland, Horton, Sue Galloway, Gunnell and Galvin	At the request of Councillor Hopton.
Askham Bryan College	Councillors B Watson, Gillies, Sunderland, Sue Galloway, Gunnell and Galvin	As the application is recommended for approval and objections have been received from the Parish Council
14 Foxton	Councillors B Watson, Gillies, Sunderland, Horton, Sue Galloway, Gunnell and Galvin	As the application is recommended for approval and objections have been received
25 Aldersyde	Councillors B Watson, Gillies, Sunderland, Horton, Sue Galloway, Gunnell and Galvin	As the application is recommended for approval and objections have been received
100 Tadcaster Road	Councillors B	As the application is

	Watson, Gillies, Sunderland, Horton, Sue Galloway, Gunnell and Galvin	recommended for approval and objections have been received
Former Waterworks Engine House, Museum Street	Councillors B Watson, Gillies, Gunnell and Galvin	As the applications have been recommended for approval and objections have been received

## 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

At this point in the meeting Members were asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda.

Councillor Horton declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 3f (25 Aldersyde), as he knew the speaker. He also declared a personal prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 3d as he knew the speaker well. He left the room and took no part in the debate.

Councillors Sue Galloway, Horton and Sunderland all declared personal prejudicial interests in Agenda Items 3h and 3i (Former Waterworks Engine House, Museum Street), as they were Members of the Shadow Executive or Executive Committees when this site was discussed. They left the room and took no part in the debate.

Councillor Gunnell declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Agenda Items 3h & 3i (Former Waterworks Engine House, Museum Street) as she knew one of the speakers.

Councillor Jamieson-Ball declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Agenda Items 3h & 3i (Former Waterworks Engine House, Museum Street) as he knew one of the speakers.

## 3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme on general issues within the remit of the Sub-Committee.

## 4. PLANS LIST

Members considered a schedule of reports of the Assistant Director (Planning and Sustainable Development), relating to the following planning applications, outlining the proposals and relevant policy considerations and setting out the views and advice of consultees and Officers.

### 4a 212 Bishopthorpe Road, York (07/00588/FUL)

Members considered a full application (retrospective) submitted by Mrs Grainne Timmis for the alteration to the roof at the rear of 212 Bishopthorpe Road to provide a new sheer second floor level.

Officers updated that the applicants for both 212 and 214 Bishopthorpe Road had submitted some additional information which outlined a number of instances where planning permission had been granted for similar extensions.

Representations were received from the applicant at 212 Bishopthorpe Road who felt that the roof extensions to both properties were in keeping with the buildings. He also stated that reclaimed materials had been used for the building works. He did not feel they were disproportional extensions and said that they were not very visible from the road. He commented on the fact that neighbours had not made any objections to the extensions.

Members discussed various matters including whether the extensions contravened policy (policy states that the extensions should be below the roofline), whether the extensions visually fitted in with the surrounding buildings and whether the extensions were visible from the road.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be refused

**REASON:** The Local Planning Authority considers that the roof extension by virtue of its shape and overall size is an overprominent addition, which is unsympathetic and harmful to the appearance of 212 and 214 Bishopthorpe Road and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

As such the proposal is contrary to PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development which states that design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area should not be accepted and policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Draft Local Plan GP1 states that development proposals must, respect or enhance the local environment; be of a layout, scale, mass and design that is compatible with the surrounding area; provide and protect amenity space; ensure no undue adverse impact from noise disturbance, overlooking, overshadowing or over dominance. H7 states that planning permission will be granted for house extensions where: the design and materials are sympathetic to the main dwelling and the locality of the development; the scale is appropriate, there is no adverse impact on residential amenity; and that the proposed development does not result in an unacceptable loss of private amenity space within the curtilage of the dwelling.

**4b 214 Bishopthorpe Road, York (07/00586/FUL)**

Members considered a full application (retrospective) submitted by James Herbert for the alteration to the roof at the rear of 214 Bishopthorpe Road to provide a new sheer second floor level.

Officers updated that the applicants for both 212 and 214 Bishopthorpe Road had submitted some additional information which outlined a number of instances where planning permission had been granted for similar extensions.

Representations were received from the applicant at 212 Bishopthorpe Road who felt that the roof extensions to both properties were in keeping with the buildings. He also stated that reclaimed materials had been used for the building works. He did not feel they were disproportional extensions and said that they were not very visible from the road. He commented on the fact that neighbours had not made any objections to the extensions.

Members discussed various matters including whether the extensions contravened policy (policy states that the extensions should be below the roofline), whether the extensions visually fitted in with the surrounding buildings and whether the extensions were visible from the road.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be refused

**REASON:** The Local Planning Authority considers that the roof extension by virtue of its shape and overall size is an overprominent addition, which is unsympathetic and harmful to the appearance of 212 and 214 Bishopthorpe Road and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

As such the proposal is contrary to PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development which states that design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area should not be accepted and policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Draft Local Plan GP1 states that development proposals must, respect or enhance the local environment; be of a layout, scale, mass and design that is compatible with the surrounding area; provide and protect amenity space; ensure no undue adverse impact from noise disturbance, overlooking, overshadowing or over dominance. H7 states that planning permission will be granted for house extensions where: the design and materials are sympathetic to the main dwelling and the locality of the development; the scale is appropriate, there is no adverse impact on residential amenity; and that the proposed development does not result in an unacceptable loss of private amenity space within the curtilage of the dwelling.

**4c Danesway, 59 Temple Lane, Copmanthorpe, York (07/00595/FUL)**

Members considered a full application submitted by Mr and Mrs Hudson for the erection of a pitched roof dormer bungalow with detached garage.

Officers updated that they had amended the reason for refusal of this application and this was set out below.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

REASON: The proposed dwelling by virtue of its location, scale, design and mass would result in a cramped and overdeveloped appearance and is not appropriate to the form and low density character of the settlement, it would not constitute infilling (defined as the filling of a small gap in an otherwise built up frontage) and is therefore considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt that would impact on the openness of the Green Belt and therefore is contrary to Policies GP1, GP10, GB1 and GB2 of the City of York Council Development Control Local Plan (2005) and Government planning policy guidance contained in PPG2 "Green Belts".

**4d Askham Bryan College, College Service Roads, Askham Bryan, York (07/00753/FULM)**

Members considered a major full application submitted by the Minster Veterinary Practice for the proposed erection of a veterinary hospital with associated outbuildings, car parking and vehicular access.

The following three updates were reported by Officers

- That subject to soakaways being suitable as a means of surface water disposal, no objections were raised by the Environment Agency or Marston Moor Internal Drainage Board. An additional condition regarding drainage would be added if the proposed development were to be approved by Members.
- A Transport Assessment had been submitted on behalf of the Applicant. It had been calculated that the peak hour trips to and from the site would be between 10:00 and 11:00, which is outside the normal highway peak hours. The estimated trip generation between 08:00 and 09:00 was 62 trips (all arrivals), and between 17:00 and 18:00 the number of trips was estimated at 124 (31 arrivals and 93 departures). In the light of this Transport Assessment, Highways (Network Management) raised no objection to the proposal subject to the conditions listed below being incorporated if the application were to be approved by the Sub-Committee today.
- Additional representations in objection to the proposed development had been received from Askham Bryan Parish Council. These stated that the proposal was 'inappropriate development within the Green Belt'. The application did not

claim that there were any very special circumstances to justify approval. The traffic generated would inevitably pass through the village to and from the new roundabout on the A1237.

Representations were received from Askham Bryan Parish Council in objection to the proposed development. Their spokesperson claimed that development of the Green Belt could only be justified in special circumstances. The Parish Council did not believe that the Applicants had proved this to be the case. They also had concerns regarding the use of the proposed veterinary hospital and felt that this would be primarily commercial rather than educational. It was added that if the Sub-Committee were minded to approve the application then a condition should be stipulated that road signs to the development should be confined to the A64 junction area.

Representations were received from a senior partner of Minster Veterinary Practice (the Applicants) in support of the application. He said that the proposed veterinary hospital would give the practice much better equine facilities. This side of the practice had grown enormously in the last few years and they were now receiving referrals from all over the North of England as well as casualties from York Racecourse. He said that most people would arrive at the facility by way of the A64 rather than through the village. The practice had been searching for a suitable site for over a year and felt that Askham Bryan College and Minster Veterinary Practice had the capability of working well together to provide a much needed facility.

Members asked the Applicant whether the aim was to turn the proposed veterinary hospital into a centre of excellence and it was acknowledged that it was. Members said that they could see the benefits of the development to the college but asked the Applicant what the benefits for Minster Veterinary Practice would be. The Applicant responded that the equine side of the business equated to approximately one quarter of the business's turnover and that about one third of all staff were involved with it. They were looking at assisting the college to upgrade some of its courses to enable it to compete with other establishments. He also added that he wholeheartedly supported the Parish Council in terms of keeping traffic away from the village.

Representations were received from the Deputy Principal of Askham Bryan College who informed the Sub-Committee that any new buildings on campus must add value to the college. There were approximately 500 students studying equine management, which amounted to about 45% of all students at the college. The college had been validated to offer a foundation course in Equine Nursing from September 2007 and this would require input from an employer.

Members said that the proposed new facility would add prestige to the college and help enhance its reputation as a provider of excellent educational courses. They asked the Deputy Principal how the educational and commercial sides of the business would be integrated with the college. He responded that the college curriculum would deliver regular timetabled courses and if any particularly interesting cases came to the veterinary hospital then students would be able to attend on an ad hoc basis.

Members felt that the proposed development had very clear educational benefits and that partnerships between educational establishments and commercial enterprises were becoming more popular.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions outlined in the report and the following additional conditions:

1. Prior to the development coming into use, all areas used by vehicles shall be surfaced, sealed and positively drained within the site, in accordance with details which have been previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent the egress of water and loose material onto the public highway.

2. The development shall not be begun until details of the junction between the internal access road and the highway have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall not come into use until that junction has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: In the interests of road safety.

3. The building shall not be occupied until the areas shown on the approved plans for parking and manoeuvring of vehicles (and cycles, if shown) have been constructed and laid out in accordance with the approved plans, and thereafter such areas shall be retained solely for such purposes.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

4. No part of the site shall come into use until the turning areas have been provided in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter the turning areas shall be retained free of all obstructions and used solely for the intended purpose.

Reason: To enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear thereby ensuring the safe and free passage of traffic on the public highway.

5. Prior to the development commencing details of the measures to be employed to prevent the egress of mud, water and other detritus onto the public highway, and details of the measures to be employed to remove any such substance from the public highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such measures as shall have been approved shall be employed and adhered to at all times during construction works.

Reason: To prevent the egress of water and loose material creating a hazard on the public highway.

6. Prior to the commencement of the use hereby approved, provision shall be made within the site for accommodation of delivery/service vehicles in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter all such areas shall be retained free of all obstructions and used solely for the intended purpose.

Reason: To ensure that delivery/service vehicles can be accommodated within the site and to maintain the free and safe passage of highway users.

7. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, including the installation of a Stormwater Management System, in accordance with details which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of satisfactory drainage.

**REASON:**

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report and above, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to:

- design and landscape considerations
- traffic, highway and access issues
- sustainability
- drainage



As such the proposal complies with Policies GB11, ED5, GP1, GP4a, GP9 and GP11 of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

In addition, the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that there are very special circumstances in this case sufficient to clearly outweigh the limited harm that would be caused to the Green Belt. In particular, it is considered that the establishment of a veterinary facility of regional importance, together with the additional educational opportunities that would result from the collaboration with the college are positive factors that weigh in favour of the proposal. Furthermore, the limited visual impact of the proposal due to the existing and proposed screening arrangements and the particular site characteristics would minimise the harm to the Green Belt.

**4e 14 Foxton, York (07/00271/OUT)**

Members considered an outline application submitted by Mr D Seavers for the erection of a detached single storey dwelling.

Officers updated that Conditions 9 and 10 as set out in the report had been removed and replaced with the following:

- The dwelling hereby approved shall be single storey with no accommodation in the roof, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity

An e-mail had also been received from Councillor Holvey on behalf of residents, this was circulated to Members at the meeting. It raised concerns regarding the proximity of the proposed new building to those in Chantry Close. He said that there would be a loss of amenity in terms of light and privacy and the proposed new building would be detrimental to the continued use of the gardens of these properties. It was also likely that there would be an increase in flooding in the gardens on Chantry Close with any form of new development in the area.

Representations were received, in objection, from the Woodthorpe and Dringhouses Planning Panel who were concerned about the implications this application would have on the local community. The proposed new building would only be a few metres away from the boundary of Chantry Close and to have a new dwelling at the bottom of your garden was not conducive to happy living. They felt that the development would have a detrimental effect on the area.

Some Members thought that the proposed new building would constitute overdevelopment of the area and would have a detrimental effect on neighbours.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

REASON: In view of the size of the site and the relationship with adjacent buildings the erection of a dwelling on the land would result in a development that would appear to be cramped and out of character with its surroundings, furthermore, because of its proximity to nos. 17 - 21 Chantry Close a dwelling would be likely to harm the living conditions of these bungalows and their rear gardens through loss of outlook and an overbearing impact. The proposal would be contrary to policy GP1 and GP10 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan 2005.

**4f 25 Aldersyde, York (07/01060)**

Members considered a full application submitted by Aldersyde Estates Limited for the erection of two detached two storey dwellings after demolition of the existing dwelling.

Officers updated that they had received three additional comments as follows: -

- The Landscape Officer considered that the red maple tree close to the boundary of the site with the garages and Aldersyde should be protected. The proposed hardstanding had not been fully delineated on the plan and was required to stop 1.5m from the trunk. Suitable materials, tree protection and construction methods should be used and a condition is proposed addressing these requirements. There are no windows in the end elevation of this house that would be affected by the tree and the distance from the tree to the house would be acceptable.
- Councillor Reid raised concerns on behalf of residents regarding overdevelopment of the site which could be potentially detrimental to the area. She made comment on the fact that there was no intention to provide any garaging on the proposed development and suggested that permitted development rights were removed in order to ensure that any future garages (or extensions) were in keeping with both the house design and the area. She also asked that there was adequate protection for the existing planting.
- One representation had been received stressing that the development would be an overdevelopment of the site that would ruin the character of the area forever.

Representations were received, in objection, from a local resident who spoke on behalf of the residents of the Aldersyde Estate. She was concerned that the proposed buildings would be an overdevelopment of a small site and would be detrimental to the area as well as bringing more cars to an already problematic area in terms of parking. The demolition of the existing bungalow would be difficult as there was very little room for vehicles to manoeuvre.

Representations were received from the Applicant who said that he took the concerns of the residents very seriously but did not believe that the scheme would alter the character of the area.

Members raised concerns about the lack of garaging provided in this development and the Applicant clarified that one of the dwellings would have a garage and there would be off street parking for 2 cars per house.

Some Members thought there could be potential damage to the verges from construction traffic and requested the dilapidation condition be added if the proposed development was approved. There were also discussions about re-using the materials from the demolished bungalow but it was decided that the site was too small for this.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved subject to the conditions outlined in the report and the following additional conditions:

1. Before the commencement of development, including demolition, building operations, or the importing of materials and any excavations, a method statement regarding protection measures for the existing trees shown to be retained on the approved drawings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This statement shall include details and locations of protective fencing shown on a plan, phasing of works, site access during demolition/construction, type of construction machinery/vehicles to be used, (Including delivery and collection lorries and arrangements for loading /off- loading), parking arrangements for site vehicles and storage of materials, location of marketing cabin. The method statement shall include construction details and existing and proposed levels, where a change in surface material and/or levels are proposed within the canopy spread and likely rooting zone of the trees to be affected.

The protective fencing line shall be adhered to at all times during development to create an exclusion zone. None of the following activities shall take place within the exclusion zone: excavation, raising of levels, storage of any materials or top soil, lighting of fires, parking or manoeuvring of vehicles; there shall be no site huts, no mixing of cement, no disposing of washings, no stored fuel, no new service runs.

**Reason:** To ensure the protection of existing trees before, during and after development which are

covered by a Tree Preservation Order and/or make a significant contribution to the amenity of the area and/ or development.

2. Prior to works starting on site a dilapidation survey of the highways adjoining the site shall be jointly undertaken with the Council and the results of which shall be agreed in writing with the LPA.

Reason: In the interests of the safety and good management of the public highway.

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order), development of the type described in Classes A-F of Schedule 2 Part 1 of that Order shall not be carried out without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of the adjoining residents the Local Planning Authority considers that it should exercise control over any future extensions or alterations which, without this condition, may have been carried out as "permitted development" under the above classes of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.

4. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, full scaled details of the proposed replacement garage/ cycle store shall be submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority, and thereafter the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with these details.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the condition listed above and the conditions in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the visual amenity and character of the adjacent listed building and the street scene, highway safety and the amenity of the neighbours. As such, the proposal complies with Policy E4 of the North Yorkshire County Structure Plan; Policies H4, H5, HE4, L1c, GP4, GP10, GP9 and GP1 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan – Incorporating the proposed 4<sup>th</sup> Set of Changes; and national planning guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement 1 “Delivering Sustainable

Development,” Planning Policy Statement 3 “Housing” and Planning Policy Guidance Note No. 15 “Planning and the Historic Environment.”

**4g 100 Tadcaster Road, Dringhouses, York (07/00959/FUL)**

Members considered a full application submitted by Mr and Mrs Kaye for a two storey pitched roof rear extension, detached double garage and replacement windows to front and back.

Officers updated that the applicants had withdrawn the detached double garage from the scheme.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the withdrawal of the detached double garage from the scheme and the conditions laid out in the report.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interest of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to design, local and residential amenity and safety. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1,NE1 and H7 of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

**4h Former Waterworks Engine House, Museum Street, York (06/02425/FUL)**

Members considered a full application submitted by the Lendal Tower Venture to change the use of the Engine House to form a restaurant (Class A3) and one apartment, the erection of an extension to form the restaurant dining room, a new outdoor terrace, new railings, gates and steps.

Officers updated that they had received an additional letter of objection which raised the following: -

- The relocation of the public toilets must be addressed before this application is considered.
- The location of the boat refuse/sluice disposal is unacceptable, being adjacent to the proposed restaurant entrance.
- The water point is to be located as an unwelcome and inappropriate addition to the Esplanade Frontage.
- All the sanitary and service facilities should be located together with the public toilets in one place.

They had also received a letter from the Inland Waterways Association which stated that it was essential that the application provided all the necessary facilities for boaters, including a 24 hour disabled toilet and a water point close to the river moorings. Temporary facilities must be provided during the construction period.

Officers said that there was an amendment to Condition 4 in the report and that ‘details of external lighting’ was to be added to the list of items

required. There were still outstanding objections from both the Environment Agency and the Council's Structures and Drainage Section. Any planning permission must be subject to these objections being satisfactorily addressed.

Representations were received from a local resident in objection to the proposed development. He said that the Esplanade had exceptional qualities, the proposed dining terrace was too wide, the proposed extension was a blank feature and would diminish the Engine House and there was little greenery in the proposed plans.

Representations were also received from the Inland Waterways Association. Their spokesman said that the toilets for the boating community were too far away and not very accessible for the disabled; it was also a long distance for them to carry waste. He felt it was unfortunate that more consultation had not taken place with the boating community.

Representations were received from the Applicant's Architect who said that the new riverside restaurant would have a sunny south facing dining area which would be an asset to York. The building had been designed to define the twenty first century as Lendal Tower was compromised of buildings of many ages. The Engine House itself was too small to be the restaurant and there would be a conflict with the residents; therefore it was necessary to build an extension for the proposed restaurant.

Members raised questions regarding the placement of the public and disabled toilets, deliveries to the restaurant and facilities for the boating community. Some Members felt that the area was in need of improvement and thought the design of the proposed extension was very good; they felt that glass was the least obtrusive material that could be used for the building. Members said that Condition 16 in the report covered the potential problem regarding public toilets and clearly stated that 'the existing toilet block shall not be demolished unless and until alternative facilities (including facilities for boaters), whether temporary or otherwise, have been provided.' Other Members felt that the Engine House should be used as the restaurant and the extension on the side was unnecessary. Concerns were also raised regarding the removal of railings from this part of the Esplanade.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved subject to the drainage and flooding issues being satisfactorily resolved, the conditions in the report and the amended condition listed below:

- Large scale details of the items listed below shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

– glazing details, including glazing bars

- glazed link between the existing building and the extension
- roof overhang
- glazed screen to front of dining terrace
- railing, gates, steps and stone pillars
- rainwater goods
- details of external lighting

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with these details.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed above and in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to:

- impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area
- impact on the setting on the adjacent listed building
- impact on the Museum Gardens
- replacement toilet facilities and facilities for boaters
- flood risk

As such the proposal complies with Policy E4 of the North Yorkshire County Structure Plan (Alteration No.3 Adopted 1995) and Policies GP1, HE2, HE3, HE9, HE12 and C3 of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

**4i Former Waterworks Engine House, Museum Street, York (06/02428/LBC)**

Members considered a Listed Building Consent application submitted by the Lendal Tower Venture for internal and external alterations including a new extension in connection with the proposed use as a restaurant and one apartment.

Officers updated that Condition 4 in the report had been amended.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions in the report and the amended Condition 4 detailed below.

- Large scale details of the items listed below shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- Glazing details, including glazing bars
- Glazed link between the existing building and the extension
- roof overhang
- glazed screen to the front of the dining terrace
- railings, gates, steps and stone pillars
- rainwater goods
- adaptations to the existing window openings
- details of lift assembly
- new internal partitions (to be scribed around existing detailing)
- details of all new doors and door openings
- details of all new windows and window openings
- details of floor and ceiling adaptations
- details of new staircases

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with these details

REASON:

The proposal, subject to the conditions listed above and in the report , would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to:

- the impact on the special architectural and historic character of the listed building

As such the proposal complies with Policy E4 of the North Yorkshire County Structure Plan (Alteration No.3 Adopted 1995) and Policy HE4 of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

COUNCILLOR B WATSON  
CHAIR

The meeting started at 3.05 pm and finished at 6.10 pm.