

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 14TH JANUARY, 2016

PRESENT: Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, J Bentley,
D Blackburn, A Castle, M Coulson,
J Heselwood, E Nash, A Smart, C Towler
and R Wood

76 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

Councillor R Wood declared an interest with regards to the applications for the applications for land adjacent to Flower Court, Burley Lane as he had previously been a Board Member of the Leeds and Yorkshire Housing Association. He took no part in the discussion or voting on these items.

77 Apologies for Absence

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

Councillor D Blackburn was in attendance as substitute.

78 Minutes - 10 December 2015

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2015 be confirmed as a correct record.

79 Applications 15/05445/FU & 15/05446/FU - Former site of 183 Haigh Moor Road, Tingley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a retrospective application for a detached house and realignment of plot boundary and an application for a detached garage and realignment of plot boundary at the former site of 183 Haigh Moor Road, Tingley.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this item.

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

- Planning approval for a detached house had been granted in 2014. The house had not been built in accordance with that approval and boundaries had also been inaccurate. Members were given details of measurements that were incorrect regarding the height and depth of the building – these measurements had been carried out by an

independent surveyor. It had also been built further forward and closer to an adjacent property.

- Enforcement action had been taken and a temporary stop notice had been issued in September 2015.
- Main concerns regarding the house included it being closer to the boundary of 185 Haigh Moor Road, increased height and an over dominating presence.
- Concern was expressed regarding the proposals for the detached garage due to its proximity to a grade II listed building and other designated none heritage assets.
- It was recommended to refuse both applications due to the impact on the amenity of existing residents and due to the harm to the setting of the listed building.

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

- It was accepted that the house had not been built exactly to plan. This error had occurred as ordnance survey plans had been used rather than topographical plans.
- The previous building overlooked the adjacent property.
- Members were asked to consider whether the changes from the approved plan were significant enough to merit refusal.
- The measurements that had been carried out by the independent surveyor were disputed by the applicant.
- Concern was expressed regarding the length of time between the commencement of the works and the enforcement notice being served.
- Overlooking other buildings was a normal feature in residential areas.
- The garage building was replacing an old timber built garage that was previously on the site.
- In response to a Members question, it was reported that the applicants measurements had been carried out by a geometrical survey.

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

- It was reported that enforcement action had commenced as soon as it was made aware that the building works were not in accordance with the approved application. This application was then submitted and subsequently refused.
- The independent surveyor had used traditional methods of measurement including physical measurements.
- There were no proposals for a garage on the originally approved application.

RESOLVED – That both applications 15/05445/FU and 15/05446/FU be refused as per the officer recommendations outlined in the report.

80 Applications 15/05230/FU and 15/05231/FU - Land adjacent to Flower Court, Burley Lane, Horsforth

The reports of the Chief Planning officer presented applications for the erection of a block of 11 older persons flats and two semi-detached houses at Flower Court, Horsforth, Leeds.

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

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

- The site was currently an amenity space and was in an overgrown state.
- There was existing older person's residential accommodation adjacent to the site.
- Gateposts to the site would be incorporated into a new boundary wall.
- Car parking for the flats would lie between the flats and proposed houses. There would be 17 spaces for the flats.
- Design principals would be similar to nearby terraced properties.
- Natural materials would be used – stone and slate.
- The houses would both have two parking spaces.
- The design proposals were sympathetic to the conservation area.
- Distances between the proposed buildings and existing properties complied with guidance.
- Some trees on the site would be lost but these were felt to be of poor quality. There would be a management plan to maintain the remaining trees.
- The Panel was made aware of representations from local residents and Ward Members.
- It was recommended to approve both applications.

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

- The loss of greenspace in a conservation area.
- The height of the proposed flats was 2 metres higher than existing properties and would have an overbearing appearance.
- Windows and gardens of existing properties would be overlooked.
- The proposals did not fit within the conservation area.
- In response to questions from Members the following as discussed:
 - The site was currently used by dog walkers.
 - The site could be turned into a usable community space.
 - Part of the site was currently used for Horsforth in Bloom.
 - Residents were surprised to see proposals to develop the site.

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

- There was a need for affordable social housing in the locality with over 2,000 outstanding applications in Horsforth.
- The applicant understood resident's concerns regarding the loss of greenspace and there would be a proposal to incorporate a usable greenspace within the boundary of the site. There would be an opportunity for local residents to be involved with the proposals for this.
- In response to Member's questions, the following was discussed:
 - The flats would be aimed at people over 55 years of age. The houses would be more general needs and suitable for families.
 - The flat sizes met guidance. If the roof of the flat building were to be lowered than size guidelines would not be met.

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

- Concern regarding parking on local streets – the parking available on site was above the minimum required.
- Inclusion of a condition for the flats to be let to older persons only.
- Conditions relating to materials to be used.

RESOLVED – That the applications be deferred to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to agreeing a suitable wording with the applicant to ensure the flats remain as social housing for older persons (i.e. over 55s).

The Chair to be consulted on materials in particular cladding system to rear.

81 Application 15/06698/FU - 5 Prince Henry Road, Otley

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the demolition of an existing bungalow and the construction of two detached dwellings at 5 Prince Henry Road, Otley.

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

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

- A previous application had been refused and dismissed on appeal due to the loss of garden space, size of proposed dwellings and being out of character with the street. This application had been significantly scaled back in comparison.
- Access to the site was shown. The hedge to the front would be retained.
- Reference was made to representations received from local residents and a Ward Councillor.
- It was considered that the applicant had revised the plans sufficiently following the appeal and it was recommended that the application be approved.

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

- The report did not refer to all the objections that had been submitted.
- The road was narrow and there would be difficulties getting in and out of driveways.
- The proposed houses were not of a good design and would not be in character with the rest of the street.
- It was not felt that the plans had been significantly altered from the application that had been refused.
- The proposals would be an enormous change to the street scene and the historical character of the street.
- The proposed buildings would overlook other properties which would impact on privacy and light.

The applicant addressed the Panel. The following issues were highlighted:

- The applicant lived in the existing bungalow and wanted to build a family home. There was opportunity to build two properties in an area that had a shortage of family homes.
- The bungalow was in a poor state of repair.
- The building designs would not be ultra-modern and would fit with the street scene.
- The applicant was willing to work with local residents with regards to design.

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

- The widths of the two driveways would be 3.2 metres and 4.6 metres which met guidelines and were felt to be more than adequate.
- Distance to the nearest other properties would be 21.5 metres and 23 metres which fell within recommended guidelines.
- There would be sufficient garden space for the proposed houses.
- The proposals would have an impact on the streetscene but there was already a mixture of different property types.
- Members were asked to consider further conditions should the application be approved to take account of demolition and construction times, a site management plan and details of proposed cycle stores.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report and subject to the additional conditions:

- Restriction of hours of demolition and construction
- Site management plan (including wheel washing)
- Submission of cycle store details.

