

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 21ST APRIL, 2016

PRESENT: Councillor C Gruen in the Chair

Councillors J Akhtar, B Anderson, A Castle,
M Coulson, R Finnigan, J Heselwood,
E Nash, A Smart and C Towler

102 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests.

Councillor C Gruen informed the meeting that she was known to the applicant in respect of Agenda Item 7, Garage Site adjacent to 1 St Ann's Lane, Burley as did Councillor B Anderson who had participated in discussions with the agent for the application but had not discussed the application itself.

103 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors J Bentley and R Wood.

Councillor B Anderson was in attendance as a substitute.

104 Minutes - 17 March 2016

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2016 be confirmed as a correct record.

105 Application 15/04158/FU - Garage Site adjacent to 11 St Ann's Lane, Burley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the demolition of garages and erection of attached pair of semi-detached houses with associated amenity space at 11 St Ann's Lane, Burley, Leeds.

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.

Issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The site was a triangular piece of land fronted by 5 garages that would be demolished. The garages were not currently in use.

- Properties to the west of the site were partly in ownership of the applicant and to the east was a section of terraced housing.
- Access arrangements for the site were explained.
- Members were shown the changes in levels between the Coach House building and the site and the proximity to the nearest residential properties and gardens.
- The proposed amenity space complied with Neighbourhoods for Living guidelines.
- Parking arrangements.
- Materials to be used.

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

- There had been significant public opposition to the application and revisions to the original application had not addressed previous concerns.
- Main concerns focussed on the height of the proposed dwellings, their proximity to existing dwellings and the impact on local residents.
- The area already suffered due to high number of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and anti-social behaviour.
- Concern regarding the loss of trees and the loss of a Sycamore Tree that was recently removed.
- Concern regarding the loss of daylight and overshadowing to existing properties.
- It was felt that bungalows would be a more suitable proposal as they would not have as much impact on overshadowing and proximity to existing properties.

The applicant and the architect of the proposals addressed the Panel. The applicant informed the Panel that he operated his business from the Coach House building which supported blind people to travel. It was felt that the proposals would enhance the quality of the area and account had been taking of advice from planning officers and concerns of the local community. The architect accepted that the proposals would alter the setting of the area but the proposals had followed Neighbourhoods for Living guidelines and the impact on existing residential properties was within levels of acceptability. The proposals would be of an innovative design and while it was understood why there was concern from existing residents it was felt that the quality of design and use of materials would be an improvement.

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

- Impact of overshadowing – Members were shown diagrams that demonstrated overshadowing at different times of the day and year.
- The proposals would fit in with the character of stone buildings in the area and the extension to the Coach House building.

- Concern regarding the height of the proposed dwellings and that they were 2.5 storeys. It was reported that this was due to the roof space being used as a bedroom. The proposed dwellings would be set in a sunken area of the site and would not appear to be 2.5 storeys from elsewhere.
- There would be 6 parking spaces.
- Gardens would be provided for the 2 new properties and would meet guidelines in relation to size.
- Members broadly supported the design of the dwellings but felt that the site was not large enough to accommodate them and would cause too much of an impact on nearby properties. It was suggested that the application be deferred to allow the opportunity of further revising the proposals to lessen impact on existing properties.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred for one cycle for further discussions with the applicant to reduce massing/dominance of 2.5 storey element.

106 Application 15/07679/FU - Eastergate, Elland Road, Churwell, Morley

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the demolition of an existing house and erection of two houses at Eastergate, Elland Road, Churwell, Morley.

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

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

- A local Ward Councillor had raised highways safety concerns at the site. There were three other houses and a bungalow at the site which were all accessed by the same private road.
- The proposals would include the erection of two 4 bedroom detached houses.
- Members were shown the impact of overshadowing that would be caused to neighbouring properties. There would be a slight impact on overshadowing of other properties.
- Distances between the proposed properties and existing properties met guidelines as did proposed room and garden sizes.
- The upper floors of the proposed properties would have velux windows to prevent overlooking.

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

- The properties had potential for conversion to 6 bedrooms.
- Refuse vehicles did not reverse into the site.

- There was no water surface drainage at the site and there would be a need for new freshwater and sewerage drainage.
- Impact on the openness of the site.
- There would only be two parking spaces for each property. This was not adequate for potentially six bedroom properties.
- There was currently no overshadowing or overlooking of existing properties.
- There were no other 3 storey residential properties nearby.
- There would not be any objection to the development of a two storey property with a similar footprint to the existing bungalow.
- In response to a question from a Panel Member, it was reported that there was problems with parking towards the entrance of the access road due to people using the nearby surgery. There was also some doubt over the future of the church building and car park which was currently used by people attending the surgery.

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

- The dwellings would have 4 bedrooms on the first floor and 2 further rooms on the second floor which could be converted to bedrooms.
- There were conditions relating to drainage including the surfacing of the parking area and submission of a suitable drainage scheme.
- Potential increase in traffic movements. It was estimated that the proposals could generate up to 10 further trips per day.
- Concern regarding the impact on residential amenity, increased traffic movements and car parking.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation with additional condition to remove permitted development rights from rear roof plane.

107 Application 16/00184/FU - 37 Woollin Crescent, Tingley

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for dormer windows to front and rear and new window opening at 37 Woollin Crescent, Tingley.

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:

- It was recommended to refuse the application due to the impact on visual amenity and the street scene.
- The adjoining property had dormer windows to the front and rear. These had been approved in the early 2000s. Another neighbouring property had gable and side dormers approved in the 1990s.

- A rear dormer could be installed under permitted development rights should the materials match the existing materials.
- There had not been any objections to the application.
- When previous dormers had been approved, different policy was in place.

The applicant addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- The dormer extensions would give opportunity to have four bedrooms at the property as the applicant wished to become a foster carer.
- Other properties down the street had installed UPVC dormers within the last 12 months.
- A rear dormer made from materials to match existing materials could be damaged in the wind and there would be movement of tiles in the wind.

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

- Only properties in the immediate vicinity had been looked at with respect to this application.
- A UPVC dormer was considered to be out of keeping with the streetscene.
- Front dormers required planning permission.
- It was suggested that the item be deferred for a site visit so other properties in the area with dormers could be viewed.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred to allow Members to visit the site.

108 Application 15/07342/FU - Springfield House, Whitehouse Lane, Yeadon

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a three storey extension with mezzanine floor and basement at Springfield House, Whitehouse Lane, Yeadon.

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

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

- The application had been referred to Plans Panel as it was a departure from the Development Plan due to the site being within the Green Belt.
- The site had extensive grounds and was surrounded by airport car parking.
- There would be a need to remove some Category C and unclassified trees. There had been some revision to the original plans to ensure retention of other trees.

- The extension would not be higher than the existing building. There would be a glass link between the two.
- The plans had support of the local Member of Parliament.
- Members were shown pictures of what the proposed extension would look like including from the roadside.
- Reference was made to the special circumstances for development in the Green Belt.
- It was recommended to approve the application with an additional condition to prevent the sale, letting or sub-letting of the extension.

Members had been impressed with how the site was managed and felt every confidence that the extension would be detrimental to the site or grounds.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved as per the officer recommendation and with the addition of a condition to ensure the extension cannot be sold off, sublet, let or in any way separated from the main use of the building.