

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 10TH DECEMBER, 2020**

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

Councillors B Anderson, K Brooks,  
S Hamilton, J Heselwood, D Ragan,  
J Shemilt and P Wray

### **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 Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations.

### **42 Apologies for Absence**

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

### **43 Minutes - 29 October 2020**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 29 October 2020 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **44 Application 20/05524/FU - Chevin Nurseries, Carlton Lane, Yeadon**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a detached dwelling at Chevin Nurseries, Carlton Lane Yeadon.

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

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

- The application had been brought to Panel at the request of a local Ward Councillor.

- The application site has had 3 previous refusals for planning permission. One for a development of 6 dwellings, one for a development of 4 dwellings and one for the development of a single dwelling. The application for the single dwelling was refused due to impact on the greenbelt, being out of character for the area and not being sustainable.
- Reference was made to neighbouring applications that had been refused and subsequent appeals including an appeal at the application site where the Inspector did not uphold the reasons for refusal due to impact to the greenbelt and sustainability with regards for a single dwelling.
- Comparisons between this and the previously refused application.
- Materials to be used.
- There was an additional objection to those outlined in the report that a five bedroom house in this location was not necessary to supply local need.
- The application was recommended for approval.

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

- The floor area of the proposed property was of a similar scale to other houses on the street.
- There was still some concern that there were issues with regard to the greenbelt and highways.
- Access to the site was difficult due to it being situated on a corner.
- Were the proposals infill or not?

In reaching their decision the Panel noted the planning history of the application site and a nearby site on Carlton Lane. Specifically appeal decisions relating to each of the sites both of which were received in July of this year, and both of which concerned proposals for new houses in the Green Belt. Whilst both appeals were dismissed the two Planning Inspectors reached different conclusions on the acceptability of the principle of development and specifically whether the proposals constituted infill development (in principle an acceptable form of development in the Green Belt). For the application site the Inspector concluded that a new dwelling was acceptable in principle and dismissed the appeal for reasons relating to the impact of the proposed dwelling on the spatial characteristics of the locality. The application before Members presented a revised proposal that sought to overcome the Inspector's criticism. The Panel were concerned and disappointed with the conclusions reached by the Inspector at appeal and the inconsistency of approach adopted by the respective Inspectors. However, Members concluded that in light of the Inspector's decision they had no option but to grant planning permission in accordance with officer advice.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be granted in accordance with the officer recommendation.

In reaching their decision the Panel noted the planning history of the application site and a nearby site on Carlton Lane. Specifically appeal decisions relating to each of the sites both of which were received in July of this year, and both of which concerned proposals for new houses in the Green Belt. Whilst both appeals were dismissed the two Planning Inspectors reached different conclusions on the acceptability of the principle of development and specifically whether the proposals constituted infill development (in principle an acceptable form of development in the Green Belt). For the application site the Inspector concluded that a new dwelling was acceptable in principle and dismissed the appeal for reasons relating to the impact of the proposed dwelling on the spatial characteristics of the locality. The application before Members presented a revised proposal that sought to overcome the Inspector's criticism. The Panel were concerned and disappointed with the conclusions reached by the Inspector at appeal and the inconsistency of approach adopted by the respective Inspectors. However, Members concluded that in light of the Inspector's decision they had no option but to grant planning permission in accordance with officer advice.

#### **45 Chair's Closing Remarks**

The Chair informed the Panel that Pam Warburton would shortly be leaving her role as Customer Services Manager within Planning Services. On behalf of the Panel, the Chair expressed appreciation to Pam for all her hard work and wished her well for the future.

#### **46 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday, 28 January 2021 at 1.30 p.m.