

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 17TH MARCH, 2016**

**PRESENT:** Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, J Bentley, A Castle,  
M Coulson, R Finnigan, M Harland,  
J Heselwood, E Nash and R Wood

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

Members were advised that an appendix to Agenda Item 10, Application 15/04285/FU – Billing Dam, Billing View, Rawdon, Leeds contained information relating to financial matters and was considered to be exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4 (3)

### **95 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

Councillor Nash informed the meeting that she was known to the applicant of Agenda Item 9, Application 15/07550/FU – Church View, Arthington Lane, Leeds.

### **96 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors A Smart and C Towler.

Councillor M Harland was in attendance as a substitute Member.

### **97 Minutes - 18 February 2016**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 February 2016 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **98 Application 15/05383/FU - Land adjacent to 3 Coronation Street, Carlton**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for two semi-detached houses with associated works on land adjacent to 3 Coronation Street, Carlton.

The application had been deferred at the previous meeting of the South and West Plans Panel and Members had visited the site beforehand on that day. Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion on this application.

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

- Proximity of the proposals to neighbouring properties and the local primary school.
- Access arrangements to the proposed properties and the school.
- Proposed parking arrangements – each new property would have two parking spaces.
- Existing hedges and trees would be retained and there would be new hedging to boundaries.
- There had been some concern from local residents regarding overshadowing and sun path and shadow analysis had been provided.
- Further concerns to the application including accessibility, existing problems due to school traffic and the loss of open space.
- A highways assessment had been carried out and there had not been any objections from Highways.
- It was felt that the proposals were in keeping with the village and surrounding area and it was recommended that the application be approved.

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

- There were no parking restrictions on New Road – it was reported that parking was prevented due to the location of the bus stop and there would be a preferable situation following development with allocated spaces for the new properties and for an existing property.
- There would be a slight increase in overshadowing of existing dwellings but was not felt enough to cause any significant harm.
- Concern was expressed regarding proposed properties having front doors that were located next to each other and the potential impact on privacy.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report.

**99 Application 16/00513/FU - 37 Kirkwood Way, Cookridge, LS16 7EU**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a single storey front extension at 37 Kirkwood Way, Cookridge, Leeds.

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

Further issues highlighted in the report included the following:

- The application was brought to the Panel as it was made by a Leeds City Councillor.
- The application was for a modest extension to the front of the property of a similar design of the rest of the property.

- Materials would match existing materials used.
- The application was recommended for approval.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and conditions outlined in the report.

**100 Application 15/07550/FU - Church View, Arthington Lane, LS21 1PJ**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the demolition of an existing dwelling, associated alterations to Jasmine Cottage and erection of replacement dwelling with access and landscaping at Church View, Arthington Lane, Arthington, Otley.

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

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

- The site fell within the greenbelt and was also part of a special landscape area.
- It was proposed to demolish the existing Church View property, which adjoined Jasmine Cottage, and replace it with a detached dwelling approximately 30 metres into the site.
- There had been letters of support from existing residents of the properties and a local Ward Councillor.
- It was recommended that the application be refused. Reasons for refusal included harm to the greenbelt and development in the curtilage of the Grade II listed Arthington Hall.

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

- The proposals did not fall within the parkland curtilage of Arthington Hall.
- There was no long term solution for the existing Church View property – the occupants of the property suffered from excessive levels of vibration and noise and air pollution due to the close proximity of the road. The stone on the roadside wall was also starting to deteriorate due to water and salt damage.
- Roadside drainage was not efficient and this caused further problems with water damage to the Church View building.

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

- The building proposed to be demolished was not listed but considered to be within the curtilage of the Grade II listed Arthington Hall.
- Concern that the proposed dwelling would be out of character in open parkland and dominate the greenspace.

- It was felt that Jasmine Cottage could be improved with the demolition of Cliff View.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be refused as per the officer recommendation and reasons outlined in the report.

*(Councillor E Nash left the room during the discussion and voting on this item)*

**101 Application 15/04285/FU - Billing Dam, Billing View, Rawdon, Leeds, LS19 6PR**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the erection of a dwelling with angling facility, car parking and retaining wall at Billing Dam Fishery, Billing Dam, Billing View, Rawdon, Leeds.

The application had been deferred at the meeting of the South and West Plans Panel held in October 2015 to allow the applicant to submit further information to substantiate the special circumstances for development on the greenbelt.

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

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

- There was concern as to whether the proposed business was viable. There would be high start-up costs and running costs and there was a lack of evidence to demonstrate the viability of the proposals.
- It was recommended to refuse the applications. Reasons for this included intrusion on the greenbelt, loss of open space and no demonstration of special circumstances for development on the greenbelt.
- The applicant had requested that the application be deferred to allow further information to be submitted.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel. Issues raised included the following:

- The financial assessment made was based in a mortgage requirement when there was no need for a mortgage for the proposals.
- The issue of developing on the greenbelt was significantly different due to the development purpose of sport and recreation and the requirement to make the business viable.
- The applicant would accept a temporary permission to demonstrate the viability of the proposals.

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

- The design of the proposed dwelling and facility appeared to be acceptable and it was asked if they could be sited elsewhere. The applicant's representative reported that the location proposed was felt to be the best option and a local Ward Councillor had also been in agreement with this.
- Extensive surveys had been carried out for potential users of the site and facilities. Interest had been shown by schools although it had not been possible to get any firm commitment pending approval of the planning application.
- Members were asked to consider whether they felt that enough further information could be submitted to allow a further deferral before a decision could be made.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred to afford the applicant further opportunity to provide additional viability information.