

**NORTH AND EAST PLANS PANEL
18TH APRIL 2013**

**SUPPLEMENTARY PACK CONTAINING INFORMATION
RELATING TO:**

**ITEM 8 - APPLICATION 13/00160/FU – THE BUNGALOW MAIN
STREET WETHERBY**

**ITEM 10 – APPLICATION 13/00369/FU – 2 ST PETER’S GARTH
THORNER**

**ITEM 12 – APPLICATION 13/01321/FU – 60 JACKSON AVENUE
GLEDHOW**

**ITEM 13 – APPLICATION 11/05186/FU – BENGAL BRASSERIE
2 VICTORIA COURT WETHERBY**

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTH & EAST PLANS PANEL – 18TH APRIL 2013

MISSING TEXT FROM ABOVE AGENDA

(Item 8 - Page 22)

APPLICATION - 13/00160/FU - The Bungalow Main Street Wetherby

8.4 UDP Policies:

LD1 Any landscape scheme should normally:

- i. Reflect the scale and form of adjacent development and the character of the area;
- ii. Complement and avoid detracting from views, skylines and landmarks;
- iii. Provide suitable access for people with disabilities;

10.4 Concern has been raised by neighbours with regarding to the proposed use of uPVC windows; wooden windows were imposed by condition on the previous approval. Although the use of uPVC windows within a conservation area is regrettable and does lead to a general diminution of character, because the current application is for an extension to an existing dwelling and not a new build property the policy tests are slightly different. Where existing houses are being extended the materials must usually match the existing and the authority is not able to impose conditions which do not reasonably relate to the development. The existing

10.9 Concern has also been raised regarding the impact of construction traffic upon highway safety. Although it is not usual to impose any restrictions upon building works relating to house extensions, in this instance the imposition of a condition is considered to be justified. There is no space within the immediate vicinity for the road to accommodate the on-street parking which often occurs during construction. The disruption which would occur would affect all traffic passing through the village and could narrow the carriageway to a point where busses and other large vehicles were unable to pass. As such a condition requiring the upgrade works to the access prior to the commencement of construction and another requiring details of access

- 10.15 The proposal is also considered acceptable in respect of overlooking. Additional ground and first floor glazing is proposed to the front and rear as well as the north-east side elevation of the new two storey extension. A terrace area is also proposed to the rear of this extension. The windows to the front do not raise a significant concern as these are not set forward of the existing and thus retain a similar

(Item 10 - Page 42)

APPLICATION – 13/00369/FU – 2 St Peter’s Garth, Thorner

6.0 PUBLIC/LOCAL RESPONSE:

- 6.4 Following the concerns raised by officers letters have been received from

10.0 APPRAISAL

Design and Character

- 10.1 The National Planning Policy Framework states that “good design is indivisible from good planning” and authorities are encouraged to refuse “development of poor
- 10.5 The proposed roof pitch is, however, the most concerning aspect of the detailed design of the extension. This is excessively shallow and contrasts poorly with both the flat roofed extensions of surrounding houses and the more steeply pitched roof of the existing house. This shallow roof pitch is driven by the excessive 3.0m projection of the extension and there is no way to create an appropriately pitched

(Item 12 - Page 74)

APPLICATION 13/01321/FU – 60 Jackson Avenue Gledhow

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

- 4.1 Reference: 12/04100/FU Proposal: First floor side extension with window to side
Status: A Decision Date: 13-NOV-12

(Item 13 - Page 80)

APPLICATION 11/05186/FU - Bengal Brasserie, 2 Victoria Court, Wetherby

- 3.3 Appendix 9 of the Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) (UDP) provides parking guidelines, and this provides the maximum parking requirement for the restaurant use without consideration of staff parking as 31 spaces. Accordingly, in terms of the existing situation there is a shortfall in relation to the UDP maximum guideline. The Inspector noted that the development at Victoria Court is relatively recent and considered that the level of parking provision was presumably viewed as adequate at the time planning permission was granted. Whilst he noted that the takeaway use would add to the parking requirement, in his view this would be a small number.

This page is intentionally left blank